Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

Name of School:

Central

Challenger 7 Elementary School

Area:

Principal:

Mrs. Sandy Demmon

Area Superintendent:

Mrs. Carol Mela

SAC Chairperson:

Mr. John Cowart

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

Teachers facilitating life-long learning by actively engaging students and utilizing state of the art technology.

Vision Statement:

Engage and encourage students in a safe environment with excellence to reach their true potential becoming life-long learners.

Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

Data Analysis from multiple data sources: *(Needs assessment that supports the need for improvement)*

One place to start – three year trend history (optional): In looking at three year trend data, it is imperative to remember that this year's cut scores were raised for all levels of the FCAT. Only 70% in reading (2011-88%, 2010-94%), 68% in mathematics (2011-79%, 2010-88%), and 67% in science (2011-78%, 2010-87%) of the students met the proficiency standard set by the state of FCAT Level 3 and above. This was a decline as compared to the previous two years. The decline was more in reading and science than the district experienced as a result of the new cut scores. In reading the district experienced a 10% decline and Challenger 7 experience an 18% decline. In mathematics the district experienced a 16% decline and Challenger 7 experienced an 11% decline. In science the district experienced a 3% decline and Challenger 7 experienced an 11% decline. Seventy-eight percent (2011-63%, 2010-76%) of the students made annual learning gains in reading while 70% (2011-58%. 2010-70%) of the students made annual learning gains in mathematics. This was an increase in reading as compared to the previous years. In mathematics this was an increase over last year and the same percentage as the previous year. In analyzing the gains of the lowest 25% students, 73% (2011-65%, 2010-82%) made annual learning gains in reading and 64% (2011-58%, 2010-69%) made annual learning gains in mathematics. This was an increase over last year in both reading and mathematics. The learning gains that were evident for all students were a direct result of the differentiated instruction that was implemented school wide as part of the 2010-2011 School Improvement Plan process. All of the Challenger 7 data points as described above were above the district averages. Although science and mathematics appear to be somewhat weaker than reading, instruction in all subject areas needs to be targeted for improvement in order to regain the

percentages from the past and start an upward trend. When comparing the beginning of the year reading and mathematics district required assessment data to the end of the year data at all grade levels over the last three years, minimal growth was noted, and in about half of the circumstances there was a decline. As with the FCAT as indicated above, students in the lowest quartile made more progress than students in the upper quartile. Instructional strategies are needed that impact all subject areas and have a large effect size so that all students are positively impacted and grade level averages increase. To get a better picture of the degree of higher level questioning that is currently occurring school wide, classrooms were visited at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year, and a sample of 12 questions were documented for each teacher. Each teacher then determined the level of each question, and the number of lower level and higher level questions was determined. The majority of the teachers (21 out of 33) asked more lower level questions than higher level questions.

Analysis of Current Practice: *(How do we currently conduct business?)*

Although present practice varies from classroom to classroom, classroom walkthroughs support what research confirms about questioning in the majority of classrooms, “The vast majority of questions asked by teachers are low-level cognitive questions that require students to focus on the memorization and recall of factual information rather than questions which foster deeper student understanding” (Wilen, 1991). Also, Tienken, Goldberg, & DiRocco (2009) recommend that teachers script 10-15 higher level questions for an average lesson as part of the planning stage. Review of teachers’ lesson plans throughout the year indicates that questions are not being planned but rather generated while teaching. Although classroom walkthroughs indicate that many of the thinking strategies are visible in the classrooms, direct instruction to explicitly teach students how to use the strategies are not in depth and no visuals outlining the steps or graphic organizers guiding students in using the thinking strategies are visibly displayed. Presently at Challenger 7 both higher level questioning and thinking strategies are not consistently and pervasively taught and utilized across all

subject areas in every classroom.

Best Practice: *(What does research tell us we should be doing as it relates to data analysis above?)*

According to Dr. Max Thompson and Dr. Julia Thompson (2009), "Research and evidence shows that in order to be most effective, schools should implement 2-4 exemplary strategies consistently and pervasively" (p. 3). Thompson and Thompson further claim that the number one strategy that positively impacts student learning is extended thinking followed closely by effective questioning. Both strategies promote a deeper understanding of the concepts being taught by requiring students to refine their original knowledge leading to the retention, application, and transfer of knowledge. There are eight thinking strategies that Thompson and Thompson suggest should be explicitly taught and then applied in an assignment. These include comparing, classifying, induction, deduction, error analysis, abstracting, constructing support, and analyzing perspectives. Improving the usage of higher level questioning involves identifying the types of questions currently being asked, their purpose, and what techniques can be utilized to improve them. Research indicates that recording questions being used during instruction and then reflecting with teachers to analyze their questions will strengthen the teachers' questioning strategies.

CONTENT AREA:

Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Parental Involvement	Drop-out Programs
Language Arts	Social Studies	Arts/PE	Other:		

School Based Objective: *(Action statement: What will we do to improve programmatic and/or instructional effectiveness?)*

Higher level questioning and thinking strategies will be implemented consistently and pervasively in all classrooms in order to positively impact student learning.

Strategies: *(Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives)*

Barrier	*Action Steps*	*Person Responsible*	*Time-table*	*Budget*	*In-Process Measure*
1. Lack of knowledge relative to higher level questions.	1. Provide teacher training on the six types of questions based on Bloom's Taxonomy.	Administration	July – December 2012	$0	Training agenda
2. Lack of knowledge relative to higher level questions.	2. Provide teacher training on how to write questions for each of the six question types.	Administration	July - December 2012	$0	Training agenda
3. There is no formal process in place to determine whether the teachers' use of higher level questioning is improving.	3. Develop a teacher questioning observation form to include the number of lower and higher level questions out of 12 being recorded during a random classroom visit.	Administration and teachers	July – August 2012	$0	Questioning observation form
4. There is no formal process in place to determine whether the teachers' use of higher level questioning is improving.	4. Complete the observation form for every teacher at least three times throughout the first semester.	Administration	August – December 2012	$0	Completed questioning observation forms
5. There is no formal process in place to determine whether the teachers' use of higher level questioning is improving.	5. Monitor teachers' level of improvement relative to asking higher level questions by maintaining a chart with teacher generated goals based on the observation form feedback.	Teachers	August – December 2012	$0	Teacher higher level questioning charts
6. Lack of knowledge relative to higher level questions.	6. Teachers will pre plan five higher level questions on a weekly basis for an assigned subject area. These will be turned into the administration and used for analysis.	Administration and Teachers	October – December 2012	$0	Teacher higher level questions submitted weekly.
7. Lack of knowledge relative to higher level questions.	7. Analyze teachers' lower-level questions and how to rewrite them at a higher level.	Teachers	October – December 2012	$0	Documenta-tion of questions rewritten

8. Lack of knowledge relative to higher level questions.	8. Share examples of exemplary higher level questions by displaying them on a bulletin board in the administrative area.	Administration	October – December 2012	$0	Bulletin board displaying higher level questions
9. Lack of knowledge relative to implementing extended thinking activities.	9. Purchase the book, Connecting Extended Thinking by Dr. Max Thompson and Dr. Julia Thompson as a training guide for the implementation of extended thinking activities.	Administration	July 2012	$40	Book
10. Lack of knowledge relative to implementing extended thinking activities.	10. Attend a training conducted by Dr. Max Thompson on extended thinking activities.	Administration 2 Teachers	November 2012	$2000	Training agenda
11. Lack of knowledge relative to implementing extended thinking activities.	11. Train teachers on the eight extended thinking activities as outlined by Dr. Max Thompson and Dr. Julia Thompson.	Administration	January - March 2013	$0	Training agenda
12. Lack of knowledge relative to implementing extended thinking activities.	12. Display posters depicting the steps and graphic organizers for each of the eight extended thinking activities in all classrooms.	Teachers	January – April 2013	$400	Posters visible in all classrooms
13. Lack of knowledge relative to implementing extended thinking activities.	13. Teachers will practice each of the eight extended thinking activities in their classrooms as they are introduced through training.	Teachers	January – March 2013	$0	Lesson plans including the thinking activities
14. There is no formal process in place to monitor teachers' use of extended thinking activities.	14. The administration will watch a lesson in which the teacher incorporates an extended thinking activity and provide feedback.	Administration	April – May 2013	$0	Feedback forms
15. There is no formal process in place to monitor teachers' use of extended thinking activities.	15. Teachers will track their usage of extended learning activities on a chart.	Teachers	January – May 2013	$0	Extended thinking activities usage chart
16. There is no formal process in place to monitor teachers' use of extended thinking activities.	16. Students will be given a survey based on their knowledge of the extended learning strategies.	Teachers and students	May 2013	$0	Survey results

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes: *(Measures the level of implementation of the professional practices throughout the school)*

Qualitative Measurement: There will be an improvement in the quality of higher level questions generated by each teacher and extended thinking activities as evidenced by training agendas, classroom walkthroughs resulting in questions sited on a bulletin board share point, evidence of higher level questions written in preparation for lessons, and the extended thinking activities usage chart.

Quantitative Measurement: Improvement will be based on the percentage of teachers who reach their goal on the questioning observation forms. At least 80% of the teachers will reach their goal as established from their baseline data. One hundred percent of the teachers will demonstrate a lesson using an extended thinking activity.

Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations: *(Measures of student achievement)*

Qualitative Measurement: There will be an improvement as seen by teachers on the quality of responses to higher level questions and extended thinking activities as indicated by teacher observations.

Quantitative Measurement: Student annual learning gains on the 2013 FCAT will be evident for at least 83% of the students in reading and 75% of the students in mathematics in Grades 4-6, and there will be at least 80% of the students reaching the 70% proficiency rate on the end of the year district required assessments in reading and mathematics at Grades K-3.

Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Quality Questioning	July 2012 – December 2012	Monitor teachers' level of improvement on higher level questioning progress monitoring charts

Extended Thinking Activities	November 2012 – May 2013	Track usage of extended thinking activities on an Extended Thinking Activities Usage Chart.

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

Data Analysis from multiple data sources: *(Needs assessment that supports the need for improvement)*

The state requires that all schools fully implement the CCSS in all grade levels by the 2013-2014 school year.

Analysis of Current Practice: *(How do we currently conduct business?)*

Currently the teachers have just become familiar with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), and those teachers in Grades K-2 have only unpacked a couple prior to the year end. The administration and several teacher leaders have attended district level and state level trainings relative to the CCSS. All grade levels have identified high priority standards during the 2011-2012 school year based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, and they have identified and/or developed common formative assessments that they have analyzed to identify student strengths and weaknesses as well as to improve instruction. Proficiency of this practice varies according to grade level. With the new standards and personnel changes across grade levels, unpacking the standards, identifying those of high priority, and developing and utilizing common formative assessments is still an area of improvement needing attention.

Best Practice: *(What does research tell us we should be doing as it relates to data analysis above?)*

The National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School

Officers (2012) suggest that in order to increase student achievement it is important that educators understand specifically what the new standards mean a student must know, understand and be able to do. Ainsworth (2003) wrote, "Unwrapped standards provide clarity as to what students must know and be able to do. When teachers take the time to analyze each standard and identify its essential concepts and skills, the result is more effective instructional planning, assessment, and student learning" (p. 1). Although unpacking the standards is important, according to research, it is only the first step in student learning. Teachers must also meet regularly as a team to identify high priority standards, develop common formative assessments, analyze current levels of achievement, set achievement goals, share strategies, and then create lessons to improve upon those levels (Schmoker, 2005).

CONTENT AREA:

Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Parental Involvement	Drop-out Programs
Language Arts	Social Studies	Arts/PE	Other:		

School Based Objective: *(Action statement: What will we do to improve programmatic and/or instructional effectiveness?)*

Teachers will unpack the reading and mathematics CCSS and identify the high priority standards on which to base common formative assessments.

Strategies: *(Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives)*

Barrier	*Action Steps*	*Person Responsible*	*Timetable*	*Budget*	*In-Process Measure*
1. Teachers do not have a deep understanding of the CCSS.	1. Schedule PLC time to unpack the English/Language Arts Standards.	Administration	July 2012	$0	PLC Schedule

2. Teachers do not have a deep understanding of the CCSS.	2. Create a Learning Goal template to be used to identify the performance bands associated with the English/Language Arts Standards.	CCSS school cadre	June 2012	$0	Learning Goal Template
3. Teachers do not have a deep understanding of the CCSS.	3. All grade levels will unpack the English/ Language Arts Standards using the Learning Goal template.	Teachers	July 2012 – May 2013	$0	Completed Learning Goal Sheets
4. Teachers do not have a deep understanding of the CCSS.	4. Schedule grade level time to discuss the Mathematics Standards.	Administration	July 2012 – May 2013	$0	Grade Level Meeting Agendas
5. Not having a process in place to ensure student progress towards mastering the standards.	5. Priority standards will be identified for reading and math and common formative assessments identified.	Teachers	July 2012 – October 2012	$0	A list of the priority standards for every grade level and the associated common formative assessment
6. Not having a process in place to ensure student progress towards mastering the standards.	6. Common formative assessments for the priority standards will be implemented and analyzed for instructional implications.	Teachers	July 2012 – May 2013	$0	PLC minutes focused on the common formative assessments

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes: *(Measures the level of implementation of the professional practices throughout the school)*

Quantitative Measurement: Learning goal sheets will be completed at all grade levels for the English/ Language Arts Standards.

Qualitative Measurement: Evidence of teaching the CCSS will be observed during classroom walkthroughs in Grades K-2 and the Mathematical Professional Practices will be evident across all grade

levels.

Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations: *(Measures of student achievement)*

Quantitative Measurement: Seventy-five percent (baseline 4%) of our kindergarten students will score 90% or better on their letter sounds on the Kindergarten Literacy Survey 4. Seventy-five percent (baseline first grade 72%, 2nd grade 60%) of our grade one and two students will score 70% or higher on the Fall DRLA.

Seventy (baseline kindergarten 52%, 1st grade 21%, 2nd grade 23%) percent of our grade K-2 students will score 70% or higher on the end of year district math assessment.

Qualitative Measurement: Students will show evidence of mastering the CCSS through anecdotal records and observations.

Common Core State Standards Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
CCSS math unpacking the standards	Twice a month during Tuesday data meetings; July 2012-May2013	K-2 will document CCSS in lesson plans, and feedback with be provided to all grades relative to the standards for mathematical practice and how well they are being implemented in the classroom.
Math Solutions intervention trainings.	Training conducted September 2012. Implementation October 2012-May 2013	Progress monitoring will be built into the program to be conducted on a regular basis.
Text Complexity	October 2012	Integration of additional text within lessons appropriate to text complexity.
ELA CCSS shifts	October 2012	These shifts will be visible in the implementation of the ELA CCSS.

APPENDIX A

Reading Goal 1. **Increase the percentage of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Reading.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance** (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)	**2013 Expected Level of Performance** (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. **It is difficult for students who are well below grade level to achieve grade level status within a year's time.**		
Strategy(s): 1. **Every grade level will have a plan of action on how they will meet the needs of their lowest 25% in reaching grade level status.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** Exceptional education students remain below grade level. **Strategy(s):** 1. Personnel with extra time will be assigned to the 5/6 and 3/4 exceptional education classrooms to offer additional instructional support.	70%=199 students	75%= 210 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading **Barrier(s):** Lack of enrichment activities **Strategy(s):** 1. Professional development relative to higher level questioning and extended thinking activities will be provided, and teachers will incorporate more of these questions and activities into their lessons. Teachers will continue to differentiate instruction.	40%=114 students	45%= 126 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**		

Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading 1. **Barrier(s):** Lack of consistent intervention with progress monitoring outside of the reading block. **Strategy(s):** 1. A reading intervention block will be built into the schedule at all grade levels, and student progress within this block will be monitored. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	70%=37 students	75% = 53 students
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline data 2010-11:**	70% = 199 students	78% = 220 students
Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading : White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	Enter numerical data for current level of performance 31% = 55 students 25% = 2 students 17% = 2 students 0% = 0 students N/A	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance 26% = 59 students 20% = 3 students 12% = 2 students 0% = 0 students N/A
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s): Lack of vocabulary.** **Strategy(s):** **1.** Continue to place ELL students in the same teacher's classrooms who are teaching out of field so that they can continue to become trained to better meet these students' needs. Closely document the ELL strategies being implemented through documentation on a checklist or in the lesson plans.	67%=6 students	57%=4 students
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	31%=21 students	28%=11 students

Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** Students are coming to school either late for breakfast or not receiving breakfast at home. **Strategy(s):** **1.** Promote breakfast and monitor the students who have habitual tardiness.	20%=26 students	18%=20 students

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:** 44%	Limited resources	Utilize the resources available from the district and free computer programs.	Admin./ Documentation of resource usage in lesson plans/ Classroom walkthroughs
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:** 33%	Limited resources	Utilize the resources available from the district and free computer programs.	Admin./ Documentation of resource usage in lesson plans/ Classroom walkthroughs
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**: 11%	Limited resources	Utilize the resources available from the district and free computer programs.	Admin./ documentation of resource usage in lesson plans/ Classroom walkthroughs

Mathematics Goal(s):	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
1. **Increase the percentage of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Mathematics.**		

Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. Reading comprehension relative to real world mathematical applications presented in written form.		
Strategy(s): 1. Implement the eight standards for mathematical practice.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** Students are lacking the basic concepts needed on which to build higher level math skills. **Strategy(s):** 1. Implement "Do the Math" intervention program in Grades 1-2.	68%=179 students	73%=204 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** Limited enrichment activities facilitated by independent group. **Strategy(s):** 1. Develop activities, focused on CCSS that will enrich students once they have demonstrated mastery of the targeted skills.	33%=93 students	38%=106 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** Exceptional education students remain below grade level. **Strategy(s):** 1. Personnel with extra time will be assigned to the 5/6 and 3/4 exceptional education classrooms to offer additional instructional support.	64%=34 students	69%=36 students

Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline Data 2010-11:**	68% = 193 students	70% = 197 students
Student subgroups by ethnicity : White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	 27% = 62 students 41% = 7 students 18% = 3 students 33% = 1 student N/A	 25% = 42 students 36% = 6 students 14% = 2 students 0% = 0 students N/A
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	0% = 0 students	0% = 0 students
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	39% = 26 students	39% = 16 students
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	40% = 39 students	32% = 35 students

Writing 1. **Conventions and spelling will improve as evidence by the district timed writings.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Barrier(s): Inconsistencies among grade levels relative to expectations related to conventions and spelling. **Strategy(s):** 1. Implement the School Writing Plan.		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	81%=55 students	86%=59 students

Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing		

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) 1. **Increase the percentage of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Science.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Barrier(s): Too much information to recall and limited understanding of scientific vocabulary. **Strategy(s):** 1. Utilize science journals/IANS to organize scientific knowledge and vocabulary learned through classroom experiences.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science**:**	65%=42 students	70%=47 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	19% = 12 students	14% = 9 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading		

Additional Goal(s)					
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1: Parent Involvement**					

Barrier	*Action Steps*	*Person Responsible*	*Timetable*	*Budget*	*In-Process Measure*
1.Limited awareness	1. Coordinate volunteer orientation and continue training throughout the year for new parents.	Administration	July 2012 - June 2013	$0	Sign in sheets for volunteer attendance, increase in volunteer participation.
2. Increasing PTA cost for National Membership	2. Complete the process of dissolving the PTA, and develop a school PTO or volunteer organization.	Administration and current PTA officers	July 2012 – June 2013	$0	Minutes
3. Lack of community involvement	3. Coordinate and recruit business partners. We will have at least three business partners for the 2012-2013 school year.	Administration	July 2012 – June 2013	$100	Business Partner Agreement Forms
4. Lack of communication with ELL parents	4. Supply ESOL parents with information from the district, school events, and any other information that will help their student be successful at our school.	Administration	July 2012 – June 2013	$0	Attendance records and communication notes to parents.
5. Limited parent opportunities	5. Coordinate family engage-ment activities such as grade level curriculum nights, student led conferences, and educational family fun nights.	Faculty	July 2012 – June 2013	$0	Sign in sheets, student led conference documentation

6. Lack of parent participation in district leadership team meetings.	6. Solicit a parent to attend the parent leadership meetings at the district.	Administration	9/7/12, 10/5/12, 11/9/12, 2/1/13 3/8/13, and 4/12/13	$0	Sign in sheets from district, Ginny Gleason
7. Lack of participation	7. Distribute information for parents to participate in the parent survey by providing flyers, opportunities to use technology on campus, and providing opportunities to fill out the paperwork on campus or at home.	Administration and teachers	January 2013 - March 2013	$0	Increase in participation on survey, copy of flyer, and newsletter documentation
8. Lack of awareness	8. Presentation given to parents about our school-wide behavior system, including how to help their child deal with conflict from peers.	Administration	October 2012	$0	Sign in sheets and copy of the invitation to attend
9. Lack of community awareness	9. Have a community showcase day in which community members are invited to visit the school.	Community Showcase Day Committee	May 2013	$200	Attendance sheets