

# Dolby Elementary

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



**2008-2009**

**Dolby Elementary**  
**PreK through 5<sup>th</sup> Grade**  
**817 Jefferson Drive**  
**Lake Charles, Louisiana 70605**  
**Pamela Quebodeaux, Principal**  
**337-477-4631**  
**pam.quebodeaux@cpsb.org**

**Check where applicable:**

- Louisiana Approved School
- Charter School
- Alternative School
- School in School Improvement
- School with Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration
- Title I School      X   School-wide    \_\_\_\_\_ Targeted Assistance
- Member of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
- Grant Application

**Name of Grant:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact Person:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Phone:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Email:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Principal's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Superintendent's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

## DISTRICT ASSURANCE

- For schools in School Improvement, and for schools with CSRP models, I hereby certify that this plan was developed with the assistance of a District Assistance Team in collaboration with the School Improvement Team and/or School Support Team, as applicable.
- I hereby certify that this plan was designed to improve student achievement, with input from all stakeholders.
- I assure that the school level personnel, including subgroup representatives responsible for implementation of this plan, have collaborated in the writing of the plan.
- I hereby certify that this plan has all of the following components as required for schools identified to be in School Improvement:
  - A statement of the school's mission
  - A comprehensive needs assessment, which includes the following quantitative and qualitative data:
    - Student academic performances on standardized achievement tests (both CRT, NRT, and LAA)
    - Demographic indicators of the community and school to include socioeconomic factors
    - School human and material resource summary, to include teacher demographic indicators
    - Interviews with principals and teachers
    - Student and teacher focus groups
    - Questionnaires with stakeholders (principals, teachers, students, parents) measuring conceptual domains outlined in school effectiveness/reform research
    - Classroom observations
  - Goals and measurable objectives
  - Scientifically based research methods, strategies, and activities that guide curriculum content, instruction, and assessment
  - Professional Development components aligned with assessed needs
  - Parental and community involvement activities aligned with assessed needs
  - Evaluation strategies that include methods to measure progress of implementation
  - Coordination of resources and analysis of school budget (possible redirection of funds)
  - An action plan with timelines and specific activities for implementing the above criteria
- I further certify that the information contained in this assurance is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Superintendent's signature (in blue ink)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Principal's signature (in blue ink)

\_\_\_\_\_  
District Assistance Team Leader (in blue ink)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair, School Improvement Team (in blue ink)

\_\_\_\_\_  
District Assistance Team Members (original signatures in blue ink) Not Applicable (No District Assistance Team in place)

## ASSURANCE OF FACULTY REVIEW OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Total Faculty in School: 51

Date: 08-29-08

The following faculty members have reviewed the School Improvement Plan and have discussed their part in implementing it.

	NAME	TITLE/POSITION	SIGNATURE (in blue ink)	SIGNATURE DATE
1	Fritzinger, Tara	Teacher		
2	Phelps, Trudy	Teacher		
3	Mudd, Leslea	Teacher		
4	Bertrand, Lori	Teacher		
5	Hoover, Heather	Teacher		
6	Miller, Liz	Teacher		
7	Mouton, Cottie	Teacher		
8	Dietz, Lisa	Teacher		
9	Fletcher, Bobbie	Support Staff		
10	Stevens, Sandy	Counselor		
11	Kennison, Ethopia	Parent		
12	Istre, Kathie	Curriculum Coordinator		
13	Bushnell, Missy	Assistant Principal		
14	Quebodeaux, Pam	Principal		

## MISSION STATEMENT

*To Achieve Academic Excellence through Quality Education*

List the names and occupations of those persons who participated in developing the mission statement:

Tom Hatfield, PPG Industries

Joy Breaux, Bank One

Jeremy Griffith, Student

Lisa Dietz, Teacher

Theresa George, Parent

Martha Shorts, Teacher

Karyl O'Banion, Central Office

Terry Romero, Teacher

Hattie White, Teacher

Pam Quebodeaux, Principal

*This mission statement was developed in January 2001. It is reviewed annually during summer strategic planning.*

## SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS/CHARACTERISTICS

<b>A D M</b>		<b>Total #</b>	<b># Certified</b>	<b># Expected Vacancies</b>	<b># in LA Principal Internship/Induction Program for SY 08-09</b>
	Principals	2	2		

<b>T E A C H E R S *</b>		<b>School Non-Title I</b>		<b>Title I</b>				<b>Total % in School</b>		<b>% Change from 2003</b>	
				<b>Schoolwide</b>		<b>Targeted Assistance</b>					
	<b>HIGHLY QUALIFIED*</b>	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed
	# Highly Qualified Core Academic Teachers (Subtotal)			34	10			77%	23%		
	<b>NOT HIGHLY QUALIFIED</b>	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed
	Non-Standard *** (TAT) (OFAT) (TEP) (EP)										
	Other										
	<b>Subtotal Not Highly Qualified</b>										
<b>TOTAL TEACHERS</b> (Highly Qualified and Not Highly Qualified)				34	10			77%	23%		
<b>P A R A S</b>	<b>HIGHLY QUALIFIED*</b>	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed
	# Highly Qualified Paras			6	3			66%	34%		
	<b>NOT HIGHLY QUALIFIED</b>	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed
	# Not Highly Qualified Paras										
<b>TOTAL PARAS</b> (Highly Qualified and Not Highly Qualified)				6	3			66%	34%		

\* Teachers include all teaching in core academic courses (English/Reading/Language Arts; Math; Science; Civics/Government; Economics; Arts; History' Geography)

\*\* **Highly Qualified:** Has met all requirements as specified by the La. Board of Elementary and Secondary Education's definition of "Highly Qualified" under NCLB adopted June 19, 2003. (Copy provided under Consolidated Application Resource section on DOE website).

\*\*\* Temporary Authority to Teach (TAT); Out-of-Field Authorization to Teach (OFAT); Temporary Employment Permit (TEP); Emergency Permit (EP)

<b>School Support</b>	
<b>Number of Related Service and Support Personnel and Areas (i.e., Speech Pathologist, Social Worker):</b>	
<b>School Improvement Team Members</b>	<b>Position</b>
Pam Grueber	Speech Pathologist
Donald Fontenot	Educational Diagnostician
Edwina Hall	Curriculum Specialist
Bobbie Fletcher	Bookkeeper

<b>District Assistance Team Leader:</b> Loree Smith	<b>Contact #:</b> 437-6126
<b>Distinguished Educator:</b> N/A	<b>Contact #:</b>
<b>Parish Homeless Liaison:</b> Loree Smith	<b>Contact #:</b> 437-6126

### Federal/State Instructional Programs and/or Initiatives

(Place a check or X in the status area for each program implemented at your school)

Program List: (including during and after school programs)	Currently Using	Proposed Program	Deleted Program
21 <sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers			
Big Buddy			
Career to Work			
DARE	X		
Early Reading First			
HIPPY			
INTECH	X		
INTECH 2 Science	X		
INTECH Social Studies	X		
K-3 Reading/Math Initiative	X		
La GEAR-UP			
LaSIP	X		
LEAD TECH	X		
Learning Intensive Networking Communities for Success (LINCS)	X		
LINCS/High School That Work (HSTW)			
LINCS/Making Middle Grades Work (MMGW)			
Louisiana Virtual School			
Making Middle Grades Work			
SAGE			
School Tech			
School to Work			
School wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PATHS)	X		
The Louisiana Literacy Corps			
The Multisensory Structured Language Program (Project Read)	X		
The Strategic Instruction Model (SIM)			
Other: Quality in Education	X		
LA-4 Pre-K	X		
Extended Day/ Americorps	X		
DIBELS	X		

<b>School Policies</b>		
<b>Policy</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Discipline Policy	X	
Security Procedures (metal detectors, etc.)	X	
Safe and Drug-Free Prevention Activities	X	
Student Code of Conduct	X	
Crisis Management (emergency/evacuation plan)	X	

<b>School Partnerships</b> (Place the name of each partner in the space provided)	
University	McNeese State University
Technical Institute	
Feeder School(s)	SJ Welsh Middle School, FK White Middle School
Community	Chase Bank, State Farm/Dale Bernard, Mike Papania, Bruce Hamilton, Monroe Printing, Waste Management, Odyssey 317, Home Furniture Company, Saundra Bridges Fournet Real Estate Company
Business/Industry	DynMcDermott, Chamber Southwest, PPG Industries
Private Grants	Drew Grant, Unsung Heroes, LA Heritage Foundation, Wal-Mart, Target, Sam's Club, Bank One, 8(g) Grant
Other	

## Student Information

List the number of students in each area

<b>Total at School</b>	<b># of Grade 4 and above</b>	<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	<b>Gifted and Talented</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>Option III</b>	<b>LEP</b>	<b>Homeless</b>	<b>Migrant</b>
<b>5503</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Number of Households Served by School</b>				400				

### Students with Disabilities, ages 3-5, By setting

<b>Early Childhood Setting</b>	<b>Early Childhood Special Education Setting</b>	<b>Home</b>	<b>Part-time Early Childhood Setting/Part-time Early Childhood Special Education Setting</b>	<b>Residential Facility</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Separate School</b>	<b>Itinerant Service Outside the Home</b>	<b>Reverse Mainstream Setting</b>		
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>		

### Students with Disabilities, ages 6-21, By setting

<b>Outside Regular Class Less Than 21% of the Day</b>	<b>Outside Regular Class 21-60% of the Day</b>	<b>Outside Regular Class More Than 60% of the Day</b>	<b>Public Separate School Facility</b>	<b>Private Separate School Facility</b>
<b>38</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Public Residential Facility</b>	<b>Private Residential Facility</b>	<b>Hospital/Homebound</b>		
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>		

### Subgroups by Ethnicity

Native/Alaskan American	Asian/Pacific Islander/Pacific Islander	African American	Hispanic	White
<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>288</b>

### Economically Disadvantaged Profile

# of Free/Reduced Lunch Students: <b>271</b>	Percent of Free/Reduced Lunch Students: <b>54</b>
--	---

## SUMMARY REPORT OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

### *DIBELS* Instructional Recommendation

YEAR		# Students Assessed	At Risk (Intensive Intervention Needed)		At Some Risk (Strategic Intervention Needed)		Benchmark (Low Risk of Reading Failure)	
			# Students	Percent	# Students	Percent	# Students	Percent
Spring 2008	Kindergarten	82	12	15	8	10	62	76
	First Grade	87	2	2	8	10	77	87
	Second Grade	97	9	9	19	20	69	71
	Third Grade	89	15	17	30	34	44	49
Fall 2007	Kindergarten	80	5	6	35	44	40	50
	First Grade	93	5	5	11	12	77	83
	Second Grade	98	5	5	16	16	77	79
	Third Grade	90	5	6	19	21	66	73
Spring 2007	Kindergarten	71	8	11	10	14	53	75
	First Grade	81	4	5	9	11	68	84
	Second Grade	85	9	11	18	21	58	68
	Third Grade	72	7	10	23	32	42	58
Fall 2006	Kindergarten	75	11	15	28	37	36	48
	First Grade	83	2	2	8	13	0	0
	Second Grade	90	1	17	17	19	72	80
	Third Grade	76	5	7	13	17	58	76

<b>Spring 2006</b>	<b>Kindergarten</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>71</b>
_____	<b>First Grade</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>85</b>
_____	<b>Second Grade</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>72</b>
_____	<b>Third Grade</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Kindergarten</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>46</b>
_____	<b>First Grade</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>83</b>
_____	<b>Second Grade</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>83</b>
_____	<b>Third Grade</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>69</b>

## Whole School SPS: CRT Trend Data (LEAP)

WHOLE SCHOOL SPS: CRT (LEAP/GEE) Trend Data     Dolby Elementary 120								
Index Category	Index Year 2004	Index Year 2005	Index Year 2006	Index Year 2007	Index Year 2008	# of Students	Index Objective* for 2009	Index Objective* for
<b>English/Language Arts</b>								
• 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: ELA	113.3	113.1	122.6	111.6	115.4	81	116.2	
• 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: ELA						#		
• HS Grade CRT Index: ELA						#		
• School CRT Index: ELA	113.3	113.1	122.6	111.6	115.4	81	116.2	
<b>Math</b>								
• 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Math	106.7	102.5	128.3	118.1	115.4	81	116.2	
• 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Math						#		
• HS Grade CRT Index: Math						#		
• School CRT Index: Math	106.7	102.5	128.3	118.1	115.4	81	116.2	
<b>Science</b>								
• 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Science	102.5	113.1	116.0	104.3	101.9	81	104.9	
• 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Science						#		
• HS Grade CRT Index: Science						#		
• School CRT Index: Science	102.5	113.1	116.0	104.3	101.9	81	104.9	
<b>Social Studies</b>								
• 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Social Studies	109.2	104.1	111.3	102.2	99.4	81	102.8	
• 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Social Studies						#		
• HS Grade CRT Index: Social Studies						#		
• School CRT Index: Social Studies	109.2	104.1	111.3	102.2	99.4	81	102.8	
<b>All Subjects</b>								
• 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: All Subjects	107.9	108.2	119.6	109.1	108.0	81	110.0	
• 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: All Subjects						#		
• HS Grade CRT Index: All Subjects						#		
• School CRT Index: All Subjects	107.9	108.2	119.6	109.1	108.0	81	110.0	

**WHOLE SCHOOL SPS: CRT (iLEAP) Trend Data Dolby Elementary  $120 - 115.4 = 4.6 / 8 =$**

<b>Index Category</b>	<b>Index Year 2006</b>	<b>Index Year 2007</b>	<b>Index Year 3 2008</b>	<b>Index Year 4</b> _____	<b>Index Year 5</b> _____	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Index Objective* for 2009</b>	<b>Index Objective* for</b>
<b>English/Language Arts</b>								
• 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade CRT Index: ELA	<b>115.4</b>	<b>121.5</b>	<b>113.1</b>			<b>88</b>	<b>114.2</b>	
• 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: ELA	<b>102.6</b>	<b>114.0</b>	<b>120.8</b>			<b>65</b>	<b>At goal</b>	
• 6 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: ELA						<b>#</b>		
• 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: ELA						<b>#</b>		
• 9 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: ELA						<b>#</b>		
• School CRT Index: ELA						<b>153</b>		
<b>Math</b>								
• 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade CRT Index: Math	<b>103.7</b>	<b>123.6</b>	<b>102.8</b>			<b>88</b>	<b>105.7</b>	
• 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Math	<b>93.0</b>	<b>107.9</b>	<b>110.0</b>			<b>65</b>	<b>111.7</b>	
• 6 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Math						<b>#</b>		
• 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Math						<b>#</b>		
• 9 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Math						<b>#</b>		
• School CRT Index: Math						<b>153</b>		
<b>Science</b>								
• 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade CRT Index: Science	<b>107.4</b>	<b>108.3</b>	<b>98.3</b>			<b>88</b>	<b>101.9</b>	
• 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Science	<b>99.1</b>	<b>110.5</b>	<b>113.1</b>			<b>65</b>	<b>114.2</b>	
• 6 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Science						<b>#</b>		
• 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Science						<b>#</b>		
• School CRT Index: Science						<b>153</b>		
<b>Social Studies</b>								
• 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade CRT Index: Social Studies	<b>114.0</b>	<b>105.6</b>	<b>99.4</b>			<b>88</b>	<b>102.9</b>	
• 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Social Studies	<b>110.5</b>	<b>111.4</b>	<b>103.8</b>			<b>65</b>	<b>106.5</b>	
• 6 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Social Studies						<b>#</b>		
• 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: Social Studies						<b>#</b>		
• School CRT Index: Social Studies						<b>153</b>		

S

**WHOLE SCHOOL SPS: CRT (iLEAP) Trend Data (continued) *Dolby Elementary***

<b>All Subjects</b>	2006	2007	2008					
• 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade CRT Index: All Subjects	<b>110.1</b>	<b>114.8</b>	<b>103.4</b>			<b>88</b>	<b>106.2</b>	
• 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: All Subjects	<b>101.3</b>	<b>111.0</b>	<b>111.9</b>			<b>65</b>	<b>113.3</b>	
• 6 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: All Subjects						<b>#</b>		
• 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: All Subjects						<b>#</b>		
• 9 <sup>th</sup> Grade CRT Index: All Subjects						<b>#</b>		
• School CRT Index: All Subjects						<b>153</b>		

**SUBGROUP: % Proficient Trend Data (Grade 3) *Dolby Elementary***

<b>Category</b>	<b>Year 1 2007</b>	<b>Year 2 2008</b>	<b>Year 3 _____</b>	<b>Year 4 _____</b>	<b>Year 5 _____</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Proficiency Goal * for 2009</b>	<b>Proficiency Goal * for</b>
<b>ELA – Grade 3</b>								
• School (Total Population)	<b>91.7%</b>	<b>86.4%</b>				<b>88</b>	<b>88.6%</b>	
• Native/Alaskan American	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
• Asian/Pacific Islander/Pacific Islander	<b>100%</b>	<b>66.7%</b>				<b>3</b>	<b>72.2%</b>	
• African American	<b>84.6%</b>	<b>82.8%</b>				<b>29</b>	<b>85.6%</b>	
• Hispanic	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>16.7%</b>	
• White	<b>95.2%</b>	<b>90.9%</b>				<b>55</b>	<b>92.4%</b>	
• Limited English Proficient	<b>100%</b>	<b>50%</b>				<b>2</b>	<b>58.3%</b>	
• Economically Disadvantaged	<b>90.5%</b>	<b>83%</b>				<b>47</b>	<b>85.8%</b>	
• Students with Disabilities	<b>62.5%</b>	<b>92.3%</b>				<b>13</b>	<b>93.6%</b>	
<b>Math – Grade 3</b>								
• School	<b>91.7%</b>	<b>72.7%</b>				<b>88</b>	<b>77.3%</b>	
• Native/Alaskan American	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
• Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>100%</b>	<b>66.7%</b>				<b>3</b>	<b>72.2%</b>	
• African American	<b>80.8%</b>	<b>69%</b>				<b>29</b>	<b>74.1%</b>	
• Hispanic	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>16.7%</b>	
• White	<b>97.6%</b>	<b>76.4%</b>				<b>55</b>	<b>80.3%</b>	
• Limited English Proficient	<b>100%</b>	<b>50%</b>				<b>2</b>	<b>58.3%</b>	
• Economically Disadvantaged	<b>88.1%</b>	<b>66%</b>				<b>47</b>	<b>71.6%</b>	
• Students with Disabilities	<b>75%</b>	<b>69.2%</b>				<b>13</b>	<b>74.4%</b>	

**SUBGROUP: % Proficient Trend Data (Grade 4) *Dolby Elementary***

<b>Category</b>	<b>Year 2004</b>	<b>Year 2005</b>	<b>Year 2006</b>	<b>Year 2007</b>	<b>Year 2008</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Proficiency Goal * for 2009</b>	<b>Proficiency Goal * for</b>
<b>ELA – Grade 4</b>								
• School	<b>85.5%</b>	<b>81.0%</b>	<b>90.6%</b>	<b>85.5%</b>	<b>93.8%</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>94.9%</b>	
• Native/Alaskan American	<b>100.0%</b>			<b>N/A</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>At goal</b>	
• Asian/Pacific Islander/Pacific Islander	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
• African American	<b>80.0%</b>	<b>72.0%</b>	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>78.6%</b>	<b>94.4%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>95.4%</b>	
• Hispanic	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>		<b>N/A</b>	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>72.2%</b>	
• White	<b>86.1%</b>	<b>88.0%</b>	<b>92.1%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>95.1%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>95.9%</b>	
• Limited English Proficient				<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16.7%</b>	
• Economically Disadvantaged	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>70.0%</b>	<b>90.9%</b>	<b>80.5%</b>	<b>93.2%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>94.3%</b>	
• Students with Disabilities	<b>72.0%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	<b>70.0%</b>	<b>36.4%</b>	<b>77.8%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>81.5%</b>	
<b>Math – Grade 4</b>								
• School	<b>81.8%</b>	<b>76.0%</b>	<b>88.7%</b>	<b>88.4%</b>	<b>86.4%</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>88.7%</b>	
• Native/Alaskan American	<b>100.0%</b>			<b>N/A</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>At goal</b>	
• Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
• African American	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>64.0%</b>	<b>71.4%</b>	<b>78.6%</b>	<b>80.6%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>83.8%</b>	
• Hispanic	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>		<b>N/A</b>	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>72.2%</b>	
• White	<b>88.9%</b>	<b>88.0%</b>	<b>94.7%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>92.7%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>93.9%</b>	
• Limited English Proficient				<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>At goal</b>	
• Economically Disadvantaged	<b>75.0%</b>	<b>66.0%</b>	<b>81.8%</b>	<b>80.5%</b>	<b>81.8%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>84.8%</b>	
• Students with Disabilities	<b>63.0%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>70.0%</b>	<b>63.6%</b>	<b>44.4%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>53.7%</b>	

**SUBGROUP: % Proficient Trend Data (Grade 5) *Dolby Elementary***

<b>Category</b>	<b>Year 1 2007</b>	<b>Year 2 2008</b>	<b>Year 3 _____</b>	<b>Year 4 _____</b>	<b>Year 5 _____</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Proficiency Goal * for 2009</b>	<b>Proficiency Goal * for</b>
<b>ELA – Grade 5</b>								
• School	<b>89.5%</b>	<b>90.8%</b>				<b>65</b>	<b>92.3%</b>	
• Native/Alaskan American	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
• Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>N/A</b>	<b>100%</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>At goal</b>	
• African American	<b>88.2%</b>	<b>83.9%</b>				<b>31</b>	<b>86.6%</b>	
• Hispanic	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
• White	<b>90%</b>	<b>97%</b>				<b>33</b>	<b>97.5%</b>	
• Limited English Proficient	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>At goal</b>	
• Economically Disadvantaged	<b>85.2%</b>	<b>85%</b>				<b>40</b>	<b>87.5%</b>	
• Students with Disabilities	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>66.7%</b>				<b>9</b>	<b>72.2%</b>	
<b>_____</b>								
• School	<b>80.7%</b>	<b>80%</b>				<b>65</b>	<b>83.3%</b>	
• Native/Alaskan American	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
• Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>N/A</b>	<b>100%</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>At goal</b>	
• African American	<b>70.6%</b>	<b>67.7%</b>				<b>31</b>	<b>73.1%</b>	
• Hispanic	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
• White	<b>85%</b>	<b>90.9%</b>				<b>33</b>	<b>92.4%</b>	
• Limited English Proficient	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>At goal</b>	
• Economically Disadvantaged	<b>74.1%</b>	<b>70%</b>				<b>40</b>	<b>75%</b>	
• Students with Disabilities	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>66.7%</b>				<b>9</b>	<b>72.2%</b>	

**SUBGROUP: % Proficient Trend Data (Whole School) *Dolby Elementary***

<b>Category</b>	<b>Year 1 2007</b>	<b>Year 2 2008</b>	<b>Year 3 _____</b>	<b>Year 4 _____</b>	<b>Year 5 _____</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Proficiency Goal * for 2009</b>	<b>Proficiency Goal * for</b>
<b>ELA – Whole School</b>								
• School	<b>88.8%</b>						<b>90.4%</b>	
• Native/Alaskan American	<b>N/A</b>						<b>N/A</b>	
• Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>100%</b>						<b>At goal</b>	
• African American	<b>83.1%</b>	<b>87%</b>					<b>85.5%</b>	
• Hispanic	<b>100%</b>						<b>At goal</b>	
• White	<b>91.7%</b>	<b>94%</b>					<b>92.9%</b>	
• Limited English Proficient	<b>100%</b>						<b>At goal</b>	
• Economically Disadvantaged	<b>85.3%</b>	<b>87.1%</b>					<b>87.4%</b>	
• Students with Disabilities	<b>56%</b>	<b>78.9%</b>					<b>62.3%</b>	
<b>Math – Whole School</b>								
• School	<b>87.3%</b>						<b>89.1%</b>	
• Native/Alaskan American	<b>N/A</b>						<b>N/A</b>	
• Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>100%</b>						<b>At goal</b>	
• African American	<b>77.5%</b>	<b>77%</b>					<b>80.7%</b>	
• Hispanic	<b>100%</b>						<b>At goal</b>	
• White	<b>92.6%</b>	<b>86%</b>					<b>93.7%</b>	
• Limited English Proficient	<b>100%</b>						<b>At goal</b>	
• Economically Disadvantaged	<b>81.7%</b>	<b>72.6%</b>					<b>84.3%</b>	
• Students with Disabilities	<b>68%</b>	<b>60.1%</b>					<b>72.6%</b>	

## SUMMARY REPORT OF STUDENT ATTENDANCE AND DROPOUT DATA

Index Category	Index Year 1 2003	Index Year 2 2004	Index Year 3 2005	Index Year 4 2006	Index Year 5 2007	Index Year 6 2008	Index Goal * for next year
Attendance Index	133.3	113.3	125.0	118.3	128.3	123.3	At Goal

	Weakness	Strength
<b>Step 1:</b> <i>Weakest/Strongest Area (DIBELS/DRA) for Current Year</i>	Third Grade students at risk went from 6% in the Fall'07 to 17% in the Spring'08	Kindergarten had 50% of their students at low risk in Fall '07 and grew to 76% in Spring '08.
<b>Step 2:</b> <i>Weakest/Strongest Area (SPS) for Current Year</i>	3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Science (98.3) 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Social Studies (99.4) 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies (99.4)	5 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA ( 120.8) 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA (115.4) 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math (115.4)
<b>Step 3:</b> <i>Declining/Improving Trends for SPS Indicators</i>	3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Social Studies (114, 105.6, 99.4) 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies (109, 104.1, 111.3, 102, 99.4)  ** 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math** (128.3, 118.1, 115.4) Although the SPS is considered a relative strength for the school, it has been declining for the past 3 years.	5 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA ( 102.6, 114, 120.8)
<b>Step 4:</b> <i>SPS Grade Level Weaknesses/Strengths</i>	3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Social Science 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies	3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade ELA 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA

	<b>Weakness</b>	<b>Strength</b>
<b>Step 5:</b> <i>SPS Subject Level Weaknesses/Strengths</i>	Social Studies	ELA
<b>Step 6:</b> <i>Subgroup Weakest/Strongest Area for Current Year</i>	African American	White
<b>Step 7:</b> <i>Declining/Improving Trends for Subgroups</i>	Using the past two years of data, all subgroups (African American, White, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities) have declined in Math.	Using the past two years of data, all subgroups (African American, White, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities) have grown in ELA
<b>Step 8:</b> <i>Achievement Gap Issues</i>		
<b>Step 9:</b> <i>Subgroup Subject Level Weaknesses/Strengths</i>		

	<b>Weakness</b>	<b>Strength</b>
<b>Step 10: <i>Major Weaknesses/Strengths</i></b>		

**LEAP Assessment worksheet**  
**Fourth Grade**

<b>1: Highest Percent Correct/How many items?</b> <b>ELA</b>		<b>Proofreading</b> 80%	<b>8 Items</b>
<b>2: Lowest Percent Correct/How many items?</b> <b>Social Studies</b>		<b>Constructed Response</b> 55%	<b>4 Items</b>
<b>3a: Math Percent Correct</b>	<b>Multiple Choice items</b>	<b>74</b>	
	<b>Constructed Responses</b>	<b>63</b>	
<b>3b: Social Studies Percent Correct</b>	<b>Multiple Choice items</b>	<b>68</b>	
	<b>Constructed Responses</b>	<b>55</b>	
<b>3c: ELA Percent Correct</b>	<i>Writing (essay)</i>	<b>71</b>	
	<i>Using Information Resources</i>	<b>62</b>	
	<i>Reading and Responding</i>	<b>64</b>	
	<i>Proofreading</i>	<b>80</b>	
<b>3d: Science Percent Correct</b>	<i>Multiple Choice items</i>	<b>73</b>	
	<i>Short Answer</i>	<b>65</b>	
	<i>Science tasks</i>	<b>57</b>	
<b>4: Best Scores/Worst Scores</b>		<b>ELA Proofreading</b>	<b>Social Studies Constructed Response</b>
<b>5: What conclusions can be drawn?</b>		<b>Constructed Response is a definite weakness.</b>	

***iLEAP Data Analysis Worksheet***  
***Grade Level: 3***

Select the strengths and weaknesses across all four core areas

School Summary of ITBS Results

Strengths <i>Percent Correct by Standard</i>		# of Items	Weaknesses <i>Percent Correct by Standard</i>		# of Items	Priority Rank for Improvement
<b>ELA</b>	Using Information in Texts 87%	43	ELA Writing 65%	32		
<b>Math</b>	Data Analysis, Probability, Discrete Math 80%	8	Algebra 53%	8		
<b>Science</b>	Life Science 81%	9	Physical Science 48%	9		
<b>Social Studies</b>	Geography 65%	19	History 63% Geography 63%	21		

Subject Area	National Percentile Rank (NPR)
Reading	
Language	
Mathematics	

*iLEAP Data Analysis Worksheet*

**Grade Level: 5**

Select the strengths and weaknesses across all four core areas

## School Summary of ITBS/ITED Results

Subject Area	National Percentile Rank (NPR)
Reading	
Language	
Mathematics	

### DATA COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: SUMMARY REPORT 2004

**For Title I Schools: ELA and Math by subgroups should be primary when considering weaknesses that will lead to the goals in the SIP.**

Rank-order the identified areas of strength (3-5) from the student performance and attendance and/or dropout data and indicate the supporting data sources:

STRENGTHS	DATA SOURCE
1. School Performance Scores have improved every year.	LDE web reporting system
2. LEAP math index has improved every year.	LEAP CRT data for 4 <sup>th</sup> grade
3. ELA subgroup for whole school is highest at 84%	LEAP CRT data for 4 <sup>th</sup> grade
4.	

Rank-order the identified areas of weakness (3-5) from the student performance and attendance and/or dropout data and indicate the supporting data sources:

WEAKNESSES	DATA SOURCE
1. 5 <sup>th</sup> grade indexes are below third grade indexes in all subjects	NRT data for 2003-2004
2. Math index has declined for 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup>	NRT data for 2004
3. Achievement gap between ELA proficient and Math for African American students	CRT data for 2004

List the underlying causes from the attitudinal/perceptual, behavioral, and archival data of the previously identified strengths:

UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THE STRENGTHS	DATA SOURCE
1. Innovative instructional strategies are being used to improve student achievement	Instructional staff interview; classroom observations; administrator questionnaire, counselor interview
2. Parents believe a good education is a contribution factor to the success of their children's lives	Administrator questionnaire, student questionnaires, parent questionnaires, counselor interview
3. Teachers use other programs and activities in addition to the basic curriculum	Student focus group; instructional staff focus group; faculty needs assessment; instructional staff interview

List the underlying causes from the attitudinal/perceptual, behavioral, and archival data of the previously identified weaknesses:

UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THE WEAKNESSES	DATA SOURCE
1. There is a need for improved student behavior/social skills in order to minimize discipline issues and improve the focus on academics.	Faculty needs assessment; student focus group; instructional staff focus group
2. External regulations and factors which influence the school's climate and culture.	Counselor interview; instructional staff interview; instructional staff focus group; faculty needs assessment
3. There is a lack of instructional strategies encompassing innovative techniques that address individual differences.	Student questionnaire; parent questionnaire; classroom observations; instructional staff questionnaires

## STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

<b>GOAL 1:</b> To achieve high academic standards in mathematics	<b>School SPS 2007: 115.4</b>	<b>School GT 2007: 117.4</b>
<b>OBJECTIVE 1:</b> During the 2008-2009 school year, to move 20% of third, fourth, and fifth graders up one performance level in math on the LEAP Test. <b>OBJECTIVE 2:</b> During the 2008-2009 school year, all students will be proficient in mathematics as measured by common grade level assessments.	<b>SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:</b> (Derived from the underlying causes) – Implementation of Quality in Education Curriculum Coordinator Differentiation of instruction Data/Technology Coordinator Assessments aligned to CCF Teacher collaboration Technology as a Tool for Teaching/Learning Cooperative Learning Parental Involvement	

**ACTION PLAN**

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	Funding Sources			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1 Object Code	2 Cost	3	
Teachers will address learning needs of students within their class.	Teachers will design and administer math assessments aligned to the each unit of the Comprehensive Curriculum Framework.	Curriculum Coordinator/Teachers	Students will take tests at end of each unit				Teachers will report results to the Curriculum Coordinator and Principal.
	Teachers will create data binders for students to monitor progress and set learning goals.	Teachers	Students will use on a daily basis.	<b>Classroom funds</b>			Data binders will be reviewed by principal and discussed during learning team meetings.
Teachers will collaborate regularly.	Through participation in LINCS, teachers will meet as learning teams (grade level) weekly for the purpose of curriculum mapping, creating assessments, and analyzing student work.	Teachers, Principal, Curriculum Coordinator, Quality coordinator	Teachers, weekly	<b>Title I</b>			LINCS/Learning Team meeting documentation will be kept in the conference room and reviewed weekly by the principal.
	A curriculum coordinator will be hired to assist with aligning curriculum and coaching through LINCS process.	Principal, Leadership Team	August; for the entire year	<b>Title I</b>			CPSB Employee Appraisal process
Students math skills will improve	Teachers will utilize Scantron results to meet individual needs of students.	Teachers, Curriculum coordinator	Students in grades 2-5 Aug/April	<b>District</b>			Teacher portfolios, lesson plans, study group documentation
	Tutors will be hired to address individual needs of students.	Principal, Curriculum Coordinator	August; for the entire year	<b>Title I</b>			
Teachers will be	Curriculum Coordinator and	Principal,	Summer 2008	<b>Title I</b>			Agenda, materials,

supported in implementation of strategies	teachers will be trained in Singapore Math strategies and techniques.	Curriculum Coordinator					registration, and travel documents
	School-wide math strategies (Singapore Math, 8 step model drawing process) will be developed and implemented through all grade levels.	Curriculum Coordinator, Teachers	November-February				Documentation of strategies in study group logs, posted on classroom walls
	Teachers and students will use various strategies to strengthen basic Math Facts skills in all grade levels						
Increased parental involvement	Teachers will meet with parents in individual conferences before school begins	Principal, Teachers	August	<b>Admin</b>			Agendas, sign-in sheets
	Parents will be invited to grade level family math nights (K-2, 3-5) for participation and increased knowledge of skill requirements for students.	Curriculum coordinator, Teachers, Parents	Throughout the year	<b>Admin</b>			Agendas, sign-in sheets
	Student-led conferences will be held mid-year to allow students to share individual progress with their parents.	Principal, Teachers, Parents, Students	January/February				Agendas, sign-in sheets
Increased student engagement	Teachers will be trained in a variety of ways to increase student engagement: Kagan cooperative learning structures, quality in education training, Win-Win Discipline training, technology training, Brain research training, curriculum training, Exemplars, Thinking	Administration, Curriculum Coordinator	2008-2009 year				



participate in the process.		Parents					
Teachers will address learning needs of students within their class.	Teachers will design and administer ELA assessments aligned to the each unit of the Comprehensive Curriculum Framework.	Teachers	Students will take tests at end of each unit				Teachers will report results to the Curriculum Coordinator and Principal.
	Teachers will create data binders for students to monitor progress and set learning goals.	Teachers	Students will use on a daily basis.	<b>Classroom funds</b>			Data binders will be reviewed by principal and discussed during learning team meetings.
Teachers will collaborate regularly.	Through participation in LINCS, teachers will meet as learning teams (grade level) weekly for the purpose of curriculum mapping, creating assessments, and analyzing student work.	Teachers, Principal, Curriculum Coordinator, Data coordinator	Teachers, weekly	<b>Title I</b>			Learning Team meeting documentation will be kept in the conference room and reviewed weekly by the principal.
	A curriculum coordinator will be hired to assist with aligning curriculum and coaching through LINCS process.	Principal, Leadership Team	August; for the entire year	<b>Title I</b>			CPSB Employee Appraisal process
Students math skills will improve	Teachers will utilize Scantron results to meet individual needs of students.	Teachers, Lab manager, curriculum coordinator	Students in grades 2-5 Aug/April	<b>District</b>			Teacher portfolios, lesson plans, study group documentation
	Tutors will be hired to address individual needs of students.	Principal, Curriculum Coordinator	August; for the entire year	<b>Title I</b>	<b>100</b>		
Increased parental involvement	Teachers will meet with parents in individual conferences before school begins	Principal, Teachers	August	<b>Admin</b>			Agendas, sign-in sheets
	Student-led conferences will be held mid-year to allow students to share individual progress with their parents.	Principal, Teachers, Parents, Students	January/February				Agendas, sign-in sheets

Increased student engagement	Teachers will be trained in a variety of ways to increase student engagement: Kagan cooperative learning structures, quality in education training, Win-Win Discipline training, technology training, Brain research training, curriculum training, Exemplars, Thinking Maps.	Administration, Curriculum Coordinator	2008-2009 year				Training agendas, sign-in sheets, supplemental pay, lesson plans
	Teachers/staff will implement Positive Behavior Support	District, Administration, PBS Team	2008-2009 year				Meeting agendas, sign-in sheets
Students will read on or above grade level	Through information from STAR, DIBELS, and CARS teachers will monitor student reading ability and promote Accelerated Reader	Principal, Curriculum Coordinator, Teachers	Each six weeks	Admin Funds			August, January, and May assessments of STAR; six weeks reports on AR; CARS pre/post results; DIBELS Aug, Jan, May
	Student recognition celebrations for students who meet AR goals.	Assistant Principal	Students; each six weeks	Admin/ Title I			Each six weeks
	Teachers will utilize a multi-sensory approach (Project Read, Spalding, Reading Groups) for students who are below level in reading (DIBELS)	Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Coordinator, teachers	Students throughout the year				Documentation in lesson plans; teacher observations; progress monitoring results
Students will become more proficient writers.	DOL and grade level writing prompts will be implemented, scored according to the LEAP rubric, and reported through teacher collaboration.	Principal, Curriculum Coordinator, Teachers	Each six weeks				Scored writing assignments with LEAP rubric
	Teachers will provide daily language activities aligned with state assessments.	Teachers	Weekly plans				Lesson plans
Students will use	Teachers will provide	Principal,	Test prep wkbks				Lesson plans

information resources more effectively.	resources and assessments aligned with state assessments and meet in grade levels to discuss strategies and results.	Curriculum Coordinator, Librarian, Teachers					
<b>Total Cost</b>							
<b>Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy:</b> Student performance on I-LEAP, LEAP, CARS, and STAR Reading will be analyzed during strategic planning in June 2009 to determine goal attainment.							

<b>GOAL 3:</b> To achieve high academic standards in science	<b>School SPS 2007:</b> 114.8	<b>School GT 2007:</b> 117.6
<b>OBJECTIVE 1:</b> During the 2008-2009 school year, to move 20% of third, fourth, and fifth graders up one performance level in science on the LEAP, I-LEAP Tests. <b>OBJECTIVE 2:</b> During the 2008-2009 school year, all students will be proficient in science as measured by common grade level assessments.	<b>SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:</b> Performance Based Assessment Higher Order Thinking Skills Teaching Critical Reading/Writing Skills Experiential/Hands on Learning Technology Imbedded Instruction Teacher collaboration Guest Speakers United Streaming	

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
Students will become proficient in science.	Schoolwide science activities will be provided targeting GLEs for all grades (Starlab, KIDS TV)	Principal, Curriculum Coordinator, Teachers	Teachers/Students throughout the year				List of participants and documentation in lesson plans
	A 5 <sup>th</sup> grade science fair will be held which involves school-wide presentations via KIDS TV and a scavenger hunt for students.	Principal, Curriculum Coordinator	Teachers/student; March	<b>Title I</b> <b>Admin</b>			Lesson plans, schedule, agendas
	Class projects for grades PK-4 will demonstrate understanding of the scientific process and be shown on KIDS TV.						
	Teachers will develop and	Principal,	Teachers;				Study group logs,

	administer aligned grade level assessments.	Curriculum Coordinator, Teachers	throughout the year				assessments, Scantron results
	Teachers will attend technology workshops and conferences to learn new strategies for integrating curriculum and technology	Administration, Curriculum Coordinator, Teachers					Professional trip forms, training agendas
	Teachers will use technology resources (United Streaming, KIDS TV) and community members to act as “Partners in Science” for engaging student learning	Curriculum Coordinator, Teachers, community members					
	Teachers will receive training in hands-on/minds-on teaching and inquiry method (INTECH Science)	Administration, Curriculum Coordinator	Teachers				Agendas, training handouts
	SPARK teachers will teach “model Kernel” lessons to assist classroom teachers with science as inquiry	Curriculum Coordinator, SPARK teachers	Teachers/student; monthly				Lesson plans, activity sheets
Refurbishing of science lab	Science lab will house equipment and materials needed by all grade levels.	Curriculum coordinator	Teachers/student; fall 2007				List of equipment, materials

**Total Cost**

**Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy:** Student performance on I-LEAP and LEAP will be analyzed during strategic planning in June 2009 to determine goal attainment.

<b>GOAL 4:</b> To achieve high academic standards in social studies	<b>School SPS 2007:</b> 114.8	<b>School GT 2007:</b> 117.6		
<b>OBJECTIVE 1:</b> During the 2008-2009 school year, to move 20% of third, fourth, and fifth graders up one performance level in social studies on the LEAP, I-LEAP Tests. <b>OBJECTIVE 2:</b> During the 2008-2009 school year, all students will be proficient in social studies as measured by common grade level assessments	<b>SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:</b> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">           Experiential/Hands on Learning            Technology Imbedded Instruction            Teacher collaboration            Guest speakers            Constructed response items            publications         </td> <td style="width: 50%;">           CCF            United Streaming            Map studies            Career awareness            Current Events         </td> </tr> </table>		Experiential/Hands on Learning Technology Imbedded Instruction Teacher collaboration Guest speakers Constructed response items publications	CCF United Streaming Map studies Career awareness Current Events
Experiential/Hands on Learning Technology Imbedded Instruction Teacher collaboration Guest speakers Constructed response items publications	CCF United Streaming Map studies Career awareness Current Events			

<b>Expected Impact (Observable Change)</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Persons Responsible</b>	<b>Target Audience and Timeline</b>	<b>1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost</b>			<b>Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity</b>
				<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	
Students will become proficient in social studies.	Teachers will use the CCF to develop and administer common grade level assessments including constructed response items.	Principal, Curriculum Coordinator, Teachers	Teachers/students ; each six weeks				Study group logs, assessments, Scantron results
	Schoolwide social studies activities and technology enhanced lessons will target GLEs for all grades levels (guest speakers, KIDS TV, Wax Museum of Famous Americans,	Principal, Curriculum Coordinator, teachers	Teachers/students ; throughout the year				Schedules, agendas, lesson plans

	Patriotic Events, United Streaming, LA week)						
	Each grade will plan field trips aligned to specific social studies GLEs	Teachers	Students; throughout the year	Classrooms			Schedules, lesson plans
	Teachers will use maps studies and Daily Oral Geography to enhance map skills of students in all grade levels	Teachers	Throughout the year				Lesson plans
	Teachers will invite guest speakers in to engage students in learning curriculum	Teachers	Throughout the school year				Lesson plans
	Teachers will focus on civics, government, and the election process during this Presidential Election year.	Curriculum Coordinator; Teachers	Teachers/students ; Fall 2008				Lesson Plans
	A 5 <sup>th</sup> grade social studies fair will be held that will involve school-wide presentations via KIDS TV.	Librarian, Curriculum Coordinator, Teachers	Spring 2008				SS Fair schedule
Students will become familiar with Louisiana history and culture.	A Louisiana Week with class projects for grades PK-5 will demonstrate understanding of the Louisiana concepts and be shown on KIDS TV.	Administration, Curriculum Coordinator, Teachers	February 2008				LA Week schedule

**Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy:** Student performance on I-LEAP and LEAP will be analyzed during strategic planning in June 2009 to determine goal attainment.

<b>GOAL 5:</b> To improve student attendance	<b>School SPS 2007:</b> 114.8	<b>School GT 2007:</b> 117.6
<b>OBJECTIVE 1:</b> Dolby students will achieve a 98% attendance rating for the 2008-2009 school year.	<b>SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY:</b> Parental Involvement	

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
Parents will understand their role in improving student attendance.	A "parent report" will be implemented to inform parents of their progress in school processes	Principal, Curriculum Coordinator, Teachers, PTO	Parents, midyear				Parent surveys and comments
	Tardy sign placed in front driveway when tardy bell rings at 7:50.	Duty teacher					
Increased parental understanding of their role in their child's education	Student-led conferences will be held school-wide	Principal, teachers, students	Parents in January				Sign-in sheets, agendas
	Information in handbooks, newsletters, and website regarding district/school policies and tracking of schoolwide data and performance	Principal, Webmaster					

Students will take ownership of school attendance	Promotion of schoolwide goal and posting of data charts on KIDS TV and hallways	Principal, Leadership Team	Students; weekly	Admin			Attendance for each six weeks
	Recognition of students with perfect attendance (ribbon, sticker, certificate, attenDANCE, jean day)	Administration, Attendance Committee					
	Reward for classes/teachers with 98% attendance for 6 week period (extra recess, free lunch duty day)	Administration					

**Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy:** Student attendance ratings by the six weeks and for the year will be analyzed during strategic planning in June 2009 to determine goal attainment.

**TOTAL SCHOOL BUDGET FOR RESTRICTED AND DISCRETIONARY FUNDS**

Indicate the total funds per Funding Source, per object category. See *SAM 2000* for clarity on operational definitions.

FUNDING SOURCES*	TITLE I								TOTAL
SALARIES (100)	\$106,102								\$106,102
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS (200)	\$24,195								\$24,195
PURCHASED PROFESSIONAL and TECHNICAL SERVICES (300)									
PURCHASED PROPERTY SERVICES (400)	\$2,000								\$2,000
OTHER PURCHASES SERVICES (500)	\$13,000								\$13,000
SUPPLIES (600)	\$10,320								\$10,320
INDIRECT COSTS (If applicable)									
PROPERTY (700)	\$14,573								\$14,573
OTHER OBJECTS (800)									
OTHER USES OF FUNDS (900)									

<b>TOTAL</b>	\$160,050									\$160,050
--------------	-----------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-----------

\*Funding Sources: Title I – Part A, Part B (Even Start), Part C (Migrant), Part D (N & D), Part F (CSRP); Title II – Part A (Professional Development), Part D (Technology); Title III – English Language Proficient; Title V – Parental Choice and Innovative Programs; Title VII – Part A (Indian Education), Part B (Native Hawaiian Education), Part C (Alaska Native Education); Learn and Serve America; Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; State Funding; 8(g); LaSIP; Foreign Languages; IDEA; K-3 Initiatives; Early Reading First; MSL; Education Excellence Act; School Choice; miscellaneous funding sources; foundations/grants, etc.