ADDENDUM

Waterford Oaks Elementary 2010-2011

Campus Improvement Plan
Checklist

Each school year the principal of each school campus, with the assistance of the campus-level committee, must develop, review and revise the campus improvement plan for the purpose of improving student performance for all student populations, including students in special education programs under Education Code Chapter 29, subchapter A, with respect to the academic excellence indicators and any other appropriate performance measures for special needs populations. Education Code 11.252 (b). Each campus improvement plan must:

- ☐ Utilize a school wide planning team to complete the needs assessment (NCLB).
- ☐ Assess the academic achievement for each student in the school using the academic excellence indicator system (AEIS). Identify data sources and analyze data (NCLB).
- ☐ Set the campus performance objectives based on the academic excellence indicator system, including objectives for special needs populations, including students in special education programs under Education Code Chapter 29, subchapter A. Clarify the vision for reform (NCLB).

- ☐ Identify how the campus goals will be met for each student.

- ☐ Determine the resources needed to implement the plan.

- ☐ Identify staff needed to implement the plan.

- ☐ Set time lines for reaching the goals.

- ☐ Measure progress toward the performance objectives systematically to ensure that the plan is resulting in academic improvement.

- ☐ Provide for a system to document and analyze parental and community involvement at the campus.

- ☐ Create a school profile that includes (NCLB):

- ☐ Identify all funding sources in the Resources Needed column of the SMART Goals document.

- ☐ Have not met Adequate Yearly Progress see AYP Section after Professional Development Section.

_____

Principal Signature   Date

Addendum

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

The data used for our needs assessment is derived directly from the results of our ITBS, TAKS as well as the TEA Accountability tables, AEIS, data from PEIMS and district surveys.

TAKS

Table 1 shows a comparison between 2009 and 2010 grade 3 TAKS Reading and Math scores.

TABLE 1: TAKS Grade 3

Grade 3	Reading					Math				
2009	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED
Passed	91%	91%	94%	83%	91%	88%	87%	89%	100%	89%
2010	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED
Passed	93%	93%	89%	100%	97%	87%	85%	89%	100%	89%
09/10 Difference	+2	+2	-5	-17	+6	-1	-2	=	=	=
2010 w/TPM	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED
Passed	95%	96%	89%	100%	98%	98%	98%	100%	100%	98%

Reading –A comparison between the 2009 and 2010 scores without TPM show an increase in all sub groups with the exception of the Hispanic group which decreased 6% (21 students tested). All population   s are at a passing rate of 93% or above with the exception of the Hispanic population with a pass rate of 89%.   With TPM all sub groups are at a pass rate of 95% or above with the exception of the Hispanic population with a pass rate of 89%.

Math - A comparison between 2009 and 2010 scores without TPM show a 1% decrease for All students (129 tested) and a   2%

Grade 3	Reading					Math				
2009	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED
Commended	52%	48%	72%	50%	43%	36%	31%	56%	50%	30%
2010	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED
Commended	41%	39%	42%	62%	34%	29%	28%	32%	25%	28%
09-10 Difference	-12	-9	-30	+12	-8	-7	-3	-24	-25	-2

decrease for African American students (96 testes). The Hispanic (21 tested), White (9 tested), and Economically Disadvantaged (65 tested) populations maintained the previous years pass rates of 89%, 100%, and 89% respectively. With TPM all populations are at a pass rate of 98% or above.

Table 2 shows a comparison between 2009 and 2010 grade 3 TAKS college readiness indicators in Reading and Math. .

TABLE 2: College Readiness, Commended Performance & Average Scale Score

A comparison between 2009 and 2010 TAKS commended scores show a decrease in all populations in reading with the exception of the White population which showed a 12% increase (9 tested). However all populations were at 39% or above which is above the State goal of 30%.   In math all populations showed a decrease in commended performance as well. The Hispanic population was at 32% which is above the State 30% goal.   The White population is at 25%.   All, African American and the Economically Disadvantages populations are at 29%, 28%, and 28% respectively.

Table 3 is a comparison between 2009 and 2010 grade 4 TAKS Reading, Math and Writing scores.

TABLE 3: TAKS Grade 4

Grade 4	Reading					Math					Writing				
2009	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED
Passed	85%	86%	81%	83%	80%	82%	80%	88%	100%	78%	92%	92%	88%	100%	93%
2010	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED
Passed	83%	81%	94%	83%	82%	84%	83%	88%	83%	84%	87%	85%	94%	100%	87%
09-10 Diff/	-2	-5	+13	=	+2	+2	+3	=	-17	+6	-5	-7	+6	=	-6
2010 W/ TPM	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED
Passed	92%	91%	94%	100%	87%	92%	91%	94%	100%	91%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

A comparison between 2009 and 2010 reading scores without TPM show a 2% decrease for All students (125 tested), a 5% decrease for African American students (101 tested), a 13% decrease for Hispanic students (17 tested), White students maintained at 83% (6 tested), and a 2% increase for the economically disadvantaged group (66 tested).   With TPM all populations are at 91% or above with the exception of the economically disadvantaged group which is at 87%.

A comparison between 2009 and 2010 math scores without TPM show a 2% increase for All students (125 tested), a 3% decrease for African American students (101 tested), Hispanic students maintained at 88% (17tested), and a 17% decrease for White students (6 tested) and a 6% increase for the economically disadvantaged group (66 tested). With

TPM all populations are at 91% or above.

A comparison between 2009 and 2010 scores without TPM show a 5% decrease for All students (122 tested), a 7% decrease for African American students (99 tested), a 6 % increase for Hispanic students (16 tested), White students maintained at 100% (6 tested), and a 6% decrease for the economically disadvantaged group (65 tested). With TPM all populations are at %100.

Table 4 shows a comparison between 2009-2010 grade 4 TAKS college readiness indicators in Reading, Writing and Math.

Table 4: College Readiness- Commended Performance & Average Scale Scores

Grade 4	Reading					Math					Writing				
2009	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED
Commended	24%	25%	25%	17%	20%	28%	26%	25%	50%	22%	10%	9%	6%	17%	9%
2010	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED
Commended	15%	17%	%	17%	8%	23%	19%	41%	33%	23%	22%	20%	25%	33%	15%
09/10 Difference	-9	-7	-25	=	-12	-5	-7	+16	-17	+1	+12	+11	+19	+16	+6

District Assessments

Table 5 shows the results of the district assessment in reading and math for grades 1-4.

Table 5
District

District Assessments	Reading					Math				
	All	AA	H	W	ED	All	AA	H	W	ED
1st	97%	98%	91%	100%	97%	97%	98%	90%	100%	97%
# Tested	123	96	22	2	60		85	20	2	59
2nd	82%	83%	75%	100%	83%	92%	92%	100%	50%	95%
# Tested	103	86	16	1	58	104	86	16	2	59
3rd	68%	68%	67%	78%	70%	91%	88%	100%	100%	88%
# Tested	128	95	21	9	76	127	95	20	9	75
4th	70%	68%	82%	50%	71%	79%	74%	94%	100%	83%
# Tested	119	95	17	6	65	121	97	17	6	66

Summative Reading and Math Assessment Data

Table 6 shows the results of the district summative assessment in science for grades 1-4.

Students in grades 1 and 2 met the 75% standard in Reading and Math in all groups with the exception of the White population in grade 2 math with 50% (2 students tested). In grade 3 reading White and Economically Disadvantaged populations met the 75% standard. The populations representing All, African American and White did not meet standard and are at 68%, 68%, and 70% respectively. In grade 3 math all populations me6t the standard with scores at 88% or above. All populations of students in grade 4 reading did not meet standard with the exception of the Hispanic population with 82%. All populations of students in grade 4 math met the standard with the exception of the African American population with 74%.

District Assessments	Science				
	All	AA	H	W	ED
1st	96%	97%	91%	100%	97%
# Tested	128	99	23	3	62
2nd	92%	92%	94%	100%	93%
# Tested	104	86	16	2	59
3rd	80%	79%	81%	88%	78%
# Tested	126	94	21	8	74
4th	67%	64%	82%	83%	67%
# Tested	126	102	17	6	69

Students in grades 1, 2 and 3 successfully met the district standard of 70%. Hispanic and White students in grade 4 met the standard.   The populations that represent All, African American and Economically Disadvantaged did not meet the standard with percent scores of 67%, 64%, and 67% respectively.

ITBS

Table 7 shows a comparison of ITBS scores for students in grades K-4 in Reading Language and Math.

In the subject areas of Reading, Language and Math the percentiles for all grade levels are below the 50% district goal. However growth is evident from the previous year.

Attendance

Table 7 shows the attendance rate for each six week period for the school year 2009-2010. Student attendance met the target of 96%.

Table 7::Waterford Oaks Attendance / ADA Data

1ST Six Wks	2nd Six Weeks	3rd Six Weeks	4th Six Weeks	5th Six Weeks	6th Six Weeks	Year
97%	97%	96%	96%	97%	97%	96%

Demographic Data

Table 8 shows the 2009-2009 demographics by grade, ethnicity, and gender.

Table 8
Demographic Data Analysis

Grade	Am. Indian		Hispanic		Asian		African Am.		White		Total		Total
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
K	0	0	7	4	1	0	32	29	4	4	44	37	81
1	1	0	13	12	1	1	59	41	1	2	75	56	131
2	0	0	11	5	0	0	43	43	1	1	55	49	104
3	0	0	17	6	2	1	46	51	5	5	70	63	133
4	1	0	11	7	0	0	56	50	6	1	74	58	132
Total	2	0	59	34	4	2	236	214	17	13	318	263	581

%	.34%	0	10%	6%	.7%	.34%	41%	37%	3%	2%	55%	45%	100%
Total Percent	.34%		16%		1%		77%		5%		55%	45%	100%

Demographic data shows that the campus make up is 77% African American, 16% Hispanic, 5% White, 1% Asian, and less than 1% American Indian.   The male population is 55% and the female population is 45%.

School Programs and Processes Analysis

- **Teacher Practices:** Weekly team meetings are held to review student data and monitor student progress. Campus wide vertical and horizontal planning takes place to ensure alignment of instruction. Campus wide use of instructional strategies and initiatives. Parent conferences, before and after school tutoring, Saturday tutorials, TAKS/Curriculum night for parents, Math, Reading and Writing Power Hours (grades 2-4),   instructional strategies that include differentiation of instruction, small groups, hands on activities, cooperative groups, goal setting with teacher feedback, homework , tutoring, note taking, graphic organizers, and progress monitoring.

- **Acts of Leadership:** Campus leadership meets with grade level teams weekly on assigned days to monitor teacher planning and student progress. The 3-Minute-minute Walk Thru, informal and formal PDAS observations and teacher conferences are used to monitor instruction.   Class schedules are reviewed to ensure appropriate time is spent on core subjects. As student data is reviewed instructional strategies are adjusted to meet student needs. After assessments reports on student performance from AWARE are discussed with teachers. Individual IEP's are developed for regular education students to ensure that their specific academic needs are met and documented.   Curriculum is accelerated as needed in grades 3 and 4 in preparation for state assessment. Students are assigned to tutorial groups and Saturday school based on level and area of deficiency.

- **Engaged Stakeholders:** Parents receive information regarding standards, best practices and grading at "Meet the Teacher" night, during the TAKS/Curriculum night and during individual parent conferences. The Campus Improvement Plan is posted on the campus website. Each teacher is required to post their assignments and parent notices to their websites as well. Parents receive campus information and updates monthly through the PTA newsletter which is distributed in the Thursday folder and posted on the website. Waterford Oaks relies heavily on our parents, volunteers and staff members for support.

Inquiry Process

The inquiry process required the use of data from TAKS, ITBS, PIEMS, District Assessments, and district surveys.

10 Components of a Title I Program

1. **Comprehensive needs assessment** – All data were reviewed for all students and student groups. The results and conclusions of this review are reflected in the SMART goals and the Executive Summary for the next school year. The components of the campus needs assessment include identification of data sources and analysis of the data.

2. **School-wide reform strategies** – The continued use of the student information system AWARE to identify and monitor student growth. The use of SCOPE to aid teachers in planning rigorous lessons for students. The use of Boys Town campus wide to reduce the number of office referrals and fights. All teachers will satisfy the district professional development requirements as outlined in the 2010-2011 Professionals Development Handbook. The use of best practice lesson plans and the meeting by grade levels to monitor and develop instructional plans are also a part of our school-wide reform strategies.

3. **Instruction by highly qualified teachers** –100% of our teachers are certified for the position they hold. They have varying levels of experience, and support is given to less experienced teachers by their colleagues and the campus administrator. Parents are notified if a teacher is not certified and the teacher must either be working toward certification or efforts continue to hire someone who is certified.

4. **High-quality and on-going professional development** – Lead Teachers who receive training during the summer and during the school year will provide on-site training and monitoring to assist in professional development. The Site Base Decision-Making Committee identifies areas in which staff development is needed. Staff members participate in staff development. Staff development may also be done on site by in-house instructional leaders or by administrative district instructional support staff. Region 10 may conduct trainings as well.

5. **Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers** – Recruitment and retention of teachers who are certified for positions for which they are appropriately certified is ongoing. We closely work with our district's Personnel officer and network with other principals to help in this effort; our own teachers also serve as recruiters. The result has been that 100% of our classroom teachers are appropriately certified for the position they hold.

6. **Strategies to increase parental involvement** – Grand Parents Day, Fitness Night, Family Math, Science and

Literacy Nights are held to increase parent involvement in the school's programs. Open Houses, frequent telephone contact and weekly folder updates/newsletters are methods of recognizing parents as partners. Through the counseling department in conjunction with PTA parent information session are held to meet parent needs.

7. **Transition from early childhood programs** – Early Childhood Centers collaborate with receiving elementary schools to coordinate parent and student visits to kindergarten programs. Elementary schools conduct round up and registration days to distribute information about programs and registration. Newsletters are distributed from receiving elementary schools.

8. **Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the uses of academic assessments** – Ongoing staff development is available on site to analyze assessment data, whether national, state or teacher produced, to use in making instructional decisions. Grade level meetings and the SBDMC provide forums to discuss assessment issues.

9. **Effective, timely additional assistance** – The use of formative and summative assessments and AWARE allow for individual student progress to be monitored at the teacher level, building and administrative district levels so that interventions and assistance will be timely.

10. **Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs** – At the building level, federal, state and local services and programs are coordinated to best address student needs; this coordination of services and programs is reflected in the activities listed in the campus goals and activities.

Organizational Structure

Our campus Shared Decision-Making Model (SDM) is designed to establish, monitor, and evaluate goals for budgeting, staffing, curriculum, planning, school organization, staffing patterns, and staff development. This model is aligned to state legislation and CHISD board policy. The intention of the SDMC is to pull together all stakeholders in a constructive, organized, and unified body to enhance the education of all students.

The SBDMC is the shared decision-making body. SBDMC representatives are elected by the faulty and parents are elected by the PTO membership. It meets monthly and as needed to discuss issues brought forth by the administration, staff, parents, or community. The Council is supported by standing committees that address budgeting, staffing, curriculum, planning, school organization, staffing patterns, and staff development. Standing committees meet as needed.

The SBDMC functions under the direction of the Principal. Members of the SBDMC attend SBDMC meetings for the

term of his/her office, monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan, address issues presented by the principal, present issues for discussion and recommend resolutions to the SBDMC, create ad hoc committees by consensus of the SBDMC, chair standing committees and ad hoc committees, submit minutes to the principal for committee meetings, and report the recommendations to the SBDMC. The SBDMC is responsible for approving all professional development plans for the school.

The Principal coordinates the process of shared decision making, facilitates communication for all stakeholders, considers issues and recommendations from the community, SBDMC, and standing committees, and makes decisions based on those recommendations.

Shared Decision-making Process

Consensus is the ultimate goal of the SBDMC. Agreement by all participants is not always possible or necessary for consensus. Consensus is a collective process that provides a forum for full dialogue on appropriate/applicable responses to issues.

Members of the committees discuss and make recommendations to the SBDMC. The SBDMC reviews recommendations and reaches consensus. Sufficient consensus is defined as a willingness to settle an issue in favor of the majority. All points of view will be considered and general agreement must be reached before decisions will be implemented. If general agreement is not reached, further study of the issue will occur and alternatives will be presented until agreement is reached. After all alternatives have been explored, a deadlock can be broken by a majority vote. As issues come up for discussion, the chairperson is responsible for ensuring that all present have a legitimate opportunity to state their case. The principal retains the authority to exercise a veto over decisions made by the SBDMC.

Method of Communication

Members of the school community may submit non-personnel issues for consideration through the shared decision-making process. Written issues or concerns may be submitted to any SDMC member. A school community member may attend a meeting of any committee to discuss or present an issue. All meetings are on the monthly calendar. Communication is transmitted to faculty, staff, and parents.

Membership Composition of the Shared Decision-Making Committee			
Number of Classroom Teachers (2/3)	3	Number of Parents	3
Number of School-based Staff (1/3)	2	Number of Community Members	
Number of Non-Instructional Staff	1	Number of Business Members	1
Name of SDMC Member		Position (Term expires)	
Kevin Davis		Business Member / Parent (2010-2011) 2yr	
Elizabeth Diggs		Classroom Teacher (2009-2010) 1yr	
		Classroom Teacher	
Latonya Carter-Herman		Classroom Teacher (2009-2010) 1yr	
Demitree Dade		Classroom Teacher (2010-2011) 2yr	
		Community Member	
		Community Member	
Janice Wessa		Non-Instructional Staff (Term On-Going)	
Kirk Lockhart		Parent (2010-2011) 2yr	
Melanie Cave		Parent (2010-2011) 2yr	
Violet Maxwell		Principal (Term On-Going)	
Quentyn Seamster		School-Based Staff (Term On-Going)	
Allena Anderson		School-Based Staff (Term On-Going)	

State Compensatory Education	
Total amount of State Compensatory Education Funds.	$34380.09
Personnel funded with State Compensatory Education Funds (number of FTEs.) Special Education Aide	.5 .5

State Compensatory Funds are coded in the *Resources Needed* column of the campus goals as SCE are
$34,380.09. These supplemental state compensatory education funds are used to enhance the Title 1 school wide
program at our campus.

Gifted/Talented Program Goal

For 2010-2011, provisions to modify services for students identified as Gifted/Talented (G/T) are provided through the implementation of the Vanguard Standards (Standards 5, 6, 7 and 8), Standard Practice Memorandum (SPM) 5610.A and the G/T Curriculum Framework Scholars & Knowledge.

Formative   Differentiated strategies for instruction and assessment are documented weekly in lesson plans.

Summative   Students identified as G/T shall be expected to score above grade level on the district required ITBS; and score at the commended level on TAKS.

Strategy   Implement and monitor skills and strategies and the G/T Curriculum Framework Scholars & Knowledge.

Attendance Goal

For 2010-2011, the ADA student attendance will be at or above **97**%.

Formative   Monthly attendance rates by grade level and total school will be reviewed in addition

Violence Prevention and Intervention Goal

For 2010-2011, discipline referrals for fighting **10**% from the previous year.

Formative   Each grading period, the discipline referrals will be reviewed to determine the percent of referrals for fighting.

Summative   At the end of the school year, the discipline referrals will be reviewed to determine the percent of referrals for fighting.

Strategy   Implement and monitor the school wide discipline, safety and security plan.

	to a list of students with more than three absences per month.
Summative	The yearend ADA will be reviewed to determine if the annual attendance objective was met.
Strategy	Send letters to parents of students with three or more unexcused absences. Initiate attendance referrals for students with more than five unexcused absences.

District and State Waivers

The district utilizes the following four waivers:

Staff Development Waiver- This waiver allows the district to add additional days to train staff on various educational strategies designed to improve student performance in lieu of a maximum of three days of student instruction.

Reading/ELA, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies Staff Development Waiver- This wavier allows the district to conduct additional staff trainings in these specific content areas to provide strategies aligned with the TEKS in lieu of a maximum of two days of student instruction.

Early Release Waiver- This wavier allows the district to conduct school for less than seven hours for a total of six days of instruction to provide additional training in educational methodologies and to provide time to meet the needs of students and local communities.

Modified Schedule/TAKS Testing Days Waiver- This wavier allows the district to modify the schedule of classes on TAKS testing days during the current school year to reduce interruptions during the testing period.

Dyslexia Program Goals

For 2010-2011, provisions for identification, assessment and instructional services to students having or suspected of having dyslexia or a related disorder, dyslexia teachers and parents are provided through compliance with laws governing dyslexia programming: TEC §11.252, TEC §38.003; TEC §28.006; TAC 19 §74.28; §504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Dyslexia Program Guidelines/standards.

Formative   Various objective data examples: in-service/meeting agendas and sign-in sheets; campus data files; documentation of procedures, instructional services, campus parent education program; student records; program evaluation;

Summative   Various objective data examples: student progress monitoring data; program evaluation;   in-service/meeting agendas and   sign-in sheets; campus data files; documentation   of procedures, Tier II and Tier III instruction, campus parent education program data; student records; program evaluation;

Strategy   Various strategies as determined by needs of campus. (Refer to Dyslexia Program Supplement for possible strategies.)

Parent and Community Involvement Goal

For 2010-2011, the percent of parents and community members attending PTA meetings will increase by **15**%.

Formative   At the end of the first semester, the percent of parents and community members attending PTO meetings will be reviewed to determine progress.

Summative   At the end of the school year, the percent of parents and community members attending PTO meetings will be reviewed to determine if the objective was met.

Strategy   Provide a variety of methods and in appropriate languages to communicate opportunities for parent and community involvement throughout the year to attend school events.

Highly Qualified Teacher Goal

For 2010-2011, the percent of highly qualified teachers in the core academic areas will be at or above **100**%.

Formative   At the end of the first semester, the percent of teachers in the core academic areas who are highly qualified will be reviewed to determine progress.

Summative   At the end of the school year, the percent of teachers in the core academic areas who are highly qualified will be reviewed to see if the objective was met.

Strategy   Conference with teachers to implement a plan to become highly qualified.

Waterford Oaks
Staff Development Plan

Date	Who should attend	Purpose
	Full Day Staff Development	
October 8, 2010	All Staff Members	**Growing Writers: Teaching Writing in K-2** Can a child really become a better reader by learning to write? Yes! Even with all of the research to support the reading/writing connection, writing still tends to get neglected in the early years of education. This workshop will address teaching strategies that support writing throughout the day and emphasize the use of writing to strengthen early reading skills. Teachers will walk away with a better understanding of how to differentiate writing instruction, as well as how to teach K-2 students both the art and mechanics of writing. **Writer's Block: Interventions for Struggling Writers (3-4)** In both academic and professional worlds, a person's ability to write well can have significant implications for future success. Unfortunately, many students are receiving writing instruction, yet they do not seem to be meeting minimum standards for written composition. This workshop will examine the reasons that students struggle with writing and what intervention strategies can be used to help them overcome these difficulties. Teachers will have an opportunity to review student writing samples and practice how to adjust Instruction according to areas of student need. **Doing What Works! Best Practices in the Science Classroom** This staff development session is designed to help teachers employ best practices as determined by

		research on what is proven to increase student achievement in science. Areas of focus will include an introduction to the following: the BCSC 5E instructional model, Robert Marzano's academic vocabulary strategies, as well as content area reading.
November 8, 2010		**Jazz Up Math with Journaling (K-4,** In this professional development session, teachers will learn journaling strategies and techniques that help ALL students organize their learning, find relevance, and assist in knowledge retention. Included are TEKS-based activities that not only address math content, but also facilitate math process skill building. These strategies will support participants as they develop the expertise necessary to lead every student to math excellence. **Just the Facts: Effective Strategies for Teaching Mathematics Facts (K-2, 3-5**) Researchers such as Fuson agree that computational fluency, and the ability to learn, apply, and recall mathematical facts is necessary for students to become efficient athematical problem solvers. In this professional development session, participants will learn effective strategies for introducing, reinforcing, practicing, extending, and recalling addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division facts.
Half Day Staff Development		
September 24, 2011		**Encouraging Effort in Every Child** Based on the article "The Key to Raising Smart Kids" by Carol S. Dweck, this workshop examines the role effort and motivation play in the academic success of our students. Participants will walk away with strategies for encouraging effort and motivating their students as well as research on the long-term effects positive interactions with students

		can create.
January 14, 2011		**Strengthening Family and Community Relationships** In this session, district and school staff will learn about and be able to use strategies to create a common understanding of meaningful family and community engagement; strategies to engage family and community in regular, two way communication and tools to plan and track progress of communication with family and community members. **Do I Know What They Know? How to Assess for Understanding in the Mathematics Classroom (K-5), In** this session educators will develop a common understanding of formative assessment and how it is implemented in the classroom. Focus will be placed on effectively using formative assessment to measure what students think and know throughout the instructional period, not just at the end of a unit of study. Teachers will be able to adjust instruction based on this important feedback from students.