The STAR School

Performance Management Plan

Data Self-analysis and Interpret Findings

Data in the form of AIMS scores in percentages and graphs is included in the attached documents. This data includes averages of AIMS scores by grade for the past five years. Multiple meetings of the entire STAR School faculty were held looking at AIMS scores averages for the past five years as well as an analysis by concept category. Teachers and the Principal also considered AIMS Web monthly assessments, which were utilized this past year as formative assessments in grades K -8 as part of our ASIP plan to address the one year of being labeled Underperforming. For the 2009-10 school year, the school received a ranking of Performing, indicating that the strategies addressed in the ASIP are working. However, we believe our formative assessments will be much more targeted if we utilize Galileo instead of AIMS Web, so we are using that program instead this year. More in-depth discussion of the data self-analysis and the interpretation of the findings is in the section called Introductory Narrative.

Determining the Underlying Reasons for Performance

As part of this management plan, our school is expected to develop hypotheses, based on the data analysis, about the underlying reasons for the school's academic performance. The STAR School was labeled Underperforming for the 2008-09 school year and was labeled as Performing for the 2009-10 school year. The following are hypotheses we developed:

1. School wide, math is the particular academic area in which the greatest percentage of students fell far below on AIMS and is therefore the area where we should focus our most extensive efforts.
   Past efforts to address this problem: The past school year, 2009-2010, a Math Coach was hired to identify all students who fell far below and provide intervention lessons and assessments to observe progress. As a school we improved during that year to Performing. AIMS Web was used as the assessment tool, but this tool is not aligned with the AIMS test and we noticed that even though our AIMS Web monthly results showed steady progress toward meeting the standards, The AIMS test results showed that in several grades Falls Far Below percentages increased even while in some grades Meets/Exceeds percentages increased. This year we are utilizing Galileo which is aligned with AIMS and which has a prescriptive format for lessons to teach the concept needing to be taught. The Math coach is still being utilized to intervene with those students falling far below, but weekly concept lessons and mastery levels will be identified by Galileo formative test results .

2. Students who stay at our school over multiple years are more likely to meet state standards than students who stay two years or less.
   Past efforts to address this problem: We noticed that 83% of our 7th graders who met or exceeded the state standard in Reading have been students at our school for more than two years. Also, 80% of the 7th graders who met or exceeded the state standard in Math have been students at our school for two years or more. Conversely, 100% of 7th graders who Fell Far Below in both Reading and Math were students here for less than two years. Similarly, we noticed that 86% of our 8th graders who met or exceeded the state standard in Reading have been students at our school for 3 years or more. Also, 80% of the 8th graders who met or exceeded the state standard in Math have been students at our school for three years or more. Similarly, 80% of the 8th graders who Fell Far Below on the AIMS math, have been students at our school for less than 3 years. Our interpretation of this data is that we really do know how to raise these students' performance up to the state standards, but the students need to attend our school and have the benefit of our excellent teaching for several years. Therefore, retention of students from year to year is an important goal.
   Retention of students year to year school wide in from 2005 to 2006 was 72%. By this past year, retention of students from year to year had increased to 94%. We now have a waiting list for students to get into most grades. Student retention, we have realized, depends upon developing positive relationships among students and between students and adults at the school. Our school utilizes the 40 Developmental Assets and a character building reading program (Voices) in addition to our school wide values of 4R's (Respect, Relationship, Responsibility, and Reasoning) to establish a school culture of caring for one another.
3. The high poverty of most families (85% free and reduced lunch) and the fact that most parents and grandparents speak Navajo as their first language, mean many students do not come to school with math concept vocabulary with which to discuss and understand math concepts.
   Past efforts to address this problem: Acknowledging that research shows that children coming from poverty situations have the same intuitive math concepts as children coming from higher income areas, but lack the vocabulary to manipulate and discuss those concepts, we began this past year to include specific vocabulary and language objectives in math lessons for all grades. This is still a goal, but we need to work with a local professor of mathematics to determine the best use of these vocabulary goals. This is being planned for this school year.
4. Many students do not have a familiarity with standardized test taking procedures and strategies and therefore sometimes make mistakes on format and filling out answers properly.
   Past efforts to address this problem: None of the 3rd and 4th grade students have received practice lessons in taking AIMS tests. The results on the math portion of the

AIMS test for these grades in 2010 was far worse than their performance all the way through the year on the AIMS Web formative tests. On the other hand, the 7th and 8th graders who did receive AIMS training practice, performed fairly well on the AIMS. This lead the teaching staff and principal to suspect that these students need some test taking practice . This will be implemented this year before the spring testing dates.

5. Time on task as evidenced by behavior procedures in place and thoroughly practiced has a great impact on learning and academic performance.
   Past efforts to address this problem: Teacher/ classroom observations in the 2008-09 school year indicated that in several classrooms, the behavior management was so undeveloped that a good percentage of students were not attending long enough to the lesson to obtain the objective. This resulted in a concerted effort of developing classroom management through training in the Harry Wong procedures. The principal then evaluated teachers on their degree of implementation and teachers were released at the end of the school year who were not fully implementing the procedures. Classrooms in which procedures were faithfully implemented demonstrated significant improvements in achievement from the previous years.

Introductory Narrative

The STAR School just began its 9th year of operation. It has made AYP for the past five years. In the past five years the school has received the ranking of Performing or Performing Plus in four of those years. In 2010, The STAR School again received a rating of Performing. The STAR School is located on the edge of the Navajo Reservation. 99% of our students are Native American. In October 2008, Keith Brown, Director of Academic Service for the ASBCS, met with the staff of The STAR School, observed classrooms, reviewed curriculum resources, attendance rosters, bus driver licenses, and Fingerprint clearance cards. Mr. Brown found that the school was meeting requirements in all of these areas. In his summary on Curriculum and Instruction, Mr. Brown provided the following:

" * During classroom observation, instruction was observed to be orderly and systematic. Long and short range plans and assessments indicated alignment to Arizona Academic Standards. Resources (i.e. texts, computers, trade books, etc.) were evident and in sufficient quantity for all students to access.

* In the primary grades, evidence that formative assessments (Voices Curriculum and DIBELS) are conducted periodically.

*Teachers and students had access to relevant technology such as SMARTBoard and desktop computers. Access to high-speed Internet was available

*A character development program (i.e. Service Learning) is being implemented which supports the STAR School's charter.

*Through discussion with teachers, it was evident that formative assessments are used for diagnostic purposes and results are used to modify instruction and communicate with parents.

*In fifth –eighth grades, students were actively involved in projects that integrate science and language arts, as well as the character development program." No comment or further action was required from Mr. Brown's letter.

During the beginning of the 2009-10, the principal and staff of the STAR School developed the Arizona School Improvement Plan in response to the schools' first time ever labeling as Underperforming. A coach was sent by the ADE to assist the staff in developing that plan. The plan was submitted to ADE, and subsequently the school hosted a Visitation Team, who thoroughly observed and reviewed the school and its plans to address the issues that led to its Underperforming label. During their visit, the Visitation team commended the school staff for our efforts and indicated that they thought our plan was measureable, well focused, and attainable. The ASIP plan was followed throughout the 2009-10 school year to address the priority of math skills development and math teaching. This PMP builds onto that ASIP plan and adds to it with further refinements.

As the STAR instructional staff analyzed the data from the AIMS tests as well as the formative data, the pattern that emerged for us is that while Reading still needs improvement, we are moving in the right direction in Reading with our new reading curriculum. Math is clearly the area that needs the most improvement. In nearly every one of the past five years, and for nearly every grade, the percentage of students who scored in the Falls Far Below category was larger by a significant amount for Math than for Reading. This can be seen in the attached graphs and data summaries for each grade for the past five years. Another pattern that emerges is that the lower elementary grades (2,3,4, and 5) have the lowest percentage of students who either meet or exceed the state standard in math. The attached graphs show that 71% of 7th grade in 2009-10 met or exceeded the state standard, which is above the state average of 59%. Also, 46% of the 8th graders met the Math standard, close to the state average. On the other hand, in grades 3, 4, and 5, the percentage of students meeting the state standard in Math in 2010, ranged between 0% and 29%, well below the state average. While our Kindergarten assessments show that students generally enter the STAR School a full year behind in math concepts, our data on the improvement we see in students who stay with our school more than three years tells us that these deficits can be reversed when students are provided with consistent quality teaching with a supportive environment that strengthens relationships and sets high expectations for behavior as well as academic performance.

Further analysis of the AIMS data revealed that the Math concepts that are most in need of improved instruction and assessment in grades K-3 are Numerical Operations, Estimation, Analysis of Change, and Geometric Principles. In grades 4-6, the concepts of Probability, Discrete Math, Coordinate Geometry, and Algorithms are in greatest need of improved

instruction and assessment. As a result of this analysis, the focus of the interventions by the classroom teachers and the Math coach will be especially in these concept areas, utilizing the Galileo assessment system to determine if further instruction is needed.

Another significant factor that was identified by the Principal that inhibited adequate performance in the past five years was lack of adequate classroom management in certain classrooms. Classroom observations by the principal and an outside expert indicated that in school year 2008-09, the year the school was identified as Underperforming, two of the lower grade classrooms showed evidence of a lack of effective classroom management techniques as one of the most significant features inhibiting learning. The AIMS test results also indicated a low performance in these grades as shown in the attached AIMS summaries. The School Board responded by mandating in all classrooms the implementation of classroom management procedures as defined by Harry Wong in his book and video series. "The First Day of School: How To be an Effective Teacher". The Principal trained the entire staff at the beginning of the school year and over the summer. Teachers were informed that they must implement these classroom management procedures to keep their jobs as STAR School teachers. One of the teachers (3rd grade) totally adopted the classroom management procedures and turned her classroom's performance around, raising the percentage of students who met the state standard in Math from 0% to 29% and reducing the percentage of students Falling Far Below from 17% to 0%. One other teacher only partially implemented the procedures and was let go at the end of the school year. New teachers who have been hired since then and all new teachers who will come on staff in the future will be required to fully implement these procedures. The principal continues to check on classroom procedures and has implemented with the staff procedures for behavior throughout the school. In addition, the principal has also trained the new staff on classroom management techniques described in the book "Teach Like a Champion". The staff has enthusiastically embraced these procedures because time on task has increased in the classrooms and behavioral referrals are lower than ever.

Staffing fluctuations have also had an impact on student achievement. Having high quality teachers who are healthy is very important to the achievement of our students. The teacher for the 5th and 6th grades, for example, had an outstanding record of student AIMS performance from 2006 through 2009. As you can see from the attached AIMS score summaries, her 6th grade students had met or exceeded the state standards in Reading on the AIMS test between 57% and 75% of the time for the previous three years, and had met or exceeded the state standards in Math on the AIMS test between 53% and 75% of the time from 2006 through 2009. However in the summer of 2009, she discovered she had developed cancer and during the 2009-10 school year, she had to be absent from school at least one day and sometimes two days a week for nearly four months of the school year for her chemotherapy treatments. Although we provided substitute teachers during her absence, the scores of her students dropped significantly , with 40% meeting the state standard in Reading and 20% meeting the state standard in Math. A similar pattern can be seen for the 5th grade students. We are fortunate that she is healthy again,

and eagerly teaching, and we expect outstanding performance from her students again this year and in years to come. Similarly, the past five years of 2nd grade Terra Nova test scores show the drop in performance when one very capable teacher resigned in 2007. In 2008 another teacher was hired who turned out to be a less capable teacher. He was let go in 2008, and replaced by another teacher who was let go at the end of the 2009-10 school year. The new teacher in that classroom, hired in July, 2010 is fully implementing classroom management techniques required by the Board. The monthly Galileo assessments will be monitored carefully to see that the students are progressing toward the goal of the state average of 59% meeting or exceeding the math standard, and 74% meeting or exceeding the reading standard. This highlights the importance of attracting and retaining high quality teachers who have a high quality relationship with their students to obtain high academic performances. The Governing Board is also considering ways to include in teachers' evaluations will be weighted to include between 33% and 50% consideration for improvement of student AIMS test scores.

Our data show that some of our teachers are consistently getting their students to do better on the AIMS test than others. Our data also show that teachers who implement our approaches to instruction generally show improvement in their students' AIMS scores. For the past two years, the school has provided all teachers with monthly intensive Reading coaching and instruction by an outside consultant and specialized coursework in updated math instruction techniques over the summers. In discussing with the instructional staff why some teachers have succeeded in students' scores increasing on the AIMS tests in either math or reading, and some have not, the staff determined that teachers should have time to share with one another how they effectively teach important concepts in math and reading, especially focusing on curriculum mapping. In order to improve instruction in math and in reading, weekly staff meetings are scheduled to provide sharing between successful teachers and teachers who are less successful, as measured by performance of their students on the AIMS tests in Reading and Math. Teachers are also encouraged to do peer reviews in which teachers are given time to observe in other teachers' classrooms and then discuss what has been observed as either problematic or particularly successful.

The final obstacle to performance that came out of the data is in the area of assessment. During the 2009-10 school year, the STAR School utilized AIMS Web to provide monthly formative assessments of all students in math and reading. The monthly AIMS Web results showed consistent improvement across all grades in math skills and concepts. But this was not reflected in some of the grades' performance on the AIMS tests, particularly the 4th grade scores in math in which 85% of the class scored in Falls Far Below, while the AIMS Web monthly scores for those same students indicated that over 70% of the students scored either above average or excelling. When the staff analyzed this outcome, one conclusion was that we needed to make sure students actually learned the concepts in the state standards through sharing better teaching as indicated in the above paragraph. Another conclusion was that we needed a formative assessment program that was actually aligned with the AIMS test and the state standards.

Galileo, which is an online formative assessment and prescriptive teaching program that is aligned to the Arizona state standards, was chosen to replace the AIMS web program as our formative assessment system. Our school is currently establishing the pre test base in math and reading for all students in the Galileo system. Another conclusion reached by the staff analyzing the assessment issue was that the 2nd through 4th grade students who did not have much experience with standardized tests should have practice test experience so that they are totally familiar with the proper way to take a standardized test. Practice tests will be made available to teachers in these grades prior to the spring AIMS testing dates. The fourth conclusion reached by the staff when analyzing the assessment indicators is that the supplemental instruction of the Math coach should be especially focused in the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades and that math instruction by the coach and all classroom teachers should be based on concepts to be taught by the Galileo formative assessments. All of these conclusions have been woven into the STAR School's approach to improving math and reading instruction.

.

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN
The STAR School

INDICATOR: *(Academic Area)* **Mathematics** **DURATION OF THE PLAN:** Begins __September 1 , 2010 _ to _June 30_ , 2012

MEASURE	METRIC	TARGET
(Identify what aspect of indicator, i.e. academic area, will be focused upon.) AIMS test in math in April, 2011 and in April, 2012	*(Reasonable and appropriate ways to measure the identified improvement area – generally numeric.)* **Within two years, 60% of students school-wide will reach proficiency in AIMS math**	*(Intended results or definition of success within a certain period of time)* **As determined by the spring, 2012 AIMS test, 60% of students, school-wide, including students with disabilities, English language learners and the economically disadvantaged, will be proficient in math by April, 2012**

STRATEGY I: Provide and implement a mathematics curriculum that improves student achievement.

Action Steps	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. Supplement Houghton Mifflin Math curriculum in grades 1 through 8 with Aha Math!, online math instruction.	Implement Aha Math 9-15-10 and continue through 6-1-12	Teachers in grades 2 through 8	Monthly reports of math lessons completed checked by Head Teacher and Principal	$750.00 per year
2. In Kindergarten, supplement Houghton Mifflin Math	Implement Montessori	Kindergarten teacher, Montessori trained	Weekly reports of math instructional progress to	$3,200.00

curriculum with Montessori Kindergarten math instructional materials.	math materials with guidance in teaching on 9-1-10	teacher mentor	Principal; Weekly observations by Principal and mentor.	
3. The teachers who have received training as Math mentors in the Intel math program will continue to provide mentoring to other teachers in ways to improve their math instruction	Monthly in-service beginning 9-1-10	STAR School Math Mentors	Principal will check monthly with Math mentors on trainings they are providing to other teachers.	

STRATEGY II: Develop and implement a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standard for Mathematics into instruction.

Action Steps	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. *Head teacher will monitor all teacher lesson plans weekly to assure that all math instruction includes the relevant Arizona Academic Standards.*	Weekly, beginning on 8-15-10	Head Teacher	Head teacher will review written lesson plans of each teacher and provide written statement to Principal on any teachers who have not met the standard	0
2. Teachers and Math Coach will review monthly the Galileo assessment results and the state standards that students still need to learn	Monthly beginning on 9-1-10	Math Coach and teachers	Math Coach and teachers will maintain the monthly Galileo assessment results and demonstrate monthly to the Principal how those results have influenced their teaching.	0
3.				

STRATEGY III: Develop and implement a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in mathematics.

Action Steps	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. *Math Coach will be hired to assist all teachers in all grades to assess all students monthly in their progress in math concepts as determined by the AIMS aligned Galileo program and then determine concepts that need to be emphasized in instruction.*	9-15-10	Math Coach and teachers	Monthly Galileo assessments will indicate a rate of 60% or more meeting proficiency in the concepts taught. Annual AIMS testing will result in 60% or more of the students school-wide meeting or exceeding the math proficiency standard	$20,000 per year
2. Head teacher will check lesson plans at the beginning of each week to assure alignment of lesson plans with state standards and report to Principal	8-15-10	Head teacher and Principal	Teachers are expected to have 100% compliance with this expectation. Teachers who miss the deadline will be required to meet with the Principal	$0
Principal will meet monthly with teachers to go over the school-wide progress toward the proficiency goal on student assessments	9-1-10	Principal	Attendance sheets will provide evidence of teachers present. Teachers who are not meeting the expected growth in student scores will have conferences with Principal to develop an improvement plan.	0

STRATEGY IV: Develop and implement a professional development plan that supports effective implementation of the mathematics curriculum.

Action Steps	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. As part of the ongoing weekly in-service trainings, experienced teachers will present to the whole instructional staff on aspects of effective curriculum mapping throughout the school year.	9-1-10	Head teacher and selected teachers	Head teacher will review each month running record notes on each teacher's curriculum maps of any changes or adjustments they need to make including dates of instruction of each standard.	$0
2. All teachers will be trained in administering Galileo assessments to their students and in interpreting results to more finely hone their teaching to concepts that need emphasis.	9-15-10	Math Coach, Assessment coordinator and teachers	Monthly Galileo assessments aligned with AIMS will influence the next month's instruction based on concepts that need to be strengthened.	$2,000
3. Once a month, staff in-service will center around the results of the assessments in Galileo and discussion among teachers about how they can improve student performances.	Monthly beginning 9-	Principal, Head Teacher, Instructional staff	Attendance at training based on sign in sheet; assistance provided by Principal when identified as a teacher need in in-service	0

ANNUAL BENCHMARK TARGETS:

Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Target For This Plan
Currently, the	As measured by	As measured by	**As determined by the spring 2012 AIMS test, 60% of**

school-wide average of students achieving proficiency on AIMS math is 31%.	the spring, 2011 AIMS test, the school wide average of students achieving proficiency on AIMS math will be 46%	the spring, 2012 AIMS test, the school-wide average of students achieving proficiency on the AIMS math will be 60%	**students, school-wide, including students with disabilities, English language learners and the economically disadvantaged, will be proficient in math by April, 2012**

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN
The STAR School

INDICATOR: *(Academic Area)* **Reading** **DURATION OF THE PLAN:** Begins September 1_ , 2010 to June 30, _ , 2012

MEASURE	METRIC	TARGET
AIMS test in Reading in April, 2011 and in April, 2012.	*Within two years, 75% of students school-wide will reach proficiency in AIMS Reading.*	*(Intended results or definition of success within a certain period of time)* **As determined by the spring, 2012 AIMS test, 75% of students, school-wide, including students with disabilities, English language learners, and the economically disadvantaged, will be proficient in reading by April, 2012.**

STRATEGY I: Provide and implement a reading curriculum that improves student achievement.

Action Steps	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. *Voices Reading curriculum, K-8, will include six 1.5 day advanced training sessions(on how to more effectively teach reading) throughout the year provided by a professional Voices Reading trainer.*	Beginning 8-1-10 and continuing through 6-30-12	Principal	Sign-in sheets will provide teacher attendance records. Teachers will observe peers teaching Voices bi monthly. Part of the training will include the trainer observing in the classrooms about the effectiveness of implementation by the teachers. Trainer will meet with the principal quarterly	$16,000

			to determine what needs to be focused on to improve student reading.	
2. Teachers will supplement the reading curriculum with an intensive focus on journal writing which will be shared with parents and reinforced in annual public speaking contest for the students to present to the community	Beginning 8-1-10 and continuing through 6-30-12	Teachers	Every student in the school will research, write and read a speech on a topic of their concern. Students will compete before the whole school to read their speeches. Teacher records will reflect students meeting this goal.	$500
3. DEAR (Drop Everything and Read) will be implemented school wide as an after school enrichment program	Beginning 8-15-10 and continuing through 6-30-12	After school enrichment coordinator	Charts identifying books read will be kept by the after school coordinator and shared with teachers.	

STRATEGY II: Develop and implement a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standard for Reading into instruction.

Action Steps	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1.Head teacher will monitor all teacher lesson plans weekly to assure that all reading instruction includes relevant Arizona Academic Standards	Weekly beginning on 8-15-10	Head Teacher	Head teacher will review written lesson plans of each teacher and provide written statement to the Principal on any teachers who have not included AZ Academic standards for Reading in their lesson plans.	0
2. Teachers and Head Teacher will review each month the	Monthly beginning on	Teachers and Assessment	Assessment Coordinator and teachers will maintain the	

Galileo assessments in reading with the assessment coordinator and identify the state standards that still need to be learned.	9-1-10	coordinator	monthly Galileo assessment results and demonstrate to the Principal how those results have influenced their teaching.	
3.				

STRATEGY III: Develop and implement a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency in reading.

Action Steps	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. *Voices Reading trainer will demonstrate for all teachers all the ways to use the reading curriculum and assessments in the curriculum and check on each teacher's use of these assessments during each 6 week visit and report to the Principal..*	Beginning 8-15-10 and every six weeks thereafter	Voices Reading Trainer and Principal	Trainer will provide Principal with written checklist and verbal report on each teachers progress on teaching reading and steps to be taken	$16,000
2. Assessment Coordinator will assist all teachers in all grades to assess student progress monthly as determined by the AIMS aligned Galileo online program and then determine concepts that need to be emphasized in instruction.	9-15-10	Assessment Coordinator and Teachers	Monthly assessments will aim at a rate of 60% meeting proficiency in the concepts taught in year one. Students not reaching proficiency will be offered additional tutoring. Annual AIMS testing will aim to have 60% of the students school-wide meeting the reading proficiency standard in year one. Year two will aim at 75% proficient.	$0

3. Principal will meet monthly with all Instructional staff on progress being made school-wide toward the proficiency goals in reading.	9-1-10	Principal	Attendance sheets will reflect teachers in attendance. Teachers whose Galileo scores show students are not making adequate progress toward the proficiency targets will be identified and meet with the Principal and develop improvement plans.	

STRATEGY IV: Develop and implement a professional development plan that supports effective implementation of the reading curriculum.

Action Steps	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. *As part of the ongoing weekly in-service trainings, experienced teachers will present to the whole instructional staff on aspects of effective curriculum mapping throughout the school year*	9-1-10	Head Teacher and selected teachers	Head teacher will review each month running record notes on each teacher's curriculum maps of any changes or adjustments they need to make, including dates of instruction of each reading standard	0
2. All teachers will be trained in administering Galileo assessments and instruction to their students and in interpreting results to more finely hone their teaching to concepts that need emphasis.	9-15-10	Assessment Coordinator, teachers and Galileo trainer	Monthly Galileo assessments aligned with AIMS will influence the next month's instruction based on concepts that need to be strengthened.	0
3.Once a month, Friday staff in-service will center around the results of the Galileo	Monthly beginning 9-1-10	Principal, Head Teacher, Assessment Coordinator, and	Attendance at training based on sign-in sheet; assistance provided by Principal when	0

assessments and discussion among teachers about how they can improve student performances.		Instructional staff	identified as a teacher need in the in-service.	

ANNUAL BENCHMARK TARGETS:

Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Target For This Plan
Currently, the school-wide average of students achieving proficiency on AIMS math is 44%	As measured by the spring, 2011 AIMS test, the school-wide average of students achieving proficiency in reading will be 60%.	As measured by the spring, 2012 AIMS test, the school-wide average of students achieving proficiency in reading will be 75%	**As determined by the spring, 2012 AIMS test, 75% of students, school-wide, including students with disabilities, English language learners, and the economically disadvantaged, will be proficient in reading by April, 2012.**