Arizona Department of Education

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)
LEA Application for Tier I, Tier II and Tier III

LEA APPLICATION COVER PAGE

LEA Name: Gadsden Elementary School District #32	**NCES ID#0403240**	**CTDS#140432000**	**Entity ID: 4505**
Superintendent: Dr. Raymond V. Aguilera	**Email: agui2400@yahoo.com**		
Director of School Improvement: Dr. Jerry R. Lewis	**Email: jlewis@gesd32.org**		
LEA Contact Information: Dr. Raymond V. Aguilera			
Mailing Address: 1435 N. Main Street; San Luis, AZ 85349			
Telephone number: (928) 627-6542			
Fax: (928) 627-6365			

School Board President Signature _____ **Date** 5-21-10

Superintendent Signature _____ **Date** 5-21-10

Director of School Improvement Signature _____ **Date** 5-21-10

Arizona Department of Education

School Improvement Grant
LEA Application for Tier I, Tier II and Tier III

DIRECTIONS: There are 3 STEPS to this application process:

- **Step 1: LEA teams work to complete this application form. This part consists of Sections A through J.** ***(Approval from SI Team required to move to Step 2)***
- **Step 2 – Complete Section K – complete detailed action plan for implementation of plan components for the 2010-2011 school year on ALEAT.** ***(This section needs to be approved before moving to Step 3)***
- **Step 3 – Complete Section L – detailed budget information needs to be completed on ADE's Grants Management System**

IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOLS

School Name	NCES ID#	CTDS#	Entity ID#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III
Gadsden Elementary	040324000250	140432101	6183	X		
San Luis Middle School	040324001101	140432103	6185			X
Rio Colorado Elementary	040324001213	140432102	6184			X
Southwest Junior High School	040324002388	140432107	81105			X
Desert View Elementary	040324003116	140432108	81096			X
Arizona Desert Elementary	040324001806	140432105	6187			X
Cesar Chavez Elementary	040324003066	140432106	79724			X

The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant.

A. LEA'S ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL'S NEEDS

With data and information available to you, analyze the needs of each of your Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools. The goal is for your LEA's Leadership team to carefully analyze and interpret all data in order to accurately and completely assess the needs of your Tier I and/or Tier II schools. The knowledge gained during this investigative and analytical phase will be the basis for your decision as to which of the four intervention models should be implemented in your schools. The guiding questions to consider as the LEA Leadership analyzes and interprets data are: Where are we now?; and How did we get to this place?

Where are we now?

A.1. Who are we? (as an LEA, school, staff, and community)

- Provide a brief description of the LEA and each school to be served using School Improvement Grant funds. Explain how the LEA and school(s) are organized; describe the characteristics of the student population, the teaching and administrative staff; and discuss the level of community involvement and parent engagement.

District Profile

The Gadsden Elementary School District #32 (San Luis, Arizona) is located on the U.S. – Mexico border in the southwest corner of the State of Arizona. The District is one of nine public school districts located in Yuma County, Arizona. It provides a program of public education from pre-school through grade eight, with an enrollment of 5,171 students.

The District extends over thirty square miles devoted primarily to agriculture. The student population of the district is 99.9% Hispanic with approximately 12% from migrant farm worker families. The ELL population in the district was at 99% in 1999 as compared to 79% in 2010 (this includes FEP Year 1 and Year 2 that are still monitored). The District SPED population is 10.87%. According to the National School Lunch Program, 97% of the students in the District receive free/reduced lunches due to their socioeconomic status.

The teacher demographics/educational levels in the district are indicated below:

- Asian: 5.0%
- Black: 1.0%
- Hispanic: 68%
- White: 26%

Educational Levels:

- Bachelors Degree: 50%
- Masters Degree: 37%
- Unknown: 13%

The District operates nine school sites, one in Gadsden, Arizona and eight in San Luis, Arizona. The District has a total assessed valuation of over $55 million with an annual General Fund budget of approximately $23 million. The District has experienced steady growth in student population as indicated below:

Academic Year	***Student Population***
1970/1971	300
1980/1981	820
1990/1991	1,186
2000/2001	2,817
2009/2010	5,171

Four new schools with an average of 625 students each have been completed in the last six years. These new schools have eliminated the double session schedules at two schools and will accommodate the anticipated student growth through fiscal year 2010-2011.

Sites 1-7 School Profiles:

Site 1: GADSDEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – Tier 1:

Gadsden Elementary School is a K-6 school serving 528 students. The town of Gadsden is located on the U.S.-Mexico border in the Southwest corner of the state. Approximately 300 students reside within the Gadsden-San Luis district boundaries, 228 students are from the other five elementary schools. The majority of the 228 students have been placed at Gadsden Elementary because their home schools have met their capacity of enrolled students. Most of the parents of our "out of boundary" students have requested a transfer to their home schools and it is very likely that the parents' requests will be granted by the beginning of next school year. Approximately 74.4% of Gadsden Elementary School students are ELL, 4.5% are Special Education, 15% are Migrant, and 100% are Title I. Ninety-nine percent of the students are Hispanic and the primary language spoken at home is Spanish. Many students are recent immigrants and thus do not share the common mainstream American culture which is important as a context for learning in the United States.

Approximately 97% of our students come from families whose income falls below or at the poverty level. As a result, we are a school that has federally funded universal free breakfast and lunch for all students. Gadsden Elementary School has a Title I school-wide program and Title I School Improvement Plan to address the growing needs of our students.

The demographic make-up of our students is from the lowest low-socio-economic status. A high percentage of our student population resides in single parent homes in high-crime, gang-infested neighborhoods. Some of our students are in foster homes, while many of our students' parents have been incarcerated and/or have been deported.

A total of twenty-one (21) teachers service our students at Gadsden Elementary School: Nineteen (19) teachers teach K-6, and two (2) teachers service our Special Education students. Nineteen (19) teachers are highly qualified, and two (2) are not highly qualified. In addition, three (3) instructional coaches provide music, library, and physical education for our students. Two (2) of our instructional coaches have a bachelor's degree, and one (1) has more than 61 college credit hours. Six (6) paraprofessionals provide additional support with small group and one-on-one student support. Twelve (12) teachers have bachelor degrees, and nine (9) have master degrees. Eighteen (18) teachers are Hispanic and two (2) are Caucasian.

Site 2: SAN LUIS MIDDLE SCHOOL:

San Luis Middle School is a Title I school currently in "Corrective Action" as a failing school. A Turn-Around Principal and two AZ Turn-Around Coaches (ATCs) have been assigned to the school this year as part of a "Transformational Model." The school has an average of six hundred-fifty, seventh and eighth grade students. Demographically we have: 99.8% Hispanic, and a .2% Black student population. Approximately, 16% of our students are migrant, 15% qualify for special education resource services, 99.5% qualify for free/reduced lunch, 74.8% are English Language Learners and our average daily attendance is 94%. We currently have one hundred seventy-five students who are English Language Learners falling far below on the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) Assessment.

In this school year alone, eighty percent (80%) of the staff are new to the school and nine (9) of these teachers were hired from a foreign country due to lack of viable highly-qualified applicants. In mid-July we still had eleven certified positions that needed filling. As of today, May 20, 2010, we have four long term substitutes in classrooms. At the end of 2008-2009 we had a turnover rate of 21 teachers and the year before that, 24 teachers. Our underperforming status has also influenced applicants to choose another school over ours for a job. Although teacher retention and recruitment has been an on-going problem at this site it is now even harder to find people willing to apply.

Currently at San Luis Middle School we have instituted an afterschool tutoring class that is mandatory for students falling far below and optional for all other students. We also added to the schedule this year a period for intervention called AIMS Prep. Students were sorted by their language proficiency levels into these classrooms. This period is where positive behavior skills and test taking strategies are taught in reading and math. We

intend this year to tighten/change the curriculum for this period making it more targeted to student needs. This period will become a tier 2 intervention in our RTI Model. This period will be more flexible with student movement based on diagnostic and progress monitoring data from our new assessment system and additional data from other inventories/screeners.

Site 3: RIO COLORADO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL:

Rio Colorado Elementary School is a Title 1 consisting of 713 Hispanic students (K-6th), 326 of which are female and 387 male. English Language Learners (ELL) students equal 488 and 223 Fluent English Proficient (FEP). We have 100% free and reduced lunch. Our school is made up of 134 migrant, 2 homeless, 13 extended resource special education kindergarten, 46 resource special education, 7 speech qualified, 34 gifted, and two students on a 504 plan. Our school staff is comprised of 32 certified staff (27 Hispanic and 5 Caucasian) and 33 full or part time classified staff. Our certified staff have 12 bachelor's degrees, 19 master's degrees, and 1 unknown. All but one of the certified staff are highly qualified and fully certified. All of the classified staff are highly qualified. We also have a counselor and speech therapist 1 day a week, part time psychologist and occupational therapist.

Site 4: SOUTHWEST JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL:

Southwest Junior High School is located in a small community on the southwestern border of Arizona. Many of the students who attend Southwest Junior High School struggle just to make it to school every day. A majority of students are not proficient in the English language which makes it difficult to cope during the school day. As a school our focus is to help these students achieve great things, to become scholars. This is where our program enters the picture. We take the students from wanting to succeed to success. We show them that they can become something great with a little time and effort. We give them something to be proud of.

Southwest Junior High School is a Title I school currently in Corrective Action. We have received AZ Turn-Around Coaches last year that will be leaving at the end of this year; however, we will have an NCLB coach provided by the district for next year. We have an average of seven hundred twenty-one (721) seventh and eighth grade students. Demographically this site has: 99.8% Hispanic, and a .2% White student population. 10 % are Migrant, 8.2% qualify for special education resource services, 99.5% qualify for free/reduced lunch, 50% are English Language Learners and our average daily attendance is 96.8%. We currently have one hundred and seventy five (175) students who are also English Language Learners falling far below on the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) Assessment. Last year this school was able to make gains in the area of math and writing but not in the area of reading.

Site 5: DESERT VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL:

Desert View Elementary School is located in San Luis, AZ approximately one mile from the international port of entry with Sonora, Mexico. San Luis has a population of about 25,000 residents. A majority of San Luis residents are Hispanic. A large part of our population is comprised of

migrant workers with an average annual income of approximately $25,000 a year. Most agricultural workers rely on unemployment benefits as a source of income in the summer months due to the lack of employment opportunities.

Desert View Elementary School is a 100% Title I school that has an enrolled population of 742 students in Kinder – 6th grades. Of that population 42% (312) are English Language Learners and 17% (124) are members of migrant/transitional families. Immigrants from Mexico make up 3% (22) of our population. The Special Education population at Desert View equals 5% (38) of our students. 100% of our students qualify for free breakfast and lunch at this time.

Desert View has a staff of 36 teachers, one principal, and 24 full and part-time Instructional Assistants who are also Highly Qualified.
Of the staff of 61: 10 are men and 51 are women. 22% are white, 78% are Hispanic. Certified staff with Bachelors degree :(26) and (10) with a Masters degree.

Site 6: ARIZONA DESERT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL:

Arizona Desert Elementary School is less than one mile from the Mexican border. In this border community about 99% of the population is identified as English language learners. Strong influences from our neighbors in San Luis, Sonora, Mexico shape the culture and language of San Luis, Arizona. The border influence brings to our school some social, language, racial, ethnic, and economical tensions that impact education. The SES (social economic status) is at or below the poverty level with high unemployment. As a Title I school, Arizona Desert provides a 100% free federal food program to all students. Because of the agricultural based economy some of the population is transient, following the crop seasons. Arizona Desert serves approximately 116 migrant students. Furthermore, this school serves a total of 720 students from kindergarten to sixth grade. Finally, Arizona Desert houses a community clinic for children supported by Yuma Regional Medical Center.

Arizona Desert's staff includes one principal. The staff includes: 23 highly qualified teachers in kindergarten through sixth grade, 1 NCLB specialist, 1 reading specialist, 1 migrant intervention/advocate (BA), 1 part-time parent liaison, 1 high qualified music teacher, 3 highly qualified special education teachers .Employed to assist instruction includes: 2 full-time instruction assistances, 4 full-time instructional assistance in special education, 1 part-time special education assistance, and 5 part-time instructional assistance. Arizona Desert services students from other school in the district with unique programming. In addition, Arizona Desert shares an on-site school psychologist, speech therapist (2 days/week), and school counselor.

Site 7: CESAR CHAVEZ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL:

Cesar Chavez is a K-6 school. The principal has been with the staff for 8 years. The staff consists of 25 classroom teachers, 3 special education teachers-which includes severe and profound, 2 special area teachers – music & PE and 3 instructional assistants in computers and library. We have 2 staff members that are not HQ in the area of severe and profound special education and music. 736 students are currently enrolled with a 99.8% Hispanic population, a 60% ELL population, 9% Sped population and 100% free lunch. Through FIAT, we have provided monthly academic and

behavior focused family & community events. Our district is located on the border of San Luis, AZ and San Luis, Mexico- our school is located 5 miles from the international port of entry. The San Luis/Gadsden population is approx. 25,000 residents, with a large agricultural industry which leads to a migrant population and a high ESL population.

Community Resources: Parent Involvement is encouraged by all of our sites in the following ways: monthly Parent/Teacher Organization meetings, monthly newsletters sent from the school, a part-time site and district parent liaison who communicates regularly with parents, family nights for helping their students in reading, math and writing, parent/teacher meetings to discuss student progress, special designated parent parking spaces at the entrance of the school help parents feel welcome, a family communication kiosk is in the school lobby displays pamphlets for parents to take, parent classes to help their children succeed, family craft nights, site website, Parent Project, FIAT teams, and invitations to school reward assemblies, school dramas and musicals. Parents are also encouraged to volunteer their time at book fairs, in classrooms, in the office and at school festivals.

Community involvement is evident especially in the after school programming. Local vendors and agencies willingly give of their time to provide special assemblies, donation of materials or financial support. Our community partners include the following agencies:

- San Luis Police Department
- Arizona Western College
- San Luis Parks and Recreation
- San Luis Fire Department
- Panchitas
- Yuma County Health
- Boy Scouts of America
- Sahuaro Girl Scout Council
- Regional Center for Border Health (San Luis)
- Regional Center for Border Health (Somerton)
- San Luis Rotary
- Heritage Jewelers
- Chicanos Por La Causa
- Kids Safety
- Panaderia Kika
- Yuma County Library
- San Luis Police Department
- Border Health Foundation
- Yuma-Daily Sun
- Yuma County Fair

Gadsden Elementary School district #32 Governing Board
Luis Marquez, President
Martina Lopez, Clerk
Gloria Torres
Rosa Varela
Tadeo De La Hoya

Superintendent
Raymond V. Aguilera

Chief Financial Officer Robert Bernhard	Assistant Superintendent Olivia Zepeda	School Improvement Director Dr. Jerry Lewis	Maintenance Director Lucicano Ramirez	Special Education Director Miguel Gonzalez	Professional Development Director Diana Bovey	Systems Director Luis Ramirez
• Business Manager: Janice Durham Accounts Payable: Kathy Stephens GFA: Maggie Buchmoyer Payroll: Kim Cash Carolina Sandoval Student Activities: Veronica Sandoval Warehouse: Emilio Ponce • Transportation Dir. Bill Wagner • ADM Mary Berumen • Food Service Donna Warren • School Facilities Board	• Certified Personnel: Dalila Porchas • Classified Personnel: Rosa Perez • Bi National Program • Legal Issues Attorneys • Student Discipline • Scheduling Music Programs • Receptionist	• School Improvement • Benchmark System • District Assessments • Federal & State Projects: Jean Touchet Migrant Education Title I, II, III, IV • Director of School Effectiveness/Grant Writer: Deanna Aguilera Highly Qualified Teachers 21st Century 7-8 AWC College Program • ELL & Comp Ed Belinda Boblett Testers	• Maintenance • Custodians • Grounds • Security • Buildings • School Facilities Board	• Special Education • Psychological Services • Legal Issues (Sp Ed) • Related Services (OT, PT, Speech • Counselors	• Professional Development Jean Oerkfitz • Consultants (Subject Areas) Wilda Storm Math Learning Center Lead Team (Gary Rooker) • 4-8 Reading • NCLB's	• Data Base Delio Castillo • Computer Techs • Technology System • District Planning • Communication System • Technology Installation • E-Rate Funding • Other Tech Funding Technology Purchasing • Data Base Warehouse: Pearson

	San Luis Middle School Rafael Sanchez, Principal Nadine Manginen, Asst. Prin.			**Southwest Jr. High Richard West, Principal Jose Reynoso, Asst. Prin.**	
Arizona Desert Laura Couret, Principal	**Gadsden Elementary Carmelann Barry, Principal**	**Rio Colorado Elementary Meredith Brooks, Principal**	**Cesar Chavez Elementary Bethany Loucks, Principal**	**Desert View Elementary Lance Chebultz, Principal**	**Ed Pastor Elementary Gretchen Gross, Principal**
		San Luis Preschool Lisa Lemos			

A.2 How do we operate and do business at the LEA and school levels?

- Based on the description in A.1, provide a brief description of the climate, culture, values and beliefs that are part of the LEA and schools.

The Gadsden Elementary School District #32 (LEA's) mission is to: "Provide high quality educational programs, with an emphasis in the English language, dedicated to promote a promising future for our students. Together, the community and our personnel support this educational mission." Our Governing Board Goals/Beliefs include the following:

- Schools will make AYP and achieve Performing Status or above in AZLEARNS
- Classrooms will have Highly Qualified teachers
- Increase English Language Fluency
- Effective District/Community Communication Programs
- Provide a safe learning environment for all
- Create or implement competitive academic and extracurricular activities
- Increase teacher participation in school/community activities and events

Our school's mission/vision:

Site 1: Gadsden Elementary: Our mission at Gadsden Elementary School is to educate future leaders by providing a safe learning environment where students, teachers, staff and the community work *collaboratively* to promote student achievement. We are an "English Learning Community."

Site 2: San Luis Middle School: Our mission is to support, challenge, and motivate our students to perform at their highest potential and ultimately instill an appreciation for learning. We will involve parents and community as active participants in the education of our students. Our students will utilize the necessary tools and opportunities to become productive members of our community. Our administration and support staff will create a safe and orderly educational environment to establish and encourage success for all students alike.

Site 3: Rio Colorado: Our mission is to contribute to the creation of a culture of participation in our school community to benefit the integral education of our children.

Site 4: Southwest Jr. High: Southwest Junior High School will meet the needs of all students through a partnership between the school, the parents, and the community. This educational commitment includes the opportunity for every student: to be successful; develop a positive self-image; make decisions; and grow academically, socially, psychologically, and physically. Furthermore, this commitment will assist each student in developing the necessary abilities for successful careers and participation in promoting a free and democratic society

Site 5: Desert View: Our mission is to provide high quality educational programs, with an emphasis in the English language, dedicated to promote a promising future for our students. Together the community and our personnel support this educational mission.

Site 6: Arizona Desert: The Arizona Desert Elementary School Mission is to motivate and educate all students, to instill academic excellence, and to value education as a whole in a safe and secure environment.

Site 7: Cesar Chavez: Our mission is to achieve student success through embracing students, parents, staff, and our community. "Embracing Our School, Our Families, Our Future."

Our educational programs are based upon the Principles of Effectiveness and take into consideration the needs of the school and community.

The needs assessment process was conducted by reviewing the sites Arizona School Improvement Plan; along with aligning it to our LEA's Consolidated Plan. In each plan the academic needs of the students are clearly defined; along with strategies, evaluations, and timelines to ensure that the targeted goals are being met. We have found that there are significant factors that have contributed to our sites being in dire academic need which includes the following: low achievement scores in math and reading, the high percentage of ELL students, the SPED subgroup, discipline issues, on-going community crime, and a substantially high rate of unemployment in the community. We believe that:

1) Learning is intentional:

All of the district approved curriculum is intentionally designed to promote student achievement. All of the goals and strategies are aligned with the LEA Consolidated Plan and the site's Arizona School Improvement Plan. The staff has focused its instruction in the core areas of math, reading, and writing which includes the mandatory ELL four hour block of instruction. The district/site uses AIMS scores, DIBELS, and formative assessments to identify the students who are in need of academic intervention in each core area. After students have been identified, research-based strategies are used to increase academic achievement. Each student is tracked through our Pearson Data Base system using benchmark data to determine if the student is making gains with the academic interventions that are being used.

2) Learning is embedded in all school activities:

The core subject areas of math, reading, and writing are contained in all of the planned programming and activities. There is consistent on-going communication between the school-day staff and administration to ensure that learning is targeted and embedded in all school activities. The use of student assessments allows the staff to monitor the progress of each individual student to assure that academic goals/gains are being met. Each

activity will meet the needs of a particular subgroup that has been identified with objective data in the needs assessment process.

3) Activities are exciting and engaging

Classroom teachers will use assessments from their daytime classes to design interventions that challenge these students and meet their specific needs. Aligned with the state academic standards, the content of the classes will be engaging and exciting. Activities and instruction will be hands-on and practical. Academic enrichment opportunities will be designed to be high-quality by using interesting and challenging content, competitive games, and rich community resources. The program design will accommodate a variety of learning styles.

4) Activities are research-based and aligned with state and local academic standards

Programming used in our instruction is research-based and aligned with state standards. Accelerated Reader, Saxon Mathematics, Excel Mathematics, Study Island, and Write Up A Storm are district adopted programs that are research-based and proven to provide academic results. Each site has worked with a district consultant on curriculum-mapping and alignment so each lesson/activity is geared toward mastering the state standards in each core subject area.

5) Dosage Matters

According the Principles of Effectiveness, the more time children are engaged in learning activities the greater the school success. Our afterschool program will be offered 4 days a week for 30 weeks and 5 days a week for 3 weeks in the Summer. All of our students will be encouraged to attend classes four days a week in order to receive the highest level of interventions necessary for them to make academic gains. We have noticed with our previous 21st CCLC grant, that students who have participated in the afterschool tutoring program have shown dramatic growths academically and socially.

A.3 How are our students doing?

- Provide detailed summary of the student data for each Tier I, Tier II and/or Tier III school. Include data documents or reports as attachments.

Site 1: **Tier I School: Gadsden Elementary School**

The overall performance level of this school is in the bottom 5% of Title I schools in Arizona. The three year average in students meeting AYP was an average of -4 % over a three year period, as calculated by ADE. The patterns over a three year period in the area of major subject areas are as follows:

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENT NOT MEETING AYP LEVEL BY SUBGROUP			
Test Source	**All**	**ELL**	**SPED**
AIMS Math	**62%**	**88%**	**93%**
AIMS Reading	**72%**	**95%**	**99%**
Benchmark Math	**62%**	**75%**	**82%**
Benchmark Language	**69%**	**85%**	**75%**

All subgroups are performing well below acceptable performance levels. Previous data included in previous section substantiate that major reform is needed in this school.

See other sections for more detailed break out.

Reading results indicate a major focus and improvement must be made in all identified subgroups. Low Special Ed. Student numbers skews the results for that subgroup.

Math results indicate a major focus and improvement must be made in all identified subgroups. Low Special Ed. Student numbers skews the results for that subgroup.

AIMS and District Comprehensive Results are highly correlated.

<u>Site 2: Tier III : San Luis Middle School</u>

The patterns over a three year period in the area of major subject areas are as follows:

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENT NOT MEETING AYP LEVEL BY SUBGROUP			
Test Source	**All**	**ELL**	**SPED**
AIMS Math	**64%**	**87%**	**95%**
AIMS Reading	**65%**	**94%**	**96%**
Benchmark Math	**80%**	**96%**	**96%**
Benchmark Language	**63%**	**93%**	**92%**

San Luis Middle School is a Title I school currently in corrective action as a failing school, A Turn Around Principal and two AZ Turn Around Coaches (ATCs) have been assigned to the school this year as part of a transformational model. The school has an average of six hundred-fifty, seventh and eighth grade students. Demographically they have: 99.8% Hispanic, and a .2% Black student population. 16% of their students are migrant, 15.1% qualify for special education resource services, 99.5% qualify for free/reduced lunch, 74.8% are English Language Learners and their average daily attendance is 94%. They currently have one hundred seventy-five students who are English Language Learners falling far below on the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) Assessment. In 2008 -2009, SLMS in reading had 32% of their students Falling Far Below, 35% Approaching and 33% of their students meeting or exceeding on AIMS. Over time, SLMS has added to their Falling Far Below Category in the area of reading each year with a small decrease occurring last year. In Math, 35% were falling far below, 28% were approaching, and 36% were meeting or exceeding the standard. Looking at our sub- populations we have: In Special Education, in Reading, 66% FFB, 31% A and 3% M/E and in Math, 72% FFB, 19% A, and 9% M/E. In our ELL, in Reading 56% FFB, 38% A, and 7% M/E and in Math, 56% FFB, 29% A, and 14% M/E. As a school in Reading and Math, we haven't met the standards with over 60% of our students but when you look at SLMS sub-populations that percent is even greater (Sp.Ed: 97% reading, 91% Math, ELL: 94% Reading, 85% Math,).

Reading results indicate a major focus and improvement must be made in all identified subgroups. Low Special Ed. Student numbers skews the results for that subgroup.

Math results indicate a major focus and improvement must be made in all identified subgroups. Low Special Ed. Student numbers skews the results for that subgroup.

AIMS and District Comprehensive Results are highly correlated.

Site 3:Tier III: Rio Colorado Elementary

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENT NOT MEETING AYP LEVEL BY SUBGROUP			
Test Source	**All**	**ELL**	**SPED**
AIMS Math	**49%**	**83%**	**94%**
AIMS Reading	**57%**	**90%**	**98%**
Benchmark Math	**52%**	**72%**	**89%**
Benchmark Language	**61%**	**84%**	**92%**

AZELLA reclassification scores have increased by 10% over 3 yrs (this yr pending)

See other sections for more detailed break out

The trends we see are:

- **3rd grade overall the last 2 yrs has decreased in AIMS**
- **Special education in all grade levels shows minimal or no growth the last 3 yrs in AIMS**
- **District math benchmarks show a decrease in ELL scores 1-6th from 2008 to 2009**
- **District language arts benchmarks show a decrease in ELL scores 1-6th from 2008 to 2009**
- **DIBELS kinder scores have dropped from 80% benchmark to 61% from 2008-2010 (kinder is only ½ day this yr)**
- **DIBELS 2nd grade scores were static for 2 years and then dropped 7% this yr**
- **DIBELS 4th grade decreased by 9% over the last 3 yrs.**
- **DIBELS 1st grade scores have increased from 49-54% in the last 3 yrs.**
- **DIBELS 3rd grade had an increase of 3% in the last 3 yrs.**
- **DIBELS 5th grade had an increase of 6% in the last 3 yrs.**
- **DIBELS 6th grade increased from 25% to 62% in the last 3 yrs.**

Reading results indicate a major focus and improvement must be made in all identified subgroups, with greater emphasis in ELL and

Special Ed. Special Ed Student numbers are low and skew the percentage.

Math results indicate a major focus and improvement must be made in all identified subgroups, with greater emphasis in ELL and Special Ed. Special Ed Student numbers are low and skew the percentage.

AIMS and District Comprehensive Results are highly correlated.

Site 4: Tier III School: Southwest Junior High

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENT NOT MEETING AYP LEVEL BY SUBGROUP			
Test Source	**All**	**ELL**	**SPED**
AIMS Math	**47%**	**77%**	**88%**
AIMS Reading	**50%**	**91%**	**91%**
Benchmark Math	**73%**	**95%**	**96%**
Benchmark Language	**45%**	**84%**	**83%**

AIMS data suggests

1. For 7th grade reading, from the year 2007 through the year 2009, there has been an increase of 15% in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specifications of All Students. For the ELL subgroup, there has been a 7% decrease in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specification of ELL students. For the SPED subgroup, there has been a decrease of 1% in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specification of ELL students.
2. For 7th grade math, from the year 2007 through the year 2009, there has been an increase of 15% in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specifications of ALL Students. For the ELL subgroup, there has been a 1% decrease in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specification of ELL students. For the SPED subgroup, there has been a 9% increase in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specifications of SPED students.
3. For 7th grade writing, from the year 2007 through the year 2009, there has been a 9% increase of in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specifications of All Students. For the ELL subgroup, there has been a 19% increase in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specification of ELL students. For the SPED subgroup, there has been a 35% increase in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specifications of SPED students.
4. For 8th grade reading, from the year 2007 through the year 2009, there has been an increase of 15% in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specifications of ALL Students. For the ELL subgroup, there has been a 9% decrease in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specification of ELL students. For the SPED subgroup, there has been a 4% increase in the percentage of students who are

proficient for the specification of SPED students.
5. For 8th grade math, from year 2007 through the year 2009, there has been an increase of 11% in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specifications of ALL Students. For the ELL subgroup, there has been an 11% decrease in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specification of ELL Students. For the SPED subgroup, there has been a 4% decrease in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specification of SPED Students.
6. For 8th grade writing, from the year 2007 through the year 2009, there has been an increase of 33% in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specifications of ALL Students. For the ELL subgroup, there has been a 12% increase in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specifications of ELL students. For the SPED subgroup, there has been a 19% increase in the percentage of students who are proficient for the specification of SPED Students.
7. For 7th grade reading, from the year 2007 through the year 2009, there has been a 1% decrease in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of ALL Students. For the ELL subgroup, there has been a 1% increase in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of ELL Students. For the SPED subgroup, there has been a 6% increase in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of SPED Students.
8. For 7th grade math, from the year 2007 through the year 2009, there has been no change in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of ALL Students. For the ELL subgroup, there has been no change in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of ELL Students. For the SPED subgroup, there has been a 14% decrease in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of SPED Students.
9. For 7th grade writing, from the year 2007 through the year 2009, there has been a 2% increase in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of ALL Students. For the ELL subgroup, there has been a 6% increase in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of ELL Students. For the SPED subgroup, there has been a 2% increase in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of SPED Students.
10. For 8th grade reading, from the year 2007 through the year 2009, there has been a 1% increase in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of ALL Students. For the ELL subgroup, there has been a 22% increase in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of ELL Students. For the SPED subgroup, there has been no change in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of SPED Students.
11. For 8th grade math, from the year 2007 through the year 2009, there has been an 8% decrease in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of ALL Students. For the ELL subgroup, there has been an 8% decrease in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of ELL Students. For the SPED subgroup, there has been a 9% increase in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of SPED Students.

12. For 8th grade writing, from the year 2007 through the year 2009, there has been a 1% increase in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of ALL Students. For the ELL subgroup, there has been a 3% increase in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of ELL Students. For the SPED subgroup, there has been a 4% increase in the percentage of students who are Falls Far Below for the specification of SPED Students.

Reading results indicate a major focus and improvement must be made in all identified subgroups, with greater emphasis in ELL and Special Ed. Special Ed Student numbers are low and skew the percentage.

Math results indicate a major focus and improvement must be made in all identified subgroups, with greater emphasis in ELL and Special Ed. Special Ed Student numbers are low and skew the percentage.

AIMS and District Comprehensive Results are highly correlated.

Site 5: Desert View Elementary School

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENT NOT MEETING AYP LEVEL BY SUBGROUP			
Test Source	**All**	**ELL**	**SPED**
AIMS Math	**38%**	**74%**	**85%**
AIMS Reading	**52%**	**90%**	**90%**
Benchmark Math	**36%**	**58%**	**72%**
Benchmark Language	**47%**	**74%**	**79%**

See other sections for more detailed break out.

Reading results indicate a major focus and improvement must be made in all identified subgroups, with greater emphasis in ELL and Special Ed. Special Ed Student numbers are low and skew the percentage.

Math results indicate a major focus and improvement must be made in all identified subgroups, with greater emphasis in ELL and Special Ed. Low Student numbers in Special Ed student count are low and skew the percentage.

AIMS and District Comprehensive Results are highly correlated.

Site 6: Tier III: Arizona Desert Elementary

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENT NOT MEETING AYP LEVEL BY SUBGROUP			
Test Source	**All**	**ELL**	**SPED**
AIMS Math	**47%**	**76%**	**90%**
AIMS Reading	**55%**	**87%**	**94%**
Benchmark Math	**50%**	**66%**	**76%**
Benchmark Language	**55%**	**77%**	**88%**

See other sections for more detailed break out.

Reading results indicate a major focus and improvement must be made in all identified subgroups, with greater emphasis in ELL and Special Ed. Special Ed Student numbers are low and skew the percentage.

Math results indicate a major focus and improvement must be made in all identified subgroups, with greater emphasis in ELL and Special Ed. Special Ed Student numbers are low and skew the percentage.

AIMS and District Comprehensive Results are highly correlated.

Site 7: Tier III: Cesar Chavez Elementary School

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENT NOT MEETING AYP LEVEL BY SUBGROUP			
Test Source	**All**	**ELL**	**SPED**
AIMS Math	**48%**	**81%**	**92%**
AIMS Reading	**54%**	**90%**	**97%**
Benchmark Math	**51%**	**71%**	**77%**

Benchmark Language	**59%**	**85%**	**85%**

See other sections for more detailed break out.

2007/2008
Met in all areas except:
3rd grade Reading
(All, Hispanic, ELL, SES)
5th grade Reading
(All, Hispanic, ELL, SES)
6th grade Reading
(ELL)
2008/2009
Met in all areas except:
6th grade Reading and Math (ELL)
2009/2010 – Scores pending

Reading results indicate a major focus and improvement must be made in all identified subgroups, with greater emphasis in ELL and Special Ed. Special Ed Student numbers are low and skew the percentage.

Math results indicate a major focus and improvement must be made in all identified subgroups, with greater emphasis in ELL and Special Ed. Special Ed Student numbers are low and skew the percentage.

AIMS and District Comprehensive Results are highly correlated.

School Improvement Grant: BASELINE DATA

SCHOOL DATA: Site 1: GADSDEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – Tier 1

	2007-2008 Optional	**2008-2009 (Must Complete)**	**2009-2010 Optional**
Which intervention the school used:	**No intervention used**	**No intervention used**	**No intervention used**
AYP status:	**Underperforming**	**Underperforming**	**Data not released**
Which AYP targets the school met and missed:	**<u>Targets Met:</u>** -95% tested in math (grades 3-6) -95% tested in reading (grades 3-6) -3rd grade "math" - all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -3rd grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES **<u>Targets Missed:</u>** -4th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES	**<u>Targets Met:</u>** -95% tested in math (grades 3-6) -95% tested in reading (grades 3-6) **<u>Targets Missed:</u>** -3rd grade "math" – all students/H/Low SES -4th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -3rd grade "reading" – all students/H/Low SES -4th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL -5th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES	**Data not released**
School improvement status:	**SI Y2**	**CA –Tier 1**	**Data not released**
Number of minutes within the school year:	**54,800**	**57,480**	**59,760**

STUDENT OUTCOME/ACADEMIC PROGRESS DATA:

2007-2008	2008-2009 Optional	2009-2010 (Must Complete)	Optional
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and math, by grade and student subgroup.	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students: 41% met the standard, 4% exceeded -H: 41% met the standard, 4% exceeded -ELL: 33% met the standard, 2% exceeded -Low SES: 41% met the standard, 4% exceeded **Math (4th grade)** -All students: 44% met the standard, 0% exceeded -H: 44% met the standard, 0% exceeded -SPED: 9% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 44% met the standard, 0% exceeded **Math (5th grade)** -All students: 39% met the standard, 1% exceeded -H: 39% met the standard, 1% exceeded SPED: 0% met the standard, 0% exceeded -ELL: 18% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Migrant: 45% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 39% met the standard, 1% exceeded **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 41% met the standard, 4% exceeded -H: 40% met the standard, 4% exceeded -ELL: 24% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 41% met the standard, 4% exceeded **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students: 34% met the standard, 0% exceeded -H: 34% met the standard, 0% exceeded	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students: 30% proficient -H: 31% proficient -ELL: 31% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 30% proficient **Math (4th grade)** -All students: 36% proficient -H: 36% proficient -ELL: 31% proficient -SPED 25% proficient -Low SES: 36% proficient **Math (5th grade)** -All students: 26% proficient -H: 26% proficient -ELL:22% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 26% proficient **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 30% proficient -H: 30% proficient -ELL: 23% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 30% proficient **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students: 39% proficient -H: 38% proficient -W: 100% proficient -ELL: 37% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 39% proficient **Reading (4th grade)** -All students: 31% proficient -H: 31% proficient -ELL: 26% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES:31% proficient	**Data not released**

	-ELL: 19% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 34% met the standard, 0% exceeded **<u>Reading (4th grade)</u>** -All students: 24% met the standard, 0% exceeded -H: 24% met the standard, 0% exceeded -SPED: 0% met or exceeded -ELL: 16% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 24% met the standard, 0% exceeded **<u>Reading (5th grade)</u>** -All students:26% met the standard, 0% exceeded -H: 26% met the standard, 0% exceeded -SPED: 0% met or exceeded -Migrant: 18% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 26% met the standard, 0% exceeded **<u>Reading (6th grade)</u>** -All students: 34% met the standard,0% exceeded -H: 33% met the standard, 0% exceeded -ELL: 13% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 34% met the standard, 0% exceeded	**<u>Reading (5th grade)</u>** -All students: 31% proficient -H: 31% proficient -ELL: 25% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 31% proficient **<u>Reading (6th grade)</u>** -All students: 26% proficient -H: 26% proficient -ELL: 16% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 26% proficient	
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and math by student subgroup	**<u>Math Participation Rates:</u>** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	**<u>Math Participation Rates:</u>** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	

	Reading Participation Rates: -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	**Reading Participation Rates:** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	
Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and in math by grade, "all students", each achievement quartile and each subgroup	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students 420/state avg. 447 -H: 420/state avg. 433 -ELL:408/state avg. 414 -Low SES: 420/state avg. 431 **Math (4th grade)** -All students 438/state avg. 480 -H: 438/ state avg. 466 -SPED: 421/state avg. 414 -Low SES: 438/state avg. 463 **Math (5th grade)** -All students 463/state avg. 502 -H: 463/state avg. 486 -SPED: 424/state avg. 433 -Migrant: 467/state avg. 474 -Low SES: 463/state avg. 484 **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 490/state avg. 519 -H: 489/state avg. 501 -ELL: 468/state avg. 462 -Low SES: 490/state avg. 497 **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students 415/state avg. 452 -H: 415/state avg. 436 -ELL: 402/state avg. 411	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students 400/state avg. 420-491 **Math (4th grade)** -All students 429/state avg. 448-520 **Math (5th grade)** -All students 452/state avg. 476-549 **Math (6th grade)** -All students 469/state avg. 496-573 **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students 411/state avg. 431-515 **Reading (4th grade)** -All students 426/state avg.450-535 **Reading (5th grade)** -All students 443/state avg.468-555 **Reading (6th grade)** -All students 448/state avg. 478-570	

	-Low SES: 415/state avg. 435 **<u>Reading (4th grade)</u>** -All students: 420/state avg. 470 -H: 420/state avg. 453 -SPED: 383/state avg. 403 -Low SES: 420/state avg. 452 **<u>Reading (5th grade)</u>** -All students: 440/state avg. 487 -H: 440/state avg. 472 -SPED: 407/state avg. 421 -ELL: 420/state avg. 437 -Migrant: 445/state avg. 455 -Low SES: 440/state avg. 470 **<u>Reading (6th grade)</u>** -All students: 463/state avg. 495 -H: 463/state avg. 478 -ELL: 441/state avg. 438 -Low SES: 463/state avg. 476		
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency	**14% reclassified to FEP**	**11% reclassified to FEP**	**24% reclassified to FEP**
Graduation rate:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**
Drop out rate:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**
Student attendance rate:	**95%**	**95%**	**94%**
Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework, early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
College enrollment rates	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**

STUDENT CONNECTION AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

2007-2008	2008-2009 Optional	2009-2010 (Must Complete)	Optional
Discipline incidents	**3**	**3**	**62**
Truants	**1**	**4**	**7**

TALENT

2007-2008	2008-2009 Optional	2009-2010 (Must Complete)	Optional
Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 0 Number of teachers performing = 16**	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 1 Number of teachers performing = 19**	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 0 Number of teachers performing = 18**
Teacher attendance rate	**92%**	**91%**	**92%**

School Improvement Grant: BASELINE DATA

SCHOOL DATA: Site 2: SAN LUIS MIDDLE SCHOOL

	2007-2008 Optional	2008-2009 (Must Complete)	2009-2010 Optional
Which intervention the school used:	No intervention used	No intervention used	ADE Turnaround Model
AYP status:	Failing to meet academic standards	Failing to meet academic standards	Data not released
Which AYP targets the school met and missed:	**Targets Met:** -95% tested in math (grades 7-8) -95% tested in reading (grades 7-8) -8th grade "math" – All students/H/Low SES -8th grade "reading" – All students/H/Low SES **Targets Missed:** -7th grade "math"- all students/H/ELL/Low SES -8th grade "math" – ELL -7th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -8th grade "reading" - ELL	**Targets Met:** -95% tested in math (grades 7-8) -95% tested in reading (grades 7-8) -8th grade "math" – All students/H/Low SES **Targets Missed:** -7th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -8th grade "math" – ELL -7th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -8th grade "reading" – all students/H/ ELL/Low SES	**Data not released**
School improvement status:	**SI Y2**	**CA**	**Data not released**
Number of minutes within the school year:	**68,256**	**68,256**	**68,256**

STUDENT OUTCOME/ACADEMIC PROGRESS DATA:

2007-2008	2008-2009 Optional	2009-2010 (Must Complete)	Optional
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and math, by grade and student subgroup.	**Math (7th grade)** -All students: 40% met the standard, 2% exceeded -H: 40% met the standard, 2% exceeded -SPED: 9% met the standard, 0% exceeded -ELL: 22% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 41% met the	**Math (7th grade)** -All students: 48% proficient -H: 48% proficient -ELL: 32% proficient -SPED: 21% proficient -Low SES: 48% proficient **Math (8th grade)** -All students: 36%	**Data not released**

	standard, 4% exceeded -Migrant: 41% met the standard, 3% exceeded **Math (8th grade)** -All students: 32% met the standard, 2% exceeded -H: 32% met the standard, 2% exceeded -SPED: 5% met the standard, 0% exceeded -ELL: 15% met the standard, 1% exceeded -Low SES: 32% met the standard, 2% exceeded -Migrant: 26% met the standard, 3% exceeded **Reading (7th grade)** -All students: 37% met the standard, 1% exceeded -H: 37% met the standard, 1% exceeded -SPED: 0% met the standard, 0% exceeded -ELL: 14% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 37% met the standard, 1% exceeded -Migrant: 47% met the standard, 0% exceeded **Reading (8th grade)** -All students: 39% met the standard, 1% exceeded -H: 39% met the standard, 1% exceeded -SPED: 9% met the standard, 0% exceeded -ELL: 12% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 39% met the standard, 1% exceeded -Migrant: 35% met the standard, 0% exceeded	proficient -H: 36% proficient -ELL: 22% proficient -SPED: 15% proficient -Low SES: 36% proficient **Reading (7th grade)** -All students: 40% proficient -H: 39% proficient -ELL: 20% proficient -SPED: 13% proficient -Low SES: 40% proficient **Reading (8th grade)** -All students: 37% proficient -H: 37% proficient -ELL: 19% proficient -SPED: 24% proficient -Low SES: 37% proficient	
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and math by student subgroup	**Math Participation Rates:** -7th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	**Math Participation Rates:** -7th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -8th grade: met 95%	

	-8th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES **<u>Reading Participation Rates:</u>** -7th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -8th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES **<u>Reading Participation Rates:</u>** -7th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -8th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	
Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and in math by grade, "all students", each achievement quartile and each subgroup	**<u>Math (7th grade)</u>** -All students 509/state avg. 544 -H: 509/state avg. 527 -ELL:491/state avg. 490 -Low SES: 509/state avg. 524 -Migrant: 512/state avg. 512 **<u>Math (8th grade)</u>** -All students 519/state avg. 552 -H: 519/state avg. 534 -ELL:497/state avg. 495 -Low SES: 519/state avg. 531 **<u>Reading (7th grade)</u>** -All students 477/state avg. 511 -H: 477/state avg. 494 -ELL:455/state avg. 453 -Low SES: 477/state avg. 491 **<u>Reading (8th grade)</u>** -All students 487/state avg. 518 -H: 487/state avg. 499 -ELL:459/state avg. 453 -Low SES: 487/state avg. 496	**<u>Math (7th grade)</u>** -All students 514/state avg. 517-598 **<u>Math (8th grade)</u>** -All students 518/state avg. 537-622 **<u>Reading (7th grade)</u>** -All students 472/state avg. 489-586 **<u>Reading(8th grade)</u>** -All students 479/state avg. 499-601	
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency	**16% reclassified to FEP**	**11% reclassified to FEP**	**31% reclassified to FEP**
Graduation rate:	**71%**	**unknown**	**Data not released**
Drop out rate:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**
Student attendance rate:	**94%**	**94%**	**95%**

Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework, early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes	**14.58% -enrolled in college math/English courses**	**17.01% -enrolled in college math/English courses**	**6.52% -enrolled in college math/English courses**
College enrollment rates	**105 students enrolled**	**137 enrolled**	**47 enrolled**

STUDENT CONNECTION AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

2007-2008	**2008-2009 Optional**	**2009-2010 (Must Complete)**	**Optional**
Discipline incidents	**42**	**426**	**328**
Truants	**Unknown**	**0**	**0**

TALENT

2007-2008	**2008-2009 Optional**	**2009-2010 (Must Complete)**	**Optional**
Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 0 Number of teachers performing = 36**	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 1 Number of teachers performing = 32**	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 6 Number of teachers performing = 29**
Teacher attendance rate	**96%**	**93%**	**95%**

School Improvement Grant: BASELINE DATA

SCHOOL DATA: Site 3: RIO COLORADO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

	2007-2008 Optional	**2008-2009 (Must Complete)**	**2009-2010 Optional**
Which intervention the school used:	No intervention used	No intervention used	No intervention used
AYP status:	Performing	Performing Plus	Data not released
Which AYP targets the school met and missed:	**Targets Met:** -95% tested in math (grades 3-6) -95% tested in reading (grades 3-6) -3rd grade "math" - all students/H//Low SES -4th grade "math"-all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "reading" – all students/H/Low SES -6th grade "reading" – all students/H/Low SES **Targets Missed:** -3rd grade "math" -ELL -3rd grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "reading" – ELL -6th grade "reading" – ELL	**Targets Met:** 95% tested in math (grades 3-6) -95% tested in reading (grades 3-6) -4th grade "math"-all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "reading" – all students/H/Low SES -6th grade "reading" – all students/H/Low SES **Targets Missed:** -3rd grade "math" –all students/H/ELL/Low SES -3rd grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES	**Data not released**
School improvement status:	**SI Y2**	**CA**	**Data not released**
Number of minutes within the school year:	**57,280**	**58,920**	**56,813**

STUDENT OUTCOME/ACADEMIC PROGRESS DATA:

2007-2008	2008-2009 Optional	2009-2010 (Must Complete)	Optional
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and math, by grade and student subgroup.	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students: 42% met the standard, 2% exceeded -H: 42% met the standard, 2% exceeded -ELL: 33% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 42% met the standard, 2% exceeded **Math (4th grade)** -All students: 48% met the standard, 5% exceeded -H: 48% met the standard, 5% exceeded -SPED: 13% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 48% met the standard, 5% exceeded **Math (5th grade)** -All students: 38% met the standard, 11% exceeded -H: 38% met the standard, 11% exceeded -ELL: 33% met the standard, 5% exceeded -Low SES: 38% met the standard, 11% exceeded **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 50% met the standard, 11% exceeded -H: 50% met the standard, 11% exceeded -ELL: 46% met the standard, 2% exceeded -Low SES: 50% met the standard, 11% exceeded **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students: 36% met the standard, 2% exceeded -H: 36% met the standard, 2% exceeded -ELL: 27% met the standard, 0% exceeded	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students: 38% proficient -H: 38% proficient -ELL: 37% proficient -SPED: 10% proficient -Low SES: 38% proficient **Math (4th grade)** -All students: 68% proficient -H: 68% proficient -ELL: 66% proficient -SPED 11% proficient -Low SES: 68% proficient **Math (5th grade)** -All students: 47% proficient -H: 47% proficient -ELL:39% proficient -SPED: 7% proficient -Low SES: 47% proficient **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 64% proficient -H: 64% proficient -ELL: 54% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 64% proficient **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students: 30% proficient -H: 30% proficient -ELL: 30% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 30% proficient **Reading (4th grade)** -All students: 50% proficient -H: 50% proficient -ELL: 46% proficient -SPED: 11% proficient -Low SES:50% proficient	**Data not released**

	-Low SES: 36% met the standard, 2% exceeded **Reading (4th grade)** -All students: 51% met the standard, 2% exceeded -H: 51% met the standard, 2% exceeded -SPED: 7% met the standard, 0% exceeded -ELL: 32% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 51% met the standard, 2% exceeded **Reading (5th grade)** -All students:40% met the standard, 1% exceeded -H: 40% met the standard, 1% exceeded -Low SES: 40% met the standard, 1% exceeded **Reading (6th grade)** -All students: 33% met the standard, 2% exceeded -H: 33% met the standard, 2% exceeded -ELL: 14% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 33% met the standard, 2% exceeded	**Reading (5th grade)** -All students: 54% proficient -H: 54% proficient -ELL: 43% proficient -SPED: 14% proficient -Low SES: 54% proficient **Reading (6th grade)** -All students: 54% proficient -H: 54% proficient -ELL: 43% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 54% proficient	
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and math by student subgroup	**Math Participation Rates:** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES **Reading Participation Rates:** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	**Math Participation Rates:** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES **Reading Participation Rates:** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	

	-5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	-5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	
Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and in math by grade, "all students", each achievement quartile and each subgroup	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students 413/state avg. 447 -H: 413/state avg. 433 -ELL:403/state avg. 414 -Low SES: 413/state avg.431 **Math (4th grade)** -All students 443/state avg. 480 -H: 443/ state avg. 466 -SPED: 372/state avg. 414 -Low SES: 443/state avg. 463 **Math (5th grade)** -All students 484/state avg. 502 -H: 484/state avg. 486 -Low SES: 484/state avg. 484 **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 506/state avg. 519 -H: 506/state avg. 501 -ELL: 487/state avg. 462 -Low SES: 506/state avg. 497 **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students 414/state avg. 452 -H: 414/state avg. 436 -ELL: 402/state avg. 411 -Low SES: 414/state avg. 435 **Reading (4th grade)** -All students: 441/state avg. 470 -H: 441/state avg. 453 -SPED: 372/state avg. 403 -Low SES: 441/state avg. 452 **Reading (5th grade)** -All students: 456/state	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students 412/state avg. 420-491 **Math (4th grade)** -All students 462/state avg. 448-520 **Math (5th grade)** -All students 473/state avg. 476-549 **Math (6th grade)** -All students 510/state avg. 496-573 **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students 410/state avg. 431-515 **Reading (4th grade)** -All students 446/state avg.450-535 **Reading (5th grade)** -All students 461/state avg.468-555 **Reading (6th grade)** -All students 480/state avg. 478-570	

	avg. 487 -H: 456/state avg. 472 -ELL: 436/state avg. 437 -Low SES: 456/state avg. 470 **Reading (6th grade)** -All students: 464/state avg. 495 -H: 464/state avg. 478 -ELL: 444/state avg. 438 -Low SES: 464/state avg. 476		
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency	**17% reclassified to FEP**	**9% reclassified to FEP**	**27% reclassified to FEP**
Graduation rate:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Data not released**
Drop out rate:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**
Student attendance rate:	**95%**	**95%**	**94%**
Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework, early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
College enrollment rates	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**

STUDENT CONNECTION AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

	2007-2008	**2008-2009 Optional**	**2009-2010 (Must Complete)**	**Optional**
Discipline incidents		**796**	**646**	**377**
Truants		**20**	**17**	**25**

TALENT

	2007-2008	**2008-2009 Optional**	**2009-2010 (Must Complete)**	**Optional**
Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system		**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 1 Number of teachers performing = 35**	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 5 Number of teachers performing = 27**	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 1 Number of teachers performing = 31**
Teacher attendance rate		**94%**	**94%**	**94%**

School Improvement Grant: BASELINE DATA

SCHOOL DATA: Site 4: SOUTHWEST JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

	2007-2008 Optional	**2008-2009 (Must Complete)**	**2009-2010 Optional**
Which intervention the school used:	No intervention used	ADE Turnaround Coaches/Principal Mentor	ADE Turnaround Coaches/Principal Mentor
AYP status:	Performing	Performing Plus	Data not released
Which AYP targets the school met and missed:	**Targets Met:** -95% tested in math (grades 7-8) -95% tested in reading (grades 7-8) -7th grade "math" – All students/H/ELL/Low SES -8th grade "math" – All students/H/ELL/Low SES -7th grade "reading" – All students/H/Low SES -8th grade "reading" – All students/H/Low SES **Targets Missed:** -7th grade "reading" ELL -8th grade "reading" - ELL	**Targets Met:** -95% tested in math (grades 7-8) -95% tested in reading (grades 7-8) -7th grade "math" – All students/H/ELL/Low SES -8th grade "math" – All students/H/ELL/Low SES -7th grade "reading" – All students/H/Low SES -8th grade "reading" – All students/H/Low SES **Targets Missed:** -7th grade "reading" ELL -8th grade "reading" - ELL	**Data not released**
School improvement status:	**SI Y2**	**CA**	**Data not released**
Number of minutes within the school year:	**67,725**	**67,725**	**67,842**

STUDENT OUTCOME/ACADEMIC PROGRESS DATA:

2007-2008	**2008-2009 Optional**	**2009-2010 (Must Complete)**	**Optional**
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and math, by grade and student subgroup.	**Math (7th grade)** -All students: 52% met the standard, 9% exceeded -H: 52% met the standard, 9% exceeded -SPED: 15% met the standard, 0% exceeded -ELL: 41% met the	**Math (7th grade)** -All students: 67% proficient -H: 67% proficient -ELL: 51% proficient -SPED: 15% proficient -Low SES: 67% proficient	**Data not released**

	standard, 1% exceeded -Low SES: 52% met the standard, 9% exceeded -Migrant: 46% met the standard, 8% exceeded **<u>Math (8th grade)</u>** -All students: 43% met the standard, 4% exceeded -H: 43% met the standard, 4% exceeded -SPED: 10% met the standard, 0% exceeded -ELL: 27% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 42% met the standard, 4% exceeded -Migrant: 53% met the standard, 0% exceeded **<u>Reading (7th grade)</u>** -All students: 47% met the standard, 2% exceeded -H: 47% met the standard, 2% exceeded -SPED: 15% met the standard, 0% exceeded -ELL: 25% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 47% met the standard, 2% exceeded -Migrant: 38% met the standard, 0% exceeded **<u>Reading (8th grade)</u>** -All students: 45% met the standard, 2% exceeded -H: 45% met the standard, 2% exceeded -SPED: 5% met the standard, 0% exceeded -ELL: 20% met the standard, 1% exceeded -Low SES: 45% met the standard, 2% exceeded -Migrant: 53% met the standard, 0% exceeded	**<u>Math (8th grade)</u>** -All students: 52% proficient -H: 52% proficient -ELL: 34% proficient -SPED: 9% proficient -Low SES: 52% proficient **<u>Reading (7th grade)</u>** -All students: 55% proficient -H: 55% proficient -ELL: 35% proficient -SPED: 4% proficient -Low SES: 55% proficient **<u>Reading (8th grade)</u>** -All students: 48% proficient -H: 48% proficient -ELL: 24% proficient -SPED: 14% proficient -Low SES: 48% proficient	
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and math by student subgroup	**<u>Math Participation Rates:</u>** -7th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	**<u>Math Participation Rates:</u>** -7th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	

	-8th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES **<u>Reading Participation Rates:</u>** -7th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -8th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	-8th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES **<u>Reading Participation Rates:</u>** -7th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -8th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	
Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and in math by grade, "all students", each achievement quartile and each subgroup	**<u>Math (7th grade)</u>** -All students 510/state avg. 544 -H: 510/state avg. 527 -ELL:500/state avg. 490 -Low SES: 510/state avg. 524 -Migrant: 525/state avg. 512 **<u>Math (8th grade)</u>** -All students 531/state avg. 552 -H: 531/state avg. 534 -ELL:509/state avg. 495 -Low SES: 531/state avg. 531 **<u>Reading (7th grade)</u>** -All students 468/state avg. 511 -H: 468/state avg. 494 -ELL:456/state avg. 453 -Low SES: 468/state avg. 491 **<u>Reading (8th grade)</u>** -All students 493/state avg. 518 -H: 493/state avg. 499 -ELL:470/state avg. 453 -Low SES: 493/state avg. 496	**<u>Math (7th grade)</u>** -All students 540/state avg. 517-598 **<u>Math (8th grade)</u>** -All students 545/state avg. 537-622 **<u>Reading (7th grade)</u>** -All students 492/state avg. 489-586 **<u>Reading(8th grade)</u>** -All students 500/state avg. 499-601	
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency	**18% reclassified to FEP**	**11% reclassified to FEP**	**69% reclassified to FEP**
Graduation rate:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Data not released**
Drop out rate:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**
Student attendance rate:	**95%**	**96%**	**95%**

Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework, early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes	**14.58% -enrolled in college math/English courses**	**17.01% -enrolled in college math/English courses**	**6.52% -enrolled in college math/English courses**
College enrollment rates	**105 students enrolled**	**137 enrolled**	**47 enrolled**

STUDENT CONNECTION AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

2007-2008	**2008-2009 Optional**	**2009-2010 (Must Complete)**	**Optional**
Discipline incidents	**210**	**243**	**270**
Truants	**13**	**13**	**21**

TALENT

2007-2008	**2008-2009 Optional**	**2009-2010 (Must Complete)**	**Optional**
Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 14 Number of teachers performing = 19**	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 9 Number of teachers performing = 22**	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 9 Number of teachers performing = 22**
Teacher attendance rate	**92%**	**92%**	**94%**

School Improvement Grant: BASELINE DATA

SCHOOL DATA: Site 5: DESERT VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

	2007-2008 Optional	**2008-2009 (Must Complete)**	**2009-2010 Optional**
Which intervention the school used:	No intervention used	No intervention used	No intervention used
AYP status:	Performing	Performing Plus	Data not released
Which AYP targets the school met and missed:	**Targets Met:** -95% tested in math (grades 3-6) -95% tested in reading (grades 3-6) -3rd grade "math" - all students/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade "math"-all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -3rd grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "reading" – all students/H/Low SES **Targets Missed:** -5th grade "reading" –all students/H/ ELL/Low SES	**Targets Met:** 95% tested in math (grades 3-6) -95% tested in reading (grades 3-6) -3rd grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade "math"-all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -3rd grade "reading" – all students/H./ELL/Low SES -4th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "reading" – all students/H/Low SES **Targets Missed:** -3rd grade "math" –all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "reading" –ELL	**Data not released**
School improvement status:	**SI Y2**	**CA**	**Data not released**
Number of minutes within the school year:	**58,820**	**58,820**	**61,190**

STUDENT OUTCOME/ACADEMIC PROGRESS DATA:

2007-2008	2008-2009 Optional	2009-2010 (Must Complete)	Optional
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and math, by grade and student subgroup.	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students: 55% met the standard, 11% exceeded -H: 55% met the standard, 11% exceeded -ELL: 59% met the standard, 2% exceeded -Low SES: 55% met the standard, 11% exceeded **Math (4th grade)** -All students: 53% met the standard, 13% exceeded -H: 53% met the standard, 13% exceeded -Low SES: 53% met the standard, 13% exceeded **Math (5th grade)** -All students: 38% met the standard, 2% exceeded -H: 38% met the standard, 2% exceeded -ELL: 23% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 38% met the standard, 2% exceeded **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 55% met the standard, 15% exceeded -H: 55% met the standard, 15% exceeded -ELL: 50% met the standard, 3% exceeded -Low SES: 55% met the standard, 15% exceeded **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students: 53% met the standard, 1% exceeded -H: 53% met the standard, 1% exceeded -ELL: 46% met the	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students: 70% proficient -H: 70% proficient -ELL: 69% proficient -SPED: 50% proficient -Low SES:70% proficient **Math (4th grade)** -All students: 81% proficient -H: 81% proficient -ELL: 80% proficient -SPED 33% proficient -Low SES: 81% proficient **Math (5th grade)** -All students: 74% proficient -H: 74% proficient -ELL:66% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 74% proficient **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 66% proficient -H: 66% proficient -ELL: 55% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 66% proficient **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students: 60% proficient -H: 60% proficient -ELL: 59% proficient -SPED: 25% proficient -Low SES: 60% proficient **Reading (4th grade)** -All students: 60% proficient -H: 60% proficient -ELL: 56% proficient	**Data not released**

	standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 53% met the standard, 1% exceeded **<u>Reading (4th grade)</u>** -All students: 47% met the standard, 3% exceeded -H: 47% met the standard, 3% exceeded -ELL: 31% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 47% met the standard, 3% exceeded **<u>Reading (5th grade)</u>** -All students:35% met the standard, 1% exceeded -H: 35% met the standard, 1% exceeded -SPED: 0% met or exceeded the standard -Low SES: 35% met the standard, 1% exceeded **<u>Reading (6th grade)</u>** -All students: 52% met the standard, 1% exceeded -H: 52% met the standard, 1% exceeded -ELL: 29% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 52% met the standard, 1% exceeded	-SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES:60% proficient **<u>Reading (5th grade)</u>** -All students: 61% proficient -H: 61% proficient -ELL: 48% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 61% proficient **<u>Reading (6th grade)</u>** -All students: 51% proficient -H: 51% proficient -ELL: 35% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 51% proficient	
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and math by student subgroup	**<u>Math Participation Rates:</u>** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES **<u>Reading Participation Rates:</u>** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	**<u>Math Participation Rates:</u>** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES **<u>Reading Participation Rates:</u>** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	

	-4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	-4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	
Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and in math by grade, "all students", each achievement quartile and each subgroup	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students 440/state avg. 447 -H: 440/state avg. 433 -ELL:430/state avg. 414 -Low SES: 440/state avg. 431 **Math (4th grade)** -All students 465/state avg. 480 -H: 465/ state avg. 466 -ELL: 450/state avg. 440 -Low SES: 465/state avg. 463 **Math (5th grade)** -All students 456/state avg. 502 -H: 456/state avg. 486 -SPED: 343/state avg. 433 -Low SES: 456/state avg. 484 **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 520/state avg. 519 -H: 520/state avg. 501 -SPED: 464/state avg. 438 -ELL: 492/state avg. 462 -Low SES: 520/state avg. 497 **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students 434/state avg. 452 -H: 434/state avg. 436 -ELL: 425/state avg. 411 -Low SES: 434/state avg. 435 **Reading (4th grade)** -All students: 448/state avg. 470	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students 436/state avg. 420-491 **Math (4th grade)** -All students 484/state avg. 448-520 **Math (5th grade)** -All students 509/state avg. 476-549 **Math (6th grade)** -All students 516/state avg. 496-573 **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students 440/state avg. 431-515 **Reading (4th grade)** -All students 455state avg.450-535 **Reading (5th grade)** -All students 480/state avg.468-555 **Reading (6th grade)** -All students 481/state avg. 478-570	

	-H: 448/state avg. 453 -Low SES: 448/state avg. 452 **<u>Reading (5th grade)</u>** -All students: 443/state avg. 487 -H: 443/state avg. 472 -ELL: 429/state avg. 437 -Low SES: 443/state avg. 470 **<u>Reading (6th grade)</u>** -All students: 477/state avg. 495 -H: 477/state avg. 478 -ELL: 457/state avg. 438 -Low SES: 477/state avg. 476		
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency	**17% reclassified to FEP**	**20% reclassified to FEP**	**49% reclassified to FEP**
Graduation rate:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Data not released**
Drop out rate:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**
Student attendance rate:	**96%**	**96%**	**95%**
Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework, early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
College enrollment rates	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**

STUDENT CONNECTION AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

2007-2008	2008-2009 Optional	2009-2010 (Must Complete)	Optional
Discipline incidents	**21**	**321**	**427**
Truants	**5**	**0**	**0**

TALENT

2007-2008	2008-2009 Optional	2009-2010 (Must Complete)	Optional
Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 3 Number of teachers performing = 28**	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 1 Number of teachers performing = 30**	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 0 Number of teachers performing = 31**
Teacher attendance rate	**96%**	**96%**	**95%**

School Improvement Grant: BASELINE DATA

SCHOOL DATA: Site 6: ARIZONA DESERT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

	2007-2008 Optional	**2008-2009 (Must Complete)**	**2009-2010 Optional**
Which intervention the school used:	No intervention used	No intervention used	No intervention used
AYP status:	Performing	Performing Plus	Data not released
Which AYP targets the school met and missed:	**Targets Met:** -95% tested in math (grades 3-6) -95% tested in reading (grades 3-6) -5th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES **Targets Missed:** -3rd grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -3rd grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES	**Targets Met:** 95% tested in math (grades 3-6) -95% tested in reading (grades 3-6) -3rd grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "reading" – all students/H/Low SES **Targets Missed:** -4th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -3rd grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade "reading" - all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "reading" - ELL	**Data not released**
School improvement status:	**SI Y1**	**SI Y2**	**Data not released**
Number of minutes within the school year:	**69,718**	**61,500**	**69,718**

STUDENT OUTCOME/ACADEMIC PROGRESS DATA:

2007-2008	2008-2009 Optional	2009-2010 (Must Complete)	Optional
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and math, by grade and student subgroup.	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students: 55% met the standard, 12% exceeded -H: 55% met the standard, 12% exceeded -ELL: 39% met the standard, 4% exceeded -Low SES: 55% met the standard, 12% exceeded **Math (4th grade)** -All students: 37% met the standard, 8% exceeded -H: 37% met the standard, 8% exceeded -ELL: 33% met the standard, 8% exceeded -Low SES: 37% met the standard, 8% exceeded **Math (5th grade)** -All students: 43% met the standard, 17% exceeded -H: 43% met the standard, 17% exceeded -ELL: 37% met the standard, 1% exceeded -Low SES: 43% met the standard, 17% exceeded **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 55% met the standard, 12% exceeded -H: 55% met the standard, 12% exceeded -ELL: 39% met the standard, 4% exceeded -Low SES: 55% met the standard, 12% exceeded **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students: 38% met the standard, 4% exceeded -H: 38% met the standard, 4% exceeded -ELL: 34% met the	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students: 54% proficient -H: 54% proficient -ELL: 51% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES:54% proficient **Math (4th grade)** -All students: 47% proficient -H: 47% proficient -ELL: 43% proficient -SPED 0% proficient -Low SES: 47% proficient **Math (5th grade)** -All students: 65% proficient -H: 65% proficient -ELL:61% proficient -SPED: 20% proficient -Low SES: 65% proficient **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 59% proficient -H: 59% proficient -ELL: 46% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 59% proficient **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students: 44% proficient -H: 44% proficient -ELL: 43% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 44% proficient **Reading (4th grade)** -All students: 33% proficient -H: 33% proficient -ELL: 27% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES:33%	**Data not released**

	standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 38% met the standard, 4% exceeded **<u>Reading (4th grade)</u>** -All students: 34% met the standard, 3% exceeded -H: 34% met the standard, 3% exceeded -ELL: 30% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 34% met the standard, 3% exceeded **<u>Reading (5th grade)</u>** -All students:42% met the standard, 2% exceeded -H: 42% met the standard, 2% exceeded -SPED: 12% met the standard, 0% exceeded -ELL: 15% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 42% met the standard, 2% exceeded **<u>Reading (6th grade)</u>** -All students: 55% met the standard, 1% exceeded -H: 55% met the standard, 1% exceeded -ELL: 26% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 55% met the standard, 1% exceeded	proficient **<u>Reading (5th grade)</u>** -All students: 65% proficient -H: 65% proficient -ELL: 60% proficient -SPED: 13% proficient -Low SES: 65% proficient **<u>Reading (6th grade)</u>** -All students: 49% proficient -H: 49% proficient -ELL: 31% proficient -SPED: 15% proficient -Low SES: 49% proficient	
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and math by student subgroup	**<u>Math Participation Rates:</u>** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES **<u>Reading Participation Rates:</u>** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	**<u>Math Participation Rates:</u>** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES **<u>Reading Participation Rates:</u>** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	

	-4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	-4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	
Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and in math by grade, "all students", each achievement quartile and each subgroup	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students 440/state avg. 447 -H: 440/state avg. 433 -ELL:430/state avg. 414 -Low SES: 440/state avg. 431 **Math (4th grade)** -All students 442/state avg. 480 -H: 442/ state avg. 466 -ELL: 438/state avg. 440 -Low SES: 442/state avg. 463 **Math (5th grade)** -All students 484/state avg. 502 -H: 484/state avg. 486 -SPED: 393/state avg. 433 -Low SES: 484/state avg. 484 **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 510/state avg. 519 -H: 510state avg. 501 -ELL: 488/state avg. 462 -Low SES: 510/state avg. 497 **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students 414/state avg. 452 -H: 414/state avg. 436 -ELL: 406/state avg. 411 -Low SES: 414/state avg. 435 **Reading (4th grade)** -All students: 436/state avg. 470 -H: 436/state avg. 453	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students 423/state avg. 420-491 **Math (4th grade)** -All students 444/state avg. 448-520 **Math (5th grade)** -All students 491/state avg. 476-549 **Math (6th grade)** -All students 508/state avg. 496-573 **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students 425/state avg. 431-515 **Reading (4th grade)** -All students 431state avg.450-535 **Reading (5th grade)** -All students 476/state avg.468-555 **Reading (6th grade)** -All students 476/state avg. 478-570	

	SPED: 397/state avg.403 -ELL: 428/state avg. 424 -Low SES: 436/state avg. 452 **<u>Reading (5th grade)</u>** -All students: 456/state avg. 487 -H: 456/state avg. 472 -ELL: 433/state avg. 437 -Low SES: 456/state avg. 470 **<u>Reading (6th grade)</u>** -All students: 475/state avg. 495 -H: 475/state avg. 478 -ELL: 457/state avg. 438 -Low SES: 475/state avg. 476		
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency	**18% reclassified to FEP**	**17% reclassified to FEP**	**25% reclassified to FEP**
Graduation rate:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Data not released**
Drop out rate:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**
Student attendance rate:	**96%**	**96%**	**95%**
Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework, early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
College enrollment rates	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**

STUDENT CONNECTION AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

	2007-2008	**2008-2009 Optional**	**2009-2010 (Must Complete)**	**Optional**
Discipline incidents		**Unknown**	**Unknown**	**86**
Truants		**Unknown**	**Unknown**	**0**

TALENT

	2007-2008	**2008-2009 Optional**	**2009-2010 (Must Complete)**	**Optional**
Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system		**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 0 Number of teachers performing = 29**	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 4 Number of teachers performing = 24**	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 4 Number of teachers performing = 24**
Teacher attendance rate		**92%**	**93%**	**94%**

School Improvement Grant: BASELINE DATA

SCHOOL DATA: Site 7: CESAR CHAVEZ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

	2007-2008 Optional	**2008-2009 (Must Complete)**	**2009-2010 Optional**
Which intervention the school used:	**No intervention used**	**No intervention used**	**No intervention used**
AYP status:	**Performing**	**Performing Plus**	**Data not released**
Which AYP targets the school met and missed:	**<u>Targets Met:</u>** -95% tested in math (grades 3-6) -95% tested in reading (grades 3-6) -3rd grade "math" - all students/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "reading" – all students/H/Low SES **<u>Targets Missed:</u>** -3rd grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "reading" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "reading" – ELL	**<u>Targets Met:</u>** -95% tested in math (grades 3-6) -95% tested in reading (grades 3-6) -3rd grade "math" - all students/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "math" – all students/H/Low SES -3rd grade "reading" - all students/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade "math" – all students/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade "reading" – all students/H/Low SES **<u>Targets Missed:</u>** -6th grade "math" – ELL -6th grade "reading" – ELL	**Data not released**

School improvement Status:	**SI Y1**	**SI Y2**	**Data not released**
Number of minutes within the school year:	**57,920**	**57,810**	**61,740**

STUDENT OUTCOME/ACADEMIC PROGRESS DATA:

2007-2008	**2008-2009**	**2009-2010**	
	Optional	**(Must Complete)**	**Optional**
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and math, by grade and student subgroup.	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students: 42% met the standard, 8% exceeded -H: 42% met the standard, 8% exceeded -ELL: 43% met the standard, 1% exceeded -Low SES: 42% met the standard, 8% exceeded **Math (4th grade)** -All students: 49% met the standard, 10% exceeded -H: 50% met the standard, 9% exceeded -ELL: 39% met the standard, 7% exceeded -Low SES: 49% met the standard, 10% exceeded **Math (5th grade)** -All students: 44% met the standard, 1% exceeded -H: 44% met the standard, 1% exceeded SPED: 7% met the standard, 0% exceeded -ELL: 26% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 44% met the standard, 1% exceeded **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 50% met the standard, 9% exceeded -H: 50% met the standard, 9% exceeded -ELL: 34% met the standard, 1% exceeded -Low SES: 50% met the standard, 9% exceeded	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students: 63% proficient -H: 63% proficient -ELL: 61% proficient -SPED: 22% proficient -Low SES: 63% proficient **Math (4th grade)** -All students: 56% proficient -H: 56% proficient -ELL: 53% proficient -SPED 9% proficient -Low SES: 56% proficient **Math (5th grade)** -All students: 54% proficient -H: 54% proficient -ELL:51% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 54% proficient **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 50% proficient -H: 50% proficient -ELL: 40% proficient -SPED: 12% proficient -Low SES: 50% proficient **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students: 54% proficient -H: 54% proficient -ELL: 51% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 54% proficient **Reading (4th grade)** -All students: 51%	**Data not released**

	Reading (3rd grade) -All students: 35% met the standard, 2% exceeded -H: 35% met the standard, 2% exceeded -SPED: 0% met or exceed the standard -ELL: 21% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 35% met the standard, 2% exceeded **Reading (4th grade)** -All students: 47% met the standard, 1% exceeded -H: 47% met the standard, 1% exceeded -ELL: 33% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 47% met the standard,1% exceeded **Reading (5th grade)** -All students:37% met the standard, 0% exceeded -H: 37% met the standard, 0% exceeded -SPED: 7% met or exceeded -ELL: 14% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 37% met the standard, 0% exceeded **Reading (6th grade)** -All students: 50% met the standard,1% exceeded -H: 50% met the standard, 1% exceeded -ELL: 23% met the standard, 0% exceeded -Low SES: 50% met the standard, 1% exceeded	proficient -H: 51% proficient -ELL: 48% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES:51% proficient **Reading (5th grade)** -All students: 45% proficient -H: 45% proficient -ELL: 39% proficient -SPED: 0% proficient -Low SES: 45% proficient **Reading (6th grade)** -All students: 47% proficient -H: 47% proficient -ELL: 35% proficient -SPED: 6% proficient -Low SES: 47% proficient	
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and math by student subgroup	**Math Participation Rates:** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95%	**Math Participation Rates:** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95%	

	tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES **Reading Participation Rates:** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES **Reading Participation Rates:** -3rd grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -4th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -5th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES -6th grade: met 95% tested – All/H/ELL/Low SES	
Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and in math by grade, "all students", each achievement quartile and each subgroup	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students 421/state avg. 447 -H: 421/state avg. 433 -ELL:413/state avg. 414 -Low SES: 421/state avg. 431 **Math (4th grade)** -All students 456/state avg. 480 -H: 455/ state avg. 466 -Low SES: 456/state avg. 463 **Math (5th grade)** -All students 463/state avg. 502 -H: 463/state avg. 486 -SPED: 364/state avg. 433 -Low SES: 463/state avg. 484 **Math (6th grade)** -All students: 500/state avg. 519 -H: 500/state avg. 501 -ELL: 476/state avg. 462 -Low SES: 500/state avg. 497 **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students 417/state avg. 452 -H: 417/state avg. 436 -ELL: 405/state avg.	**Math (3rd grade)** -All students 432/state avg. 420-491 **Math (4th grade)** -All students 462/state avg. 448-520 **Math (5th grade)** -All students 480/state avg. 476-549 **Math (6th grade)** -All students 489/state avg. 496-573 **Reading (3rd grade)** -All students 430/state avg. 431-515 **Reading (4th grade)** -All students 450/state avg.450-535 **Reading (5th grade)** -All students 465/state avg.468-555 **Reading (6th grade)** -All students 471/state avg. 478-570	

	411 -Low SES: 417/state avg. 435 **Reading (4th grade)** -All students: 448/state avg. 470 -H: 448/state avg. 453 -Low SES: 448/state avg. 452 **Reading (5th grade)** -All students: 446/state avg. 487 -H: 446/state avg. 472 -SPED: 353/state avg. 421 -ELL: 424/state avg. 437 -Low SES: 446/state avg. 470 **Reading (6th grade)** -All students: 473/state avg. 495 -H: 473/state avg. 478 -ELL: 449/state avg. 438 -Low SES: 473/state avg. 476		
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency	**30% reclassified to FEP**	**13% reclassified to FEP**	**37% reclassified to FEP**
Graduation rate:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**
Drop out rate:	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**
Student attendance rate:	**96%**	**97%**	**96%**
Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework, early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
College enrollment rates	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**

STUDENT CONNECTION AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

	2007-2008	**2008-2009**	**2009-2010**
	Optional	**(Must Complete)**	**Optional**
Discipline incidents	**3**	**3**	**62**
Truants	**1**	**4**	**7**

TALENT

2007-2008	2008-2009 Optional	2009-2010 (Must Complete)	Optional
Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 1 Number of teachers performing = 26**	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 0 Number of teachers performing = 27**	**Number of teachers on improvement plan = 0 Number of teachers performing = 27**
Teacher attendance rate	**95%**	**95%**	**92%**

B. DESCRIPTION OF LEA'S CAPACITY

B1.a How effective are our processes?

- LEA demonstrates that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected**.**

Behavior for successful restructuring of persistently low achieving schools	**What are the strengths? What is in place?**	**What are the weaknesses? What needs to be put in place?**	**What changes will be made to address the weaknesses and improve on the strengths?**
Standard 1: Leadership Systems			
Administrators are chosen for getting results, influencing others and willingness to change	Use of "Identifying the School Turnaround Principal" as a guide in the selection of new administrators. (See attachment 1) Principal placed in Gadsden Elementary School – Tier I, has a proven track record by turning around Desert Elementary School which was quickly approaching a Failing Status. LEA, in collaboration with ADE School Improvement Personnel which includes: Principal mentors, Site Study Teams, and Robert Gray, has kept, placed and/or terminated school principals and key personnel in several schools, generally based on individual's leadership abilities. The Gadsden Elementary School's Tier I school principal was replaced through the Transformational Model. The San Luis Middle School	Mentoring of new Principals has been informal. An effective LEA Turnaround Office will provide necessary daily supervision and mentoring of newly assigned administrators. Incentives for improving administrator selection pool would draw more qualified candidates. Summer Academies for opportunities for Leadership Teams, consultants and school improvement coordinator to guide work on school improvement. Contract for Comprehensive Site Assessments and monitoring of school progress throughout the year.	The new LEA Turnaround School Improvement Director will facilitate and oversee implementation plan and continuous improvement process. Please review his resume. (See attachment 2) Continue a "Grow Your Own" program for future administrators. Monitoring of Principals: Principals must be monitored on a monthly basis in the school setting. Supplement the salaries of all Tier I and Tier III Principals and Turnaround Coaches via Improvement Grant. Pay for Performance Incentives for administrators.

	Principal at a Tier III school was replaced last year with a Turnaround Principal from ADE's list of candidates. All school principals that started in 1999 have been replaced by instructional leaders. Seven of the eight principals have been selected from within the district, only after rigorous training. All administrators, including district level support administrators, are interviewed by district committees with the final selection made by the superintendent. A strong aspiring administrator program is in place, with potential assistant principals identified through a grant program with Arizona State University. Arizona State University Professional Development for administrators is required. A 360 VALED administrator Evaluation is used in conjunction with Arizona State University for improving administrator performance. School climate surveys are administered annually and reviewed with administrators.		Quarterly review of benchmark data will be required. Development of an induction program for new administrators will be developed. Summer Academies (Data Summits) for school improvement coordination and planning. Utilize bidding process for selection of a vendor for comprehensive site monitoring.
District has a comprehensive plan for recruiting and retaining highly effective teachers and leaders.	A comprehensive recruiting and retention plan is included in the District LEA Plan. (See attachment 3) All Tier I and III elementary schools are projected to have 100% Highly qualified teachers for the next school year.	Middle School and Junior High have higher turnover rates, generally because of teachers unable to obtain or retain HQ status.	Hire Highly Qualified Teachers Signing bonus for highly qualified teachers Retention bonus for HQ Teachers. Summer in-service training, at teacher's and administrators' daily rate.

	Only Special Education in the area of Severe and Profound and Pre-school will be the exception.	State budget resources are limited resulting in no salary increases for teachers or leaders for the past two academic years. An increase is not projected for next school year.	Student achievement performance for incentive compensation for teachers and administrators.
	Incentives for teachers include 301 Performance Based Pay and Title II Performance Pay. SLMS in its first year as a "Failing School" received incentive funds for the Turnaround Principal and Turnaround Coaches.	There are currently no incentives for personnel to apply at the Tier I School (Gadsden Elem.) or the High Priority School (SLMS).	Incentive pay for being highly qualified personnel from available funds and Improvement Grants to be distributed as a percentage using multiple criteria, including the teacher evaluation process.
	Teacher and administrator turnover is minimal at the elementary schools. Turnover in SLMS (the highest priority Tier III school and Southwest Junior High (Tier III school) continues to be high.	In grades 7 and 8, some teachers were hired from outside of the U.S. and struggled with the culture shock of the environment and the US education system. Most will not receive a contract for the 2010-2011 school years. Personnel involved in screening potential candidates must consider the total impact on students.	Administrators involved in screening and hiring of 7-8 teachers will be more cognizant of this "problem." Less reliance on similar teachers will be immediately initiated.

	The Gadsden Elem. Tier I school principal was transferred to the classroom and replaced by an In-district and experienced principal. The San Luis Middle School assistant principal was not offered a contract for next school year and will be replaced by a more effective leader.	Principal being replaced at Tier I School is still at the site.	The Transformational Principal assigned to Gadsden Elem. School (Tier I School) assigned to the site in May 2010. Employ a Turnaround Assistant Principal for SLMS using "Identifying the School Turnaround Principal" as a guide in the selection of new administrators. (See Attachment 4)
There is a process to evaluate principals' abilities to demonstrate behavioral competencies of instructional leadership	Annual School Climate Survey in all schools (See Attachment 5) 360 VALED Survey, in conjunction with Arizona State university) on each principal (self-assessment, as perceived by each principal's teachers, and as perceived by Superintendent. (See attachment 6) Introduction of the TAP Instructional Rubric and Inter-rater reliability training. (See attachment 7) Arizona School Improvement Plan School Needs Assessment: Standards 1, 2, 3, 4 (See attachment 8)	School Climate Survey results have been distributed for this school year, but not discussed with school principals. Lack of coaching or follow up for principals from the district at the site level. TAP Training by ASU has been slow. LEA Turnaround Office personnel will improve evaluations in this area	Review of VALED information with principals. (Info. Available in June) School Climate Survey results discussed with school principals and included in their improvement plans. District Turnaround Personnel designated for program/feedback/coaching support. Professional Development in the use of the TAP Instructional Rubric for all administrators.

The LEA aligns personnel evaluations to effective instructional performance.	Instructional Data and evaluation instrument are part of the professional improvement plan. The evaluation tool is aligned to state standards.	Mentors for principals and school improvement teams will no longer be made available to Tier I and Tier III schools. Limited plan for training/mentoring of new administrators. Training and support from ADE will be more limited for Tier I and Tier III schools.	Turnaround Office District positions will provide a principal mentor for underperforming/all schools. Partnering with ASU for Professional Development for administrators in effective instruction that demonstrates high student achievement. This will include training specific to best practices.
The LEA has a process and procedures in place to exempt schools from district policies that restrict innovation; i.e. staffing, budgeting, and scheduling.	Schools can be exempted from district policies. The LEA has implemented a Site-Based Decisions Making Policy for several years. Staffing, school level budgeting, innovation, and scheduling is at the school level within budget constraints and must be data based. Research based strategies for school improvement have been instituted over the last two years and are supported by LEA professional development. Use of Title II Funds for performance based incentives. SIG Leadership Team for Tier I School Improvement is used.	Site-based decision making on innovations, staffing, budgeting at the school level, and scheduling is provided by the building principal with support from the LEA as requested.	School principals in collaboration with the LEA will utilize their improvement plans to clarify this section. Continued use of SIG and School Leadership Teams for planning. Schools based innovation, revisions and replacement of programs or practices are based on three year longitudinal data and available research. Schools develop improvement plans to reflect school improvement and innovation. Continued use of LEA Turnaround Personnel and administrators to emulate the Transformational Model. Performance based incentives will be increased, based on the availability of

	School Leadership Teams at each of the Tier III Schools are used.		funds.
District has a plan to monitor implementation of the intervention model or school improvement plan. This would include processes to be used, timelines, benchmarks, consequences, etc. **Path for Rapid Improvement** Evidence of dramatic changes in district structures, culture, policies, and process; recent implementation of research-based instructional, data, and assessment strategies; changes and improvements that are recognized system-wide and sustainable; process for use of incentives for Tier I and Tier II schools	Annual data summit for (ASIP) development and planning. Improvement Plans developed by school leadership teams and approved by the LEA. Quarterly benchmark comprehensive assessments results at the district level, school level, grade level, teacher level and student level are provided by the LEA Instructional Management Program and Pearson Data Warehouse. District has principal meetings where sites share their challenges and successes (weekly to biweekly-depending on the calendared district events, i.e. testing).	Action planning with timeline reviews of achievement, mentoring, interventions, consequences from the district level has been implemented for ASIP development. However, they must be improved to meet the new ESEA requirements. Quarterly benchmark assessments must be updated. Outside consultants, similar to ADE principal mentors, would strengthen the implementation and monitoring of ESEA school improvement plans.	District school improvement mentor to assist in building action plans, interventions and administration support. District data person to analyze the data and lead the site in best practice for effective instructional planning. This person would follow up with monthly site observations/collaboration for implementation. Arizona State University administrator training in monitoring, principal coaching, walkthrough's etc. to continue. Utilize outside consultants to assist principals and LEA to monitor improvement plans. Utilize of outside consultants to implement instructional components in targeted areas.

	The LEA Improvement Plan (ALEAT) serves as the basis for the district and school focus. (Annual review by ADE Personnel)		
	The 2009-2010 LEA Organizational Chart indicates support of Tier I and Tier III schools. The Intergovernmental agreement with ADE for San Luis Middle School as a Turnaround School was approved and implemented during the 2009-10 school year. The Intergovernmental Agreement with ADE for Southwest Junior High was approved for two years. The LEA utilizes a Curriculum Management System (CMS) at all schools for monitoring student, teacher, grade level, and school and district performance on state standards on a quarterly basis with comprehensive benchmark assessments. Formatives are utilized in all schools. The LEA utilizes a Data Warehouse, Pearson Inform, to store and retrieve achievement data on teachers, schools and students.	The LEA Organizational Chart focusing on Turnaround support for schools does not reflect adequate resources for supporting Tier I and tier III schools adequately. The School Improvement Director position remained unfilled for lack of qualified applicants until May 2010. Funding and agreement terminates in June 2010. Funding and agreement terminates in June 2010. The use of formative evaluations which are managed by the CMS has been inconsistent in all targeted schools.	The 2010-2011 LEA Organizational Chart (See Attachment 9) reflects major changes in structure towards the Transformational model in Tier I Gadsden Elem. School and Tier III first priority school, San Luis Middle School. The remaining Tier III schools will emulate the Transformational Model. A Turnaround Office with appropriate support with a proposed Turnaround Data analysis position and a parental support (FIAT) position. Major changes are indicated in Dark Blue. The LEA will continue supporting the agreement at SLMS as a district commitment with 2 Turnaround Coaches. The LEA will continue supporting Southwest J.H. with a greater emphasis from the new Turnaround Office. Formative evaluations will be used in

Shared Leadership **LEA vision, mission, goals and student learning are shared and articulated throughout the LEA. Leaders are focused on student achievement. There are multiple shared leadership opportunities. Leaders facilitate decision making with data. LEA has a vigorous process for developing leaders.**	Administrators utilize the Concerns Based Adoption Model for planning, introducing, and implementation of innovations. (See attachment 9) LEA mission and goals are approved in Governing Board Meetings open to the public. They are posted on the LEA home page. Input was received from all schools for board consideration. All schools receive posters of the mission statement and goals that are posted in all classrooms and schools. ASIP's reflect these goals as they relate to individual school data. The Annual Data Summit for Leadership Teams focuses on LEA goals and mission as ASIP plans are reviewed, updated, or revised. This process continues throughout the year. The LEA Improvement Plan based on governing goals and district data is presented to all school staffs, parent groups and is on the LEA web site. Student achievement is the driving force for most activities in each school. Leaders effectiveness is measured through various instruments/activities: VALED, School Climate Survey, LEA survey on State Standards, consultant observations, formal and informal	A more formal approach for providing teacher training in Pearson Inform is needed. New administrators and turnaround personnel have not received the training this year. The task of monitoring or improving the articulation to all stakeholders is not assigned to one individual. The School Improvement Position remained vacant for most of the year because of a lack of qualified applicants. Development of a vigorous process for aspiring administrators is slowly being developed with Arizona State University and the LEA.	all schools on a bimonthly basis and be monitored by District Turnaround Office Personnel on a monthly basis. This data will be used for Grade Level Task Force Teachers at each site for review and planning of lesson plans. The upgraded Pearson Inform will be made available with job-embedded professional development support in the use of the system. Professional development will provide all teachers with appropriate training. Pilot of Galileo Assessment System at the Tier I School (Gadsden Elem. School) and SLMS, the top prioritized Tier III School to supplement the District Benchmark System. Provide CBAM training for appropriate personnel. Assign School Improvement the task of developing a dissemination plan of the mission and governing board goals. A monitoring plan will also be developed. Additional targeted stakeholders will be more parents, community organizations, students, community business community, and Chamber of

	discussions with Superintendent, annual administrator evaluations, reports to the Governing Board by administrators, school meeting agendas, district meeting agendas, professional development sessions for administrators. Two long distance learning classrooms are developed for delivery of programs and planning meetings between ASU and GESD personnel. Professional development by Arizona State University for school administrators was available throughout the year. ASU provides a program for aspiring principals in the district. School Improvement meetings and in-service by ADE involved all key leaders throughout the year. Leadership development and input into teacher evaluations revisions, CBAM innovation configurations, inter-rater reliability on TAP instrument with ASU, governing board policy review by school administrators, revision of school student agendas, review/revision of uniform policy, participation in teacher and administrator interview committees, principal weekly meetings and minutes. Selection of key ESEA positions, group		Commerce. The LEA FIAT Coordinator will assist with parents and the community and each school's FIAT. The new ESEA improvement plans to be developed by school improvement teams, as a follow up to the SIG applications, will focus more on AYP and Transformational Model components. The LEA Turn Around Office will maintain school and LEA focus on student achievement. ESEA improvement plans will include detailed progress monitoring of student achievement at the school and LEA level. Partnership programs with Arizona State University will continue. Southwest Junior High, a Tier III school, and Ed Pastor Elem., an AYP and Highly Performing School, will participate in the EXCEL or TAP Program Grant. (See attachment 10) Training from this grant will be made available to school administrators and teachers from other schools. Both schools will participate in an additional pay for performance program if a TIF Grant is awarded to ASU. Gadsden Elem., a Tier I school, will

	review by leaders on budget allocations on a bi-monthly basis, collaborative placement of students in schools by school and district leaders, development of teacher pupil ratios in schools by school leaders. All district and school leaders were provided continuous training in data analysis, use of Pearson Inform for data analysis and the District Curriculum Management System for benchmark and formative assessments. Principals with appropriate support personnel, led grade Level Task Forces in data analysis to improve instruction in each school.		receive additional training on the TAP instructional rubric to be implemented in August. All other school administrators will be learning the TAP Rubric with ASU over the school year to be implemented during the 2011-2012 school year.
Quality Planning **A comprehensive plan for continuous improvement of the LEA, with a focus on student learning is established. Articulation and integration of all elements is due to high quality planning. Leadership team ensures all elements will be implemented by all**	The comprehensive LEA plan has been developed and improved over a two year with an annual review by Steve Henneberg. The latest review was May 13, 2010 with very positive comments. Current evidence in several binders addressing all audited areas are available. The LEA plan is available through the ALEAT program. Updates are made on the ALEAT system throughout the school year. Major stakeholders are involved in the development of the LEA plan. Monitoring of the plan was reviewed by Mr. Henneberg.	Prior to this year, the Superintendent was not directly involved in the Comprehensive LEA Plan development.	Training opportunities for data analysis, interpretation, planning and designing of lesson plans using the upgraded Pearson Inform Program and the Curriculum Management System will be expanded to impact more classroom teachers and leadership teams. The Superintendent will continue to participate in the development of the LEA plan. Continue to monitor the comprehensive

appropriate parties. **Teacher Evaluation** Development of the teacher evaluation process included input from relevant stakeholders (teachers, teachers' unions, school board, principals, parents, LEA staff)	All relevant stakeholders were involved input from all identified relevant stakeholders as required by Arizona Revised Statutes. The present instrument is being reviewed using the same process. This process and all its requirements are annually submitted to ADE by the Governing Board.	The present teacher evaluation instrument has been in place for several years. It should be reviewed, revised, or replaced as necessary.	LEA plan under the guidance of the LEA Turnaround Office and appropriate ADE personnel. All recommendations by Mr. Henneberg will be immediately addressed and included in the plan through ALEAT.
Multiple sources of data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of a teacher. Data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of a teacher. Data sources include but are not limited to: Lesson plans, classroom observations, classroom walkthroughs, self assessments, portfolios, student achievement data, student work-sample review.	A typical teacher evaluation meets all required state teaching standards with evidence from all the identified data sources. Feedback is also gathered from math and writing consultants, school improvement mentors and school improvement teams, NCLB personnel, and district administrators. Teacher Organization representatives may provide assistance to teachers for classroom management strategies.	The evaluation system is used more for addressing teachers in need of improvement. It is not designed to improve instruction across the board with all teachers. The reading and math program are not developed to the level of sophistication as the writing program.	Continue the development of a revised Teacher Evaluation Instrument. Finalize during the 2010-2011 school year. The TAP instructional rubric will be utilized in Gadsden Elem. School (Tier I School), Southwest Junior High (Tier III School) and Ed Pastor Elem. (An AYP and Highly Performing School. Training will be continued with Arizona State University through long distance learning classrooms or direct instruction.
A framework/model that defines effective teaching has been developed, is clearly communicated, with a plan for training teachers and principals.	The most effective framework/model used district wide has been the Wilda Storm "Writing Up A Storm Program" with a clearly articulated plan for training teachers and principals. It is also used for monitoring of every teacher in the district using Writing	The professional development is not designed to be formative and summative.	Use of the TAP Instructional Rubric will improve instruction with all teachers because of its design. (See attachment 11)

Teacher Evaluation is directly tied to professional development providing information for both summative and formative purposes.	Pacing Charts for monitoring the program. AIMS results for all sub groups are extremely positive. . Teacher evaluation and professional development assistance are directly related. Teacher improvement is formative through administrator, NCLB support, district personnel and consultant observations and coaching. Teachers in improvement plans receive more intense assistance.		Utilize Wilda Storm to assist the LEA and schools in the development of a transformational reading program which expands on the strategies used in the Writing Up A Storm Program. The program will be designed to impact all teachers and all grade levels. School leadership teams have begun this process. (See attachment 12) Use of the TAP Instructional Rubric will provide a natural formative and summative evaluation. Professional development will be facilitated by the clarity of the TAP instrument.
Standard 2: Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Development			
The LEA has core curriculum that is evaluated and revised annually.	The Arizona Standards serve as the basis for the core curriculum in the major subject areas. The effectiveness of each	Lack of financial resources to purchase needed materials in mathematics and reading for ELL and Special Education	Employ a Turn around data specialist to assist in this area.

Programs & practices are evaluated and discarded in a timely manner if they do not show measurable learning results	is reviewed formally each quarter, by student sub group. The use of formative assessments provides detailed information on the quality of instruction. Findings indicate successful core curriculum for some student sub groups. This process is used at each school site. Our most successful program with all subgroup is the "Write Up a Storm" Writing Program. A transformational reading model was begun this year with the assistance of an outside consultant for expanding the programs' strategies into reading and the content areas. Pacing guides and sample lesson plans are being developed. High Point intervention reading program & Write Up a Storm facilitated 99% upward movement for ELLs on the AZELLA.	subgroups. Lack of funds for purchasing supplementary leveled reading materials in Houghton core reading program. Over reliance on DIBELS strategies at the elementary reading resulting in low comprehension. Lack resource kits and manipulatives to implement Saxon math program with fidelity. Lack supplementary materials for High Point and Prentice Hall to implement reading programs in conjunction with Write Up a Storm with fidelity. Lack technology resources to enhance student engagement while addressing the Arizona Academic Standards.	Utilize LEA Turn Around personnel in this arena. Prioritize and purchase needed supplementary materials in core programs. Purchase resource kits and manipulatives for math to enhance instruction toward state standards. Buy necessary High Point and Prentice Hall materials that go with the textbooks/core curriculum to enhance instruction toward state and ELP standards. Purchase mobile labs for students, and LCD projectors with document cameras to further engage students with the core curriculum.
The LEA has a professional development plan that allows for PD during the work day and specifically addresses and targets school	A professional development program calendar is developed, communicated and implemented with appropriate	Survey data of certified staff indicates a need for technology professional development as a priority.	Link LEA Turnaround Office Personnel with PD Department for greater input into the offerings.

improvement needs	adjustments during the school year. Each school utilize Wednesday for embedded embedded Professional Development. (1.5 hours / week) Common planning time is provided at least once a week for all grade levels or subject areas. Outside consultants are used in all schools during the school day to help with addressing Arizona Academic Standards in reading, writing, and math by modeling research-based strategies and providing corrective feedback: Write Up a Storm consultants, Lead Team, and NAU/AWC faculty. Targeted leadership or teacher groups meet as needed throughout the year for professional development using substitute teachers. ESEA specialists, former NCLB's, are provided in-service on a scheduled basis throughout the year. PD targets research-based SEI strategies and data analysis using Pearson Inform to be delivered throughout the year. Administrative professional development is generally held during the school day. Coaching of teachers occurs on a daily	Limited time during the day for quality professional development for all teachers. Lack an adequate level of administrative and support staff development. Lack adequate money to fund substitute teachers for training.	Continue to refine the PD calendar. Maximize the school day for professional development. Improve the coaching model PD and develop a proposed schedule for observations and feedback by appropriate leaders. Stipends for teachers to attend in-service before and after school. Finance teacher travel to conferences and workshops that focus on their strengths/weaknesses.

	basis at every school. PD targets research-based SEI strategies and data analysis using Pearson Inform to be delivered throughout the year. Administrative professional development is generally held during the school day. Coaching of teachers occurs on a daily basis at every school.		
The LEA has negotiated the necessary changes in collective bargaining agreements to provide the LEA/principals with greater control over hiring, placement, and retention of staff.	A meet and confer process is used at GESD at the district level. Hiring and placement of teachers is not addressed at that level. Teachers are generally part of school interview committees. Principal currently recommend hiring, retention and placement of teachers.	Hiring, placement, and retention process includes teacher involvement as needed by each principal.	Current practices should continue. Highly qualified hiring in grades 7-8 must be improved.
The LEA has a strong teacher evaluation process in place that provides for removing ineffective teachers that aren't committed to the turnaround process.	Administration evaluations: twice per year for non-continuing and once for continuing teachers. Improvement plans are utilized. Arizona Law includes procedures to remove ineffective teachers.	The evaluations are only as effective as each evaluator. Most administrators have been involved in removing ineffective teachers, either formally and informally.	Improve the evaluation process using Arizona State University Professional Development in the TAP Rubric for administrators. Greater inter rater reliability on teacher evaluations will be a professional development focus. Utilize LEA school attorney for legal aspects of removing ineffective teachers

			and those charged with unprofessional conduct.
The LEA has a systematic process for measuring quality instruction and student engagement including walkthrough procedures	Quarterly benchmark assessments measure quality of instruction as reflected by student results. Formative evaluations have been strongly recommended by the LEA. Coaching / walk-through utilize rubrics to evaluate use of research-based reading, write, math, and SEI strategies. Coaching plans focus on engagement, SEI strategies, and lesson development to help teachers increase student success. Coaches and exemplary teachers model lessons utilizing research-based SEI strategies for other teachers to improve practice.	Classroom observations by school administrators in inconsistent. Feedback to classroom teachers is inconsistent. A LEA approved walkthrough procedure and form has not been developed.	Improve LEA Turnaround Office by employing a Turnaround Data Specialist or director to assist targeted schools in the development of formatives and methods for monitoring student progress. Develop a formal calendar or log for walk-throughs and observations at each school to be monitored by LEA Turnaround Office. Continue to refine the Comprehensive Benchmark System. Purchase and pilot of Galileo to examine teacher effectiveness through systematic, uniform formative assessment data to be piloted in one or two targeted schools. This is to supplement, not replace the Benchmark System.
The LEA has a systematic process enabling teachers to collaborate during the work day to use data to improve instruction.	Elementary teachers utilize common planning periods for collaborative work by grade level, as scheduled by each principal. Teachers meet periodically during the planning period in order to analyze data to guide instruction.	Limited time during the day. Each principal determines the priority time at their school. Opportunities for discussion of data to improve instruction vary from school to school. Instructional minutes have been increased at all levels, leaving less time	Extend the school day for planning purposes for data analysis, planning and instructional improvement at each targeted school. Stipends for Task Force Leaders and Chairpersons for conducting weekly planning meetings.

	Grade Level Task Forces receive stipends to engage in collaborative planning using assessment results.	for planning.	
Standard 3: **Assessment System**			
The LEA has a comprehensive data warehouse system that allows for the collection of student data down to individual student performance	LEA currently uses Pearson Inform (data system) storing an analyzing student achievement information from AIMS, the LEA Comprehensive Benchmark System, AZELLA, demographic data, etc. Information is collected by district, by school, by grade, by teacher, by student and by objective or concept. This system has been in place for at least four years. The district Computerized Curriculum Management System (Target Teach) provides similar information, but also develops an individual IEP for every student tested using the LEA Comprehensive Benchmark System. This system has been in place since the 2000 school year. Benchmark scores are highly correlated with AIMs results. The Wizard Test Maker is used for development of formative assessments in all LEA schools. These assessments are scored by LEA's Curriculum Management System that provides	Administrators and key leaders, NCLB specialists, have received training in these systems. NCLB's and administrators provide training for their teachers. The phased in approach should be refined with scheduled and job-embedded in-service in these two systems throughout the year. Teachers have to generate the formative assessment based on their understanding of the standard/PO and may not be on target with the correct level of rigor. Targeted schools require more assistance in development of formative assessments.	Continued refinement of the Comprehensive Benchmark System to be supplemented with the Galileo program. Hire intervention specialists to facilitate and evaluate implementation of intense, targeted interventions for students Falling Far Below the standards. Extend formal PD to all teachers in the district in the area if assessment. Purchase and pilot Galileo- train and implement all components. This will entail Purchase outside training and consulting for the implementation of Galileo. Galileo will provide a system that is efficient in compiling student data, tests that are at the correct level of rigor and are aligned to current AZ standards/POs, as well as, a comprehensive data system where everything is in one place for ease of grouping students for intervention/remediation. This system will help target our neediest populations ,ELL and Special Ed students, as well

	immediate reports for instructional planning.		as, track progress, interventions and services that are working or not. Galileo will supplement the District Benchmark System, not replace it. Employ a fulltime LEA Data Coordinator and Data Coaches for targeted schools School improvement director at the district level will review data, assist in action planning through collaborative conversations at sites, and provide feedback on the school's implementation of the action plan both to the school and district. This will include establishing time lines for growth and sorting of students and personnel for targeted instruction.
The measurement of student learning is used to better support systemic, programmatic and instructional decisions, and is part of the core work of the district and schools.	District provides benchmark tests in reading and mathematics on a quarterly basis. The district has directed sites to develop and give formative assessments every three weeks. The LEA provides a full-time clerk at each school site for data input for academic purposes. Currently formative assessments are developed by individual teachers using various programs, including Wizard Test	The formative data is examined and responded to by each school principal and teachers for intervention, action planning, and support. Comprehensive Benchmark Data requires two weeks for scoring and reporting. (1 week assess, 2nd week scanning and reporting). Formative assessment data is dependent on school assessment time, scanning, and report generation. More timely reports are completed at the formative level.	Galileo will provide a cohesive system of instructional support materials and assessments aligned to current state standards. It will also get data to the teacher in a timely manner for instructional decision making. Test items are at the correct level of rigor for the assessment of the grade level standards. Galileo will be used in addition to the District Comprehensive Benchmark System.

	Maker.	Teachers can more effectively monitor student progress with the current system using formative assessments. The district provided benchmark assessments are re-aligned annually with current state standards. Levels of rigor in the formative assessments, as they are crafted by teachers, may not be consistent with grade level standard. The use of the Wizard Test Program provides good test items.	An extended school day will provide teachers with the opportunity to make critical decisions in grouping students for classes and interventions based on present levels of performance. Data will be better utilized to plan instruction and intervention in whole group, differentiated small group, and intervention efforts. More professional development will be targeting this area. Turnaround time for assessment reports will be improved substantially.
Clear LEA/school goals are set based on what students need to know, think, and do for personal, economic, and civic success for the 21st century.	The LEA Governing Board mission and goals clearly support State Standards. State Standards drive district curriculum programs and assessments. ASIP goals are aligned to AZ state standards and district curriculum keeping in mind our community's economic and educational needs. All ASIPS and future EAEA Improvement Grants have been and will be based on student actual achievement levels, individually and as a group and subgroup, on State Standards.	At the district level on teacher surveys training in the use of technology has been identified as a high priority by teachers. Survey data clearly identifies a strong need for technology training for teachers, which will improve student knowledge in the use of technology. Lack of systematic professional development in math interventions. Technology is not used for data surveying of student perceptions and career aspirations. Due to teachers not having access technology and lack of training and use of data systems. PBIS has been introduced in all schools,	Teacher training will be provided in the use of technology for assessment, surveying and instruction of students. District trainer needed for full implementation of PBIS at LEA level. This person would also monitor schools' implementation and needs through collaboration with on site coaches. Follow up coaching on PBIS components of classroom management by turnaround coaches and site coach. Hire subs 4 times a year to provide teachers with the opportunity to disaggregate data for RTI model

		but requires further professional development.	
The LEA has a system in place to train and support teachers in using data to drive instruction.	The LEA has a system in place, and a technology department to train and support teachers in the use of two data systems- Pearson Informed and Target Teach. (Pearson Informed is for warehousing assessment and demographic information from different sources, i.e. AIMS, AZELLA, benchmark data. Target Teach is used for scoring comprehensive district benchmarks and formative assessments. Reports of student results are available to teachers, administrators, students and parents. Professional development has been provided for two years.	Currently the site must provide training on both systems for teachers to utilize data. Professional development has been introduced to teachers. Principals and NCLB's, coaches and key teachers have received extensive PD in the use of data to drive instruction.	More focused professional development in using the present and proposed systems to train and support teachers for more effective use of data to drive instruction. (To be reflected in professional calendar). Instructional coaches will also provide more job-embedded coaching on data to drive instruction. Purchase and pilot Galileo and support services to provide training for all components. Utilize mobile computer labs for Galileo testing to cut down turn around time. Student results would be uploaded directly to the data system and available for immediate teacher/site use.
Standard 4: Culture, Climate, and Communication			
District staff, school board members, and association members work together to make the dramatic changes the restructured school(s) need for improving student learning	The LEA has cooperated with ADE in school improvement efforts in targeted schools as reflected by board approved IGA's with ADE. Teacher Association meets with LEA representatives in review of district	ARRA Fiat grant funds end this school year: LEA FIAT Coordinator position not continue. Communication/coordination between elementary, middle school, and high school usually occurs at the end of the	Hire LEA FIAT Coordinator to continue this year's AARA Parent Involvement Grant. LEA Turnaround Academic Advisor hired to be utilized to meet with entering 6th grade students and parents

	policies, revision of teacher evaluations, and teacher improvement, etc. The annual LEA Governing Board Planning Session includes LEA and School Administrators ADE assigned Principal mentors and Turnaround Coaches were used with ADE supported stipends. ADE Solutions Teams observed and reported progress in several schools. Lead Team consultants for building of ASIP components –mission, vision, etc. Writing Up a Storm Consultants for on site trainings and Coaching bi-monthly for Writing Program Implementation. Task Force leadership identified to support new direction school are heading in with team leaders who have shown they can demonstrate effective strategies in their content areas, and are adaptive, flexible, and enthusiastic in their support of the necessary changes for school improvement. FIAT organization in all schools with school and district planning sessions headed by a LEA Parent Coordinator. Monthly parent meetings-PTO, focused to sharing of Data and Student Successes Academically and Behaviorally. Teachers solicited input through climate surveys, staff meetings, and looping out	school year. No district trainer for PBIS so sight can have full training of components All of the PBIS components were not trained due to there being no available trainer. Limited LEA support specifically Reading and mathematics.	to communicate skill sets needed to be successful at SLMS or to assist 8th grade students with transitioning to High School and to help package students for scholarships, summer programs, and support services to ensure academic success. PBIS Training would be part of this person's responsibilities. Enforce and monitoring sites/individuals in the implementation of PBIS by the sites administration. Hire Write Up A Storm Consultants to support the implementation process/training of Reading Curriculum Maps/Pacing Charts with emphasis on Comprehension of expository text. Utilize this organization for follow-up monthly coaching. This transformational reading program will be across all subject areas, including mathematics. Weekly department meetings/cross curricular meeting to establish techniques for data driven instruction and implementation Data disaggregation to determine student needs for after school and Saturday school programs Integration of RTI model to enable quick response teams to assist in data analysis and instruction

	of task force members for budget, program and activity plans. PBIS continued in all schools Part-time Parent liaisons at each school site helped with implementation of the FIAT grant and PTO nights as well as parent contacts for teachers who could not speak the language.		Saturday school used to close the achievement gap
The LEA sets school improvement as a priority and adheres to the implementation and monitoring of the school's goals, including consistently monitoring improvement timelines for student achievement	The LEA Governing Board mission and goals sets the tone for academic expectation. The LEA Comprehensive Improvement Plan is used as a guide for all school ASIPs developed. LEA employed outside consultants (Lead Team) to monitor all school ASIPS on a monthly basis. The LEA monitors each school on a quarterly basis using LEA Comprehensive Benchmark Assessments. LEA led Data Summits for ASIP Development and school improvement efforts with principals, school leadership teams, and available staff (summer) Tools for planning, instruction and assessment, curriculum mapping: K-8 Curriculum and Assessment Binders in Language Arts, mathematics, science (grades 4, 7, 8), and social studies	No formal report is required of principals in monitoring of their individual ASIPs. Benchmark data does not provide finite data in a timely manner to make monitoring effective or efficient for instructional purposes is not aligned to current standards Individual schools develop their own mapping in all subjects. A monitoring tool of a schools movement toward ASIP goals such as Galileo which is aligned to current AZ standard to be used to supplement, not replace, the Comprehensive Benchmark Program at targeted schools. Formatives assessments at each school are scheduled by the principal at each school. The LEA Benchmark Assessments must be completely aligned with the latest	Require all principals to file written reports with LEA on ASIP progress on a quarterly basis. Require each principal to develop an Improvement Plan Monitoring Schedule to include multiple data sources. Hire a LEA Data Director/coach for assisting targeted schools in data interpretation, planning and professional development. Hire a LEA Turnaround Assessment Coach for reviewing, developing, and updating Comprehensive Benchmark Assessments. Comprehensive Benchmark System will be site-based with results provided within two days of administration controlled at school level. Focused PD in the area of data driven instruction Continue department /grade level/task force meetings to improve data driven

	(grades 7 and 8) include academic standards, alignment to ELP standards, tests codes for formative assessments, aims specification, aims blue print Pacing charts for Writing/LA (See attachment 13) Quarterly benchmarks School improvement director hired Goals from ASIP established and tied to growth of student data Dedicated data assessment clerk hired at every school Comprehensive benchmark assessments developed teachers on a stipend basis.	state standards. Benchmark Assessments have been developed, refined and replaced over a nine year period by hiring school staff on an hourly basis after the school	instruction using formatives, benchmarks, and other available data in a timely manner. Cross curricular meetings Data driven intervention during AIMS prep classes for students Develop new math benchmark assessments (summer 2010) in grades K-8. Purchase, pilot, and implement Galileo to monitor students' progress toward state standards and respond accordingly to achievement gap tri-weekly monitor. (Galileo will supplement, not replace the LEA Comprehensive Benchmark system. Establish pull-out reading and math interventions as needed utilizing Galileo and comprehensive benchmark system data to monitor progress and need.
The LEA has a valued culture of high expectations for student achievement including established vision, mission, and goals	LEA Governing Board Mission and Goals are formulated annually based on student achievement. Development and presentation of LEA Comprehensive Plan communicated to various stakeholders at the LEA and school level.	Funds have been reduced to support cost share of tuition and books for students.	Revision of Governing Board Goals for 2010-2011 school years. Transformational Reading Program developed in grades K-8 utilizing research based strategies through outside consultants leading school personnel in the development of the program. Reading across the curriculum pacing charts

			Monthly on-site visits from consultants
	Governing Board support of 7th and 8th grade students enrolling in Arizona Western College courses in Mathematics, English and Drama. (Many students complete college pre-calculus courses in the 8th grade)	Limited funding available.	Find additional financial resources for assisting families. Expand identification of potential students to the 6th grade level through LEA Turnaround Academic Adviser.
	Governing Board support of ACT preparation classes in grades 7th and 8th Governing Board support of Johns Hopkins College Program for 7th and 8th Grade Students ($200,000 in scholarship funds from Johns Hopkins for approximately 50 students to attend universities across the country were awarded this year.)		Utilize LEA Turnaround Academic Adviser to continue the ACT identification process, coordinate ACT tutoring, and John's Hopkins College Program, Odyssey of the Mind Programs, etc.
	Governing Board support of the Odyssey of the Mind Program at the elementary and middle school level. (A 5th Grade Team qualified and will participate in International Competition this Spring.	Computer Lab instructors are employed at the Junior High/Middle School level. Elementary school positions were eliminated because of budget constraints. Positions were eliminated two years ago.	Stipends for participating teachers and purchase of materials for Odyssey of the Mind Program. Financial support for travel to State and International competition.
	Student attendance is over 95% at most schools. Annual School Climate Survey		
	Computer Labs available at every school. Middle schools have two labs in each.		Employ computer lab teachers in targeted schools. Focused PD for teachers in the use of technology.

All staff members are held accountable for increased student achievement.	Academic results are used for every teacher using the Pearson Informs Data Warehouse and the Computer Management System, Target Teach, four times a year. Reports are district level, school level, grade level, teacher level, student level, and objective or standard level. (See attachment 14) All teachers are expected to use Benchmark and formative assessment data to increase student achievement. Formatives are required between Quarterly Benchmark Assessments. Principals are expected to address student achievement as reflected in the Comprehensive LEA Plan and school ASIP's. Several teachers were placed on improvement plans this year. In 11 years, only one administrator has continued with the new administration. All principals, assistant principals, and key central office personnel have been replaced within the last five years.	Evaluation system has data-driven instruction as a performance objective, but there are limited incentives for outstanding achievement. Formative assessment schedules are determined by each principal. Highly Qualified teacher shortage at both Middle School/Junior High schools.	Provide performance based financial incentives for student achievement on AIMS, AZELLA and other site data. In cooperation with Arizona State University, develop a performance based system at the school, individual, and evaluation level. Utilize Title II Funds, 301 Funds, and SIG funds for sources to strengthen Performance Based Incentives. Use LEA Data Coordinator/coach to coordinate and schedule a more uniform formative schedule at each school. Continued focus in Professional Development on student achievement. Continue TAP Instructional Rubric Training with Arizona State University. Raise the percentage of HQ Teachers in grades 7 and 8 using signing bonus
The LEA is committed to involving community/parents in the restructuring process including communicating current reality, new vision, buy in, and silencing of	AARA Parent Involvement Grant was implemented in all schools using a part-time LEA FIAT Coordinator and a fulltime LEA FIAT clerk to establish and coordinate FIATS and meetings at every school.	Evaluation system has data-driven instruction as a performance objective, but there are limited incentives for outstanding achievement.	Continue FIAT program by funding the part-time LEA FIAT Coordinator and full-time LEA clerk to strengthen and continue progress in all schools.

naysayers.	At least two district wide FIAT meetings were conducted this year to involve parents. Officers were identified in every school FIAT. PTO Meetings were conducted on a monthly basis. LEA Comprehensive Plan and ASIPs were presented to parents. The LEA utilized newspapers, school newsletters, classes for parent academic skills improvement, scheduled parent conference nights in this arena. School messenger, a calling/emailing system that notifies parents/staff about absences, schedule changes, cancelations, upcoming events, and reminders in English and Spanish. Leadership teams, like the 2141 Committee representing a cross section of stakeholders are involved in the development, review and revision of the LEA Consolidated Plan throughout the school year. (See attachment 15) School leadership teams are involved in the development, review and revision of ASIP's at their respective schools. All plans are reviewed throughout the school year and revised for the next academic year.	Formative assessment schedules are determined by each principal. Highly Qualified teacher shortage at both Middle School/Junior High schools. AARA funding ends in June 2010. Limited parent involvement in school ASIPs Establishment of school messenger Meetings with parents of low performing students are not consistent	Use of LEA FIAT Coordinator to obtain more input into ESEA Improvement Plans and the Comprehensive LEA Plan. Utilize LEA Turnaround Academic Adviser to coordinate a formal approach across the district for communicating and meeting with parents of low performing students. Professional development on implementation and expectations of these programs for teachers. School-based parent classes offered to educate on the importance of parental involvement in the school community. Continue the FIAT program for three more years.

	An annual data summit is conducted with LEA, Principals, Leadership Teams and available teachers during the summer to review and develop Improvement Plans for the next academic year. LEA and school information is communicated through the Parent FIAT Program across the district and through PTO meetings. Certified staff are continuously involved in monitoring progress on the ASIPs throughout the school year, as reflected by weekly planning meetings at all school sites. A local newspaper dedicates two pages for LEA and school level information to the community on a weekly basis. Every school conducts monthly PTO meetings with the assistance of parents in the development of agendas.	throughout the district. Funding for the ARRA Parent project ends this school year. Parents did not participate in the Annual Data Summit. Their input was obtained after the school start date. The LEA Comprehensive Plan and individual ASIP's were presented along with other parent interests.	Include parents in the development of ESEA Improvement Plans at the annual data summit. Formally review all components of the LEA Comprehensive plan and ESEA Improvement Plans in FIAT and Parent Workshops dedicated to those items. Continue to involve school level employees in the monitoring of Improvement Plans on a scheduled basis to be coordinated by the LEA Turnaround Office.
Standard 5: Resource Management			
The LEA has prioritized the reallocation of resources to schools in improvement including personnel, funding, programming, etc.	The Comprehensive LEA Plan reflects equitable distribution and use of and resources for school improvement. Because seven of the eight schools are in AYP improvement, most of the M&O funding is allocated by student count at	State funding for the LEA has been systematically reduced by the legislature. The prognosis over the next three to five years is not clear. Reductions in teaching personnel in all schools have not occurred. The following positions have been	Review and revise Comprehensive LEA Plan to reflect additional resources made available by the SIG Grant and improvement process. The budget for 2010-2011 will be allocated equitably based on student

	each school. The LEA, through Intergovernmental Agreements with ADE, has hired additional personnel at San Luis Middle School and Southwest Junior High. Federal and state funds are allocated to schools based on grant program requirements and/or student count. AARA funds were used for specific federal requirements. AARA School Stabilization funds were used to salvage approximately 40 teaching positions across the district. Principals are involved in the distribution, planning and expenditures of all district, state, and federal funds. School Principals are involved in the redistribution of teachers and student placement throughout the district to maintain equity in teacher/pupil ratios.	eliminated over the last two-three years: all elementary assistant principals or teacher's on assignment, certified librarians in all school libraries, computer lab instructors in all elementary levels, Full day kindergarten was changed to half day kindergarten, elementary counselors, no pay increases for employees beginning in the 2009-10 school year and continuing into the 2010-11 school year.	counts. Federal and state grant funds will be allocated as per state and federal requirements. SIG grant funds will be utilized to provide financial incentives to high need schools for increased student achievement. SIG grant funds will be utilized to implement a LEA Turnaround Office to assist Tier 1 and Tier III schools in raising student achievement and increasing parental involvement. SIG grant funds will be programmed to obtaining supplementary material, otherwise not financially feasible through available funds. SIG grant funds will be utilized to acquire needed technology for classroom use in Improvement Status schools.

LEA leverages funds in order to design a viable sustainability plan for future years.	The LEA has projected District funding from the state for the next three years. However with anticipated funding reductions, projections are very tentative.	State funding is ambiguous and unpredictable as reflected by budget reductions by the legislature over the last two years. Similar reductions are anticipated into the next 3-5 years.	Develop a district budget in conjunction with the SIG sustainability plan, utilizing all available resources. Principals will plan their school level budget expenditures following the SIG improvement sustainability plan
The LEA Consolidated Plan includes strategies/action steps aligned to school improvement needs (Sustainability)	The LEA Consolidated Plan is completely aligned to school improvement needs. The plan has been reviewed annually by Steve Henneberg, ADE contact person. The latest review was in May 2010.	Funding from State resources has been and will continue to be reduced.	Utilize all available funding, including SIG funds for implementing the LEA Consolidated Plan and the new ESEA Improvement Plans at each targeted school. Involve LEA Turnaround Office personnel, in conjunction with school principals, in the development of the three year sustainability budget which will be input into ALEAD.

B1.b Describe the actions the LEA has taken or will take to address the following:

	Actions LEA has taken:	Actions LEA will take: Include a general timeline
Design and implement interventions aligned with the requirements of the selected model: **Leadership Team Elements of Transformational Model**	Replacement of Principal in Tier I School (Gadsden Elem. School) Replacement of Principal at SLMS with an ADE trained Turnaround Principal for the present school year. Employment of four Turnaround coaches at SLMS and SWJH. ADE Assistance ends this year. Continue two Turnaround Coaches at SLMS Revision of current school leaders and teachers' evaluations moving toward TAP Instructional Rubric (Introduction and training initiated with administrators) through Arizona state University Program. Administrator evaluation moving toward VALED instrument through Arizona State University. Incentive program for increasing student achievement: 301 Performance Pay Plan, Title II Performance Incentive for Highly Qualified Teachers, Bilingual/ESL Stipends	(Subject to availability of funding) Employ two coaches in Tier I school (Gadsden Elem.) Summer 2010 Revision of teacher and administrator evaluation with teacher and administrator involvement(Dec. 2010) Complete TAP Training for administrators (Dec. 2010) VALED final 360 reports to principals (Summer 2010) Program to be strengthened with SIG funding in this area; Arizona State University Pay For Performance Plan in two schools for school administrators, coaches, and certified staff (Aug. 2010) Wilda Storm Consultant services for design,

	Job-embedded professional development as reflected in comprehensive LEA Plan: Professional Development Calendar (Revised throughout the year as needed) followed up by Principal, LEA, ESEA coaches, or consultants on a regular basis. (See attachment 16) The teacher evaluation process currently used is effective for removing ineffective teachers from all district schools. Arizona Revised Statutes provide the framework for this process. (See attachment 17) Opportunities for promotion and career growth are available each year with most positions hired from within the district. Arizona State University Provides a B.A. program for employees with an A.A. Degree which allows them to apply for teaching positions. ASU provides a content academy at the Master's level for teachers to advance on the salary schedule and become more effective teachers. ASU provides professional development for improving administrators' effectiveness. ASU provides an administrator preparation program. Key ESEA positions	plan, implement and provide PD in the extension of the writing program into Reading and Mathematics in grades K-8. Leadership teams from each school participate in this development. (Continue Development Summer 2010 and through the academic year) Continued use of identified school leaders in monitoring teacher performance and fidelity to programs. (Aug.-May 2010-2011. Continued use of the Evaluation Process as per ARS. Provide professional development for all administrators using LEA legal services attorney. (Fall 2010) Continue the identified programs. (FY 2010-2011). Provide an administrator intern to Tier I school using SIG funds. (next available opening with ASU in 2010)

	undergo extensive professional development making them strong candidates for future administrative or other leadership positions in the district. The LEA uses data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research based and aligned from grade to grade with State Academic Standards alignment. Sufficient data is available from the LEA for making such determinations. If a program is working with some subgroups, the program for those subgroups will not be changed. The LEA has promoted continuous use of student data (such as formatives, comprehensive assessments, state testing results, i.e. AIMS and AZELLA data) to differentiate instruction and meet academic needs of each student. The Computer Management System in concert with the District Comprehensive Benchmark System provides Individual Educational Programs for every student tested. Objective grouping reports serve as a basis for classroom and afterschool interventions. Comprehensive Instruction Reform: Reviews have been sporadic and informal without much reliance on data. Some schools have piloted	Principals must provide statistical evidence and pilot programs targeted to the areas or student subgroups for which current programs are not working. (Immediate) Comprehensive Benchmark Assessments will be improved by a LEA Turnaround Assessment Coordinator on a fulltime basis. This individual will also provide direction in the development of a systematic formative evaluation system in all targeted schools. (Begin Summer 2010) Periodic reviews will be implemented to assess program effectiveness with targeted subgroups and schools. (Review on a minimum of 4 times per year)

	some programs based on data. The response to intervention model has been used in all schools on a sporadic basis. Professional development in special education has targeted special education personnel as the LEA moves to an inclusion model. The Limited English Proficient Students have been a central focus for two years following ADE's Office of English Language Acquisition Services (OELAS) direction by developing a comprehensive program for teachers. The 4 hour language Block is in its second year. The LEA ELL PD has been described by OELAS as exemplary. The use of technology for student and teacher use is limited. Elementary schools have computer labs but budget constraints did not allow the LEA to continue hiring computer lab teachers. Schools with 7th and 8th grades students each utilize two	The LEA Turnaround office will develop and monitor an RTI program in cooperation with targeted schools. (2009-2010 school year) PD targeting special education students will be developed and implemented during the 2009-10 school year with assistance the ADE, the special education department and consultants. Focus on the Special Education subgroup is a priority. Continue the focus on ELL students with program reviews for students that do not progress in their English proficiency. Purchase mobile computer labs with appropriate equipment to use in classrooms. PD will be provided for teachers in the effective use of the equipment. At the 7th and 8th grade schools purchase of computer labs is critical for use in ELL

	computer lab teachers. In the 7th and 8th grade, ELL students are not scheduled into the computer lab programs because of scheduling conflicts with the 4 hour block and state course requirements. The majority of classrooms have two computers for student use. They do have access to computer labs. Most classroom teachers have asked for more technology professional development. Schedules and strategies have increased learning time at all schools. Students in grades K-6 exceed state instructional minute requirements. Leadership Team has been established for the SIG application process. Comprehensive Site Assessments at all schools have been conducted.	classrooms with appropriate professional development.(Fall 2010) Provide professional development for classroom teachers in the use of technology for improving student achievement and addressing state technology standards. (Fall 2010) Extend the school day in targeted school with compensation for teachers and support staff. (Fall 2010). The transformational reading program being designed by outside consultants in collaboration with LEA and school leadership teams will maximize available instructional minutes. Written action steps and written reports to include monitoring of implementation by principal and team (Summer 2010 for Action Step Development and Monthly Written reports by Principals and Consultants) More effective sustainability plans will be developed and implemented that include leadership coaching of teachers, a plan to transfer teacher's skill in reflection and self-efficacy, and transition plans for 3 years.

	School Leadership Teams have been Established from each grade level or department. Teams meet monthly at a minimum. Agendas are used at each meeting to evaluate grade level and individual teacher progress Teams analyze data and interpret results Capacity building is a district focus Turnaround School Improvement (TSI) Director has been employed. (May 2010) Use of ADE approved Mentors for principals	(Summer 2010) Stipends for Team Planning, data analysis, and review of implementation and program effectiveness. (Summer 2010) Plan and Implement a LEA Turnaround School Improvement Office to include the existing TSI Director, Turnaround Data Director/Coordinator/Coach, Turnaround Academic Advisor; FIAT Part-time Coordinator, FIAT full time clerk (Plan summer 2010, employ Sept. 2010) Hire Turnaround Mentors on a consultant basis for School Improvement by working with LEA Turnaround office and School Principals. (Summer 2010) Summer Academies such as the Data Summit for opportunities for consultants/specialists to guide work on school improvement initiatives. (Summer 2010 and on a quarterly basis or more if plan is justified) Employment of Turnaround Coaches in Tier I and Tier III schools. Summer 2010) Hire Curriculum Consultants to assist in the development, expansion or refinement of

	Classroom walk-throughs (not scheduled) Principals use of individual walk-throughs Every teacher is visited at least once a week.	existing programs. Hire consultants to monitor, coach administrators and teachers in the improvement of instruction and monitoring of programs. Principals will develop a schedule of classroom observations and walk-throughs Use of an established protocol that includes elements of effective instruction (elementary and middle school forms)
Describe the process the LEA will use to screen and select quality external providers;	The LEA will bid out services required and review all bids submitted. Awards will be based on previous successful experiences, competency and experiential level of consultants/services, recommendations/references, cost of services, knowledge of the school improvement process. The LEA Governing Board will award the bids.	Utilize the bid process for outside services for Curriculum development and professional development LEA principal mentors Program Consultants in math, reading, ELL Monitoring of ESEA Improvement Plans and SIG Grants
Alignment of other resources;	Presently all available funding is focusing on the LEA Comprehensive Plan and existing ASIP's with major principal input into all federal and state entitlement programs.	All funds for the 2010-11 school years will be focused on the Revised LEA Comprehensive Plan, the new ESEA Improvement Plans and the approved SIG funds.
Policies and Practices LEA will modify to enable its schools to implement the selected	Comprehensive needs assessments made at each school by school leadership teams and LEA	Major involvement by school administrators in development of their individual school

intervention(s) fully and effectively	leadership teams. No definitive school improvement model used in LEA schools. Only schools identified as Failing Schools received major incentives for one principal and 4 Turnaround Coaches. Performance pay requirements have been minimal. School Improvement Office consists of one person.	SIGs. Major monitoring of SIGs for approved schools. Use of the Transformational Model in Tier I School (Gadsden Elem. School) and Tier III School (San Luis Middle School) with the remainder of Tier III schools using major components of the Transformational model. Transformational model will allow a comprehensive performance based incentive system based on student achievement and teacher and school performance in approved schools. Two Tier III Schools will participate in the TAP Schools initiative with Arizona State University providing extensive professional development and pay for performance incentives. Major LEA Turnaround Office Expansion to be coordinated by existing Turnaround School Improvement Director: Turnaround Data Coach/Director; Turnaround Assessment Developer and Coordinator Coach; a dedicated Turnaround Office Secretary; Turnaround Academic Advisor; Turnaround FIAT Coordinator and clerk.

	Targeted school leadership teams involvement in ASIP development has been minimally effective.	Major school leadership team and LEA planning for SIG grant development and monitoring of approved grants and ESEA grants.

C. ROOT CAUSES

How did we get to this place?

After the data, including information on capacity, has been analyzed the LEA must determine the root causes from the results. Based on the analyzed information, examine possible reasons for current level of performance. This requires the LEA to move from problem identification to problem solving.

C.1 Provide the conclusions the LEA has reached, that is based on the analyzed data from the previous section.

- Include the data used for analysis, the observations, findings, identified root causes, and conclusions reached by the team.

- **Limited use of technology in all LEA classrooms**
- **Middle school ELL students receive no technology lab instruction**
- **Extreme need for professional development for certified staff in the area of technology for improving student performance**
- **ELL subgroups show minimal progress from year to year when comparing the same grade level in reading and mathematics**
- **Special Education Subgroups show inadequate annual progress in reading and mathematics**
- **The All students subgroup show inadequate progress in reading in all levels**
- **LEA has limited capacity for supporting Tier I and Tier III schools without ADE assistance**
- **LEA pay for performance process and availability of incentives is extremely limited with available funding sources**
- **Parental involvement and input has been improved through the ARRA Parent Involvement Program which ends in June 2010**
- **Tier I and High priority Tier III schools require more assistance and funding at the school level**
- **Comprehensive Benchmark System Assessment provide excellent student data, but must be utilize assessment revisions**
- **The scoring process for the Benchmark System is not timely because of the present software**
- **Formative assessment development is fragmented and their impact is not clear**
- **Planning over a three year time span with the possibility of $2,000,000 per site completely changes the improvement process for the LEA and School Sites**
- **More Highly Qualified Teachers are needed at Southwest Junior High and San Luis Middle School (both are Tier III schools)**
- **Exemplary programs (Odyssey of the Mind, ACT preparation, students attending Johns Hopkins programs in various Universities, 7th and 8th grade students enrolling and succeeding in college Mathematics, English and Drama courses has very limited funding**

C.2 Identify the strengths, needs and barriers of the LEA and schools.

Student Strengths	***System Strengths***	***Student Needs***	***System Needs***	***School Barriers***	***District Barriers***
Motivated to learn	Student Centered	More exposure to technology	More effective ways to measure ELL and Special Ed. Student Progress	Lack of technology in classrooms	Supplementary funds for Tier I and Tier III Schools is non-existent at his time
Most are bilingual	Data Driven Decisions	More English Language Development	Shorten Benchmark Process from 2 weeks to 1 week	Lack of PD for classroom teachers in computer technology	Existing Turnaround Office is understaffed
Respectful students	Equity in funding schools (all sources)	More exposure to English in the community	More effective reading programs for ELL and Spec Ed Students	Developing and using effective formative assessments	Recruitment of HQ Teachers in 7th and 8th grade
Students value education	Driven administrators	More exposure to mainstream culture	More effective reading and math programs for FFB and approaching students	Ineffective use of every available instructional minute	Inadequate funding to reduce teacher/pupil ratios
Students meet expectations set	Positive Leadership Supportive Governing Board	More reading comprehensions	Instructional time to address all state standards and areas	Lack of classroom space	Reduced state funding ordinarily used for instructional materials and employee salaries

C.3 Provide an outline of the steps the district will take to address the needs and barriers of the school, as well as, the district's needs and barriers in supporting this school.

District Barriers:

1. Apply for SIG Supplementary funds for Tier I and Tier III Schools
2. Create and staff an effective Turnaround Office using available resources, included SIG funds
3. Recruitment of HQ Teachers in 7th and 8th grade by using financial incentives and more targeted recruitment
4. Reduce teacher/pupil ratios in targeted schools with any available funding
5. Purchase instructional materials identified by LEA and school sites using all available funding, including SIG funds

School Barriers

1. Expand the existing LEA Technology to expand technology available for student use in the classroom using available funding
2. Provide PD for classroom teachers in the use of technology to raise student achievement
3. Utilize a LEA Turnaround Data Coach/coordinator to assist teachers in developing an effective formative assessment process

4. Continue the development the Transformational Reading Program and PD which focuses on maximum use of instructional time
5. The lack of additional classroom space and expanded instructional areas is beyond existing or projected funds

C.4 Identify the intervention model that is chosen for each Tier I and/or Tier II school. Provide a brief justification - including how student achievement will be improved by this model.

Tier 1 School Gadsden Elementary School will use the Transformation Model:

The Transformation Model was the preferred choice because of the congruence with existing LEA practices and the removal of the present principal. The Transformation Model Blueprint, if implemented effectively, along with the newly assigned principal, will assist us in improving student achievement, raise teacher expectation and effectiveness (See attachment 16)

. Gadsden Elementary will serve as a model within a three year period.

D. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

D.1 Identify each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA *commits to serve* and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school. (The model is identified after the team analyzes the data, identifies the schools' needs and examines LEA capacity to serve the school.)

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	INTERVENTION MODEL CHOSEN			
				turnaround	restart	closure	transformation
Gadsden Elementary School	040324000250	X					X

D.2 Prioritize, by need, the district's TIER III schools:

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	AYP Designation	Area of Need(s) Based on 2009 AIMS Assessment
San Luis Middle School	040324001101	Failing to meet academic standards	7th grade "Math" - All students/H/ELL/Low SES 7th grade "Reading" – All students/H/ELL/Low SES 8th grade "Math" – ELL 8th grade "Reading" – All students/H/ELL/Low SES

Rio Colorado Elementary	040324001213	Performing Plus	3rd grade "Math" – All students/H/ELL/Low SES 3rd grade "Reading" – All students/H/ELL/Low SES
Southwest Junior High School	040324002388	Performing Plus	7th grade "Reading" – ELL 8th grade "Reading" - ELL
Desert View Elementary	040324003116	Performing Plus	6th grade "Reading" - ELL
Arizona Desert Elementary	040324001806	Performing Plus	3rd grade "Reading" – All students/H/ELL/Low SES 4th grade "Math" – All students/H/ELL/Low SES 4th grade "Reading" – All students/H/ELL/Low SES 6th grade "Reading" - ELL
Cesar Chavez Elementary	040324003066	Performing Plus	6th grade "Math" – ELL 6th grade "Reading" - ELL

D.3 If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I and/or Tier II school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each school:

E. LEA'S ACCOUNTABILITY

E.1 Describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading, math and or graduation rate that have been established in order to monitor the Tier I and Tier II schools. Using the Analysis of Data completed in A.3., complete the following for each Tier I and/or Tier II school being served:

Tier 1: Gadsden Elementary School

Goal Area	Goals	Baseline
Reading	Goal: 1A Reading/Language Arts Proficiency – as measured by 2010 AIMS Reading, the Gadsden School District will: Increase the Meets and Exceeds category of students by 10%, Decrease the falls far below/approaches category of students by 15%, and decrease the falls far below/approaches category of ELL and special education student sub group by 10%.	Students not meeting AYP: All 72% ELL 95% Sped 99%
Math	Goal: 1B Mathematics Proficiency – As measured by 2010 AIMS Math, the Gadsden School District will increase the number of students in the meets and exceeds to: 3rd grade: 63%, 4th grade: 64%, 5th grade: 54%, 6th grade: 55%, 7th grade: 59%, 8th grade: 64%. Decrease the falls far below/approaches category of ELL and Special Education student sub groups by 10%. Benchmark assessment is being to the new Math Standards.	Students not meeting AYP: All 62% ELL 88% Sped 93%
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)	N/A	N/A

For each Goal in:	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person(s) Responsible
	Process	Timeline	
Reading	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis
Math	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans,	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis

	Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan		
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)	N/A		

Tier III School Priority 1: San Luis Middle Schools

For each Goal in:	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person(s) Responsible
	Process	Timeline	
Reading	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis
Math	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)	N/A		

Tier III School Priority 2: Rio Colorado Elementary

For each Goal in:	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person(s) Responsible
	Process	Timeline	
Reading	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis
Math	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis

	oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan		
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)	N/A		

Tier III Priority 3 School: Southwest Junior High

For each Goal in:	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person(s) Responsible
	Process	Timeline	
Reading	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis
Math	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)	N/A		

Tier III Priority 4 School: Desert View Elementary

For each Goal in:	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person(s) Responsible
	Process	Timeline	
Reading	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis
Math	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans,	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis

	Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan		
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)	N/A		

For each Goal in:	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person(s) Responsible
	Process	Timeline	
Reading	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis
Math	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)	N/A		

Tier III Priority 5 School: Arizona Desert

For each Goal in:	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person(s) Responsible
	Process	Timeline	
Reading	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis
Math	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis

	oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan		
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)	N/A		

Tier III Priority 6 School: Cesar Chavez

For each Goal in:	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person(s) Responsible
	Process	Timeline	
Reading	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis
Math	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)	N/A		

For each Goal in:	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person(s) Responsible
	Process	Timeline	
Reading	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis
Math	Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans,	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis

	Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan		
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)	N/A		

E.2 Using the prioritized list developed in D.2, provide a detailed description of the support that the LEA will provide for each Tier III school. Include the interventions provided by level of need.

School	Level of Need			Describe LEA Support (Internal and/or External) Funded and non-Funded support	Timeline
	Highest	Medium	Lowest		
Gadsden Elem	X			Development of assessments, Parent Involvement, monitoring of plans, external consultants for monitoring progress, external consultants for program development and professional development, internal professional development supporting all areas identified, data analysis, support in the development of new ESEA Improvement Plans, effective budget planning over a 3-5 year period, pay for performance and incentive plan development, recruitment of highly qualified teachers, data analysis, evaluation of program effectiveness, more effective use of instructional minutes, progress monitoring of students and teachers, administrative support, TAP rubric training for administrators and targeted sites' teachers, ASU leadership training and support, ASU certification program for Teaching Assistants working towards their in education, LEA Turnaround Office Assistance as needed or requested.	Throughout school year beginning summer 2010
San Luis Middle School	X			Development of assessments, Parent Involvement, monitoring of plans, external consultants for monitoring progress, external consultants for program development and professional development, internal professional development supporting all areas identified, data	Throughout school year beginning summer 2010

				analysis, support in the development of new ESEA Improvement Plans, effective budget planning over a 3-5 year period, pay for performance and incentive plan development, recruitment of highly qualified teachers, data analysis, evaluation of program effectiveness, more effective use of instructional minutes, progress monitoring of students and teachers, administrative support, TAP rubric training for administrators and targeted sites' teachers, ASU leadership training and support, ASU certification program for Teaching Assistants working towards their in education, LEA Turnaround Office Assistance as needed or requested.	
Arizona Desert Elem	X			Development of assessments, Parent Involvement, monitoring of plans, external consultants for monitoring progress, external consultants for program development and professional development, internal professional development supporting all areas identified, data analysis, support in the development of new ESEA Improvement Plans, effective budget planning over a 3-5 year period, pay for performance and incentive plan development, recruitment of highly qualified teachers, data analysis, evaluation of program effectiveness, more effective use of instructional minutes, progress monitoring of students and teachers, administrative support, TAP rubric training for administrators and targeted sites' teachers, ASU leadership training and support, ASU certification program for Teaching Assistants working towards their in education, LEA Turnaround Office Assistance as needed or requested.	Throughout school year beginning summer 2010
Rio Colorado Elem	X			Development of assessments, Parent Involvement, monitoring of plans, external consultants for monitoring progress, external consultants for program development and professional development, internal professional development supporting all areas identified, data analysis, support in the development of new ESEA Improvement Plans, effective budget planning over a 3-	Throughout school year beginning summer 2010

				5 year period, pay for performance and incentive plan development, recruitment of highly qualified teachers, data analysis, evaluation of program effectiveness, more effective use of instructional minutes, progress monitoring of students and teachers, administrative support, TAP rubric training for administrators and targeted sites' teachers, ASU leadership training and support, ASU certification program for Teaching Assistants working towards their in education, LEA Turnaround Office Assistance as needed or requested.	
Southwest Junior High	X			Development of assessments, Parent Involvement, monitoring of plans, external consultants for monitoring progress, external consultants for program development and professional development, internal professional development supporting all areas identified, data analysis, support in the development of new ESEA Improvement Plans, effective budget planning over a 3-5 year period, pay for performance and incentive plan development, recruitment of highly qualified teachers, data analysis, evaluation of program effectiveness, more effective use of instructional minutes, progress monitoring of students and teachers, administrative support, TAP rubric training for administrators and targeted sites' teachers, ASU leadership training and support, ASU certification program for Teaching Assistants working towards their in education, LEA Turnaround Office Assistance as needed or requested.	Throughout school year beginning summer 2010
Desert View Elem	X			Development of assessments, Parent Involvement, monitoring of plans, external consultants for monitoring progress, external consultants for program development and professional development, internal professional development supporting all areas identified, data analysis, support in the development of new ESEA Improvement Plans, effective budget planning over a 3-5 year period, pay for performance and incentive plan development, recruitment of highly qualified teachers,	Throughout school year beginning summer 2010

				data analysis, evaluation of program effectiveness, more effective use of instructional minutes, progress monitoring of students and teachers, administrative support, TAP rubric training for administrators and targeted sites' teachers, ASU leadership training and support, ASU certification program for Teaching Assistants working towards their in education, LEA Turnaround Office Assistance as needed or requested.	
Arizona Desert Elem	X			Development of assessments, Parent Involvement, monitoring of plans, external consultants for monitoring progress, external consultants for program development and professional development, internal professional development supporting all areas identified, data analysis, support in the development of new ESEA Improvement Plans, effective budget planning over a 3-5 year period, pay for performance and incentive plan development, recruitment of highly qualified teachers, data analysis, evaluation of program effectiveness, more effective use of instructional minutes, progress monitoring of students and teachers, administrative support, TAP rubric training for administrators and targeted sites' teachers, ASU leadership training and support, ASU certification program for Teaching Assistants working towards their in education, LEA Turnaround Office Assistance as needed or requested.	Throughout school year beginning summer 2010

E.3 Describe the annual goals the LEA has established in order to hold accountable your Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.

Goal Area	Goals	Baseline	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person Responsible
			Process	Timeline	
Reading/Language Arts	Goal: 1A Reading/Language Arts Proficiency As measured by 2010		Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis

	AIMS Reading, the Gadsden School District will: Increase the Meets and Exceeds category of students by 10% and decrease the falls far below/approaches category of students by 15% and decrease the falls far below/approaches category of ELL and Special Education student sub groups by 10%. (See attachment 17-Comprehensive Plan)		principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan		
Math	Goal: 1B Mathematics Proficiency – as measured by 2010 AIMS Math, the Gadsden School District will increase the number of students in the meets and exceeds to: 3rd grade: 63%, 4th grade: 64%, 5th grade: 54%, 6th grade: 55%, 7th grade:		Quarterly Bench Mark Assessments and Review, Monthly Formative Assessments and reviews, Monthly consultant progress of ESEA plans, Weekly monitoring by principals, Use of LEA Turnaround Office to oversee and be involved in development of a total monitoring plan	Quarterly, Monthly, Weekly	Dr. Jerry R. Lewis

	59%, 8th grade: 64%. Decrease the falls far below/approaches category of ELL and Special Education student sub group by 10%. Benchmarks are being aligned to the new Math Standards. (See attachment 18)				
Graduation Rate					

E.4 Describe the LEA's technical assistance plan for schools that do not achieve the progress that is expected.

The LEA Turnaround Office and other LEA Administrators will meet throughout the school year to implement corrective practices for schools as needed. ADE may be utilized as a support agency. Consultants and mentors may also be identified to assist the schools in need of this assistance. Through constant review and discussions with school administrators and the LEA Turnaround Office of the Quarterly Assessments and regular and more frequent formatives, walkthroughs and observations, action will be proactive.

F. BUDGET

F. Using the Budget Excel spreadsheet, provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to –

- Implement all components of the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.

An LEA's budget must cover the period of availability (3 years), including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve.
An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by $2,000,000.

****Attach LEA budget as an appendix.**

G. SUSTAINABILITY

G. Describe your plan for sustaining these efforts after the funding period ends? Address in your plan: funding sources, hiring practices, professional development, changes in policies and practices.

Professional development will be absorbed by reallocation of available funds. All available funds will be used for continuing salaries/stipends, positions, hiring practices. Changes in policies and practice should continue within available funds. The LEA will continue applying for outside funding, etc.21st Century Grants, Federal Grants for special populations and subject areas.

H. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in it application for a School Improvement Grant.

By indicating with a mark on the below items, the _____Gadsden Elementary School District #32_____ fully and completely assures that it will:

X☐ Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;

X☐ Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;

☐ If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and

X☐ Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements

I. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

Arizona Department of Education has applied, through its SEA level application, for all of the Waivers offered for the School Improvement Grant. If Arizona receives approval for these waivers, all waivers automatically apply to any LEA in the state.

The LEA must indicate each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

____Gadsden Elementary School District #32 will implement the below marked waivers:

X☐ Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds. School(s): _All schools

☐ "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model. School(s): _____

☐ Implementing a school wide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold. School(s): _____

J. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: The LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement intervention models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

J. Before submitting its application for School Improvement Grant, the LEA must consult with all relevant stakeholders.

The LEA has consulted with the following stakeholders:

Gadsden Elementary District #32 School Board	**Gadsden Elementary School District #32 Leadership Team**	**All site principals**
Parents of Tier 1 school (Gadsden)	**District Leadership Team (Gadsden School)**	**Site Leadership Teams**

STEP 2: COMPLETE PLANNING TEMPLATE ON ALEAT

K. The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take during the 2010-2011 school year to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II schools identified in the LEA's application.

To be completed in ALEAT Plan

STEP 3: COMPLETE BUDGET ON GRANTS MANAGEMENT

L. The LEA must complete the budget information on ADE's Grant Management System.