

Florida Department of Education



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: J.A. Crookshank Elementary	District Name: St. Johns County
Principal: Jay Willets	Superintendent: Dr. Joyner
SAC Chair: Karle Hunter	Date of School Board Approval: 11/13/2012

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

[School Grades Trend Data](#) (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

Administrators

List your school’s administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
----------	------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Principal	Jay Willets	<p>BA-Elementary Education</p> <p>BA-Exceptional Student Education</p> <p>MA-Educational Admin.</p> <p>Plus an add-on certificate in Principalship</p> <p>Mr. Willets passed the FELE, FTCE, and a CLAST exam required for the State of Florida and is entering his nineteenth year as an educator in the St. Johns County School District.</p>	6	10	<p>Principal of Crookshank ES in 2008-2009: Grade A</p> <p>Principal of Crookshank ES in 2009-2010: Grade B</p> <p>Principal of Crookshank ES in 2010-2011: Grade B Reading Mastery: 72%, Math Mastery: 74%, Science Mastery:69%, Writing Mastery 80% AYP: CES met 78% of the subgroup proficiency categories to correct two statuses.</p> <p>Principal of Crookshank ES in 2011-2012 Grade: C Reading Mastery: 54% Math Mastery: 48% Science Mastery: 45% Writing Mastery: 58% AYP: CES</p>
-----------	-------------	---	---	----	---

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Assistant Principal	Esther Seward	BA-Business Administration MA-Mathematics Education SPC-Educational Leadership	2	5	Assistant Principal of Cunningham Creek ES in 2010-2011: School Grade: A Reading Mastery: 96% Math Mastery: 97% Science Mastery: 79% Writing Mastery: 96% AYP: Cunningham made AYP for the 2010-2011 school year. Assistant Principal of Crookshank Elementary ES in 2011-2012 School Grade: C Reading Mastery: 54% Math Mastery: 48% Science Mastery: 45% Writing Mastery: 58% AYP:
---------------------	---------------	--	---	---	---

Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
--------------	------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>Reading and Math Instructional Literacy Coach</p>	<p>Julia Shatto</p>	<p>B.A. Elementary Education Reading Endorsed</p>	<p>12</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Literacy Coach of Crookshank ES in 2011-2012 Grade: C Reading Mastery: 54% Math Mastery: 48% Science Mastery: 45% Writing Mastery: 58% AYP: CES</p> <p>Literacy Coach of CES in 2010-2011: Grade B, Reading Mastery: 72%, Math Mastery: 74%, Science Mastery: 69%, Writing Mastery 80% AYP: CES met 78% of the subgroup proficiency categories to correct two statuses.</p> <p>Literacy Coach for Crookshank ES in 2009-2010 Grade: B Reading Mastery: 74% Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 45% Writing Mastery: 81% AYP: CES met 87% of the subgroup proficiency categories to maintain Corrective 1 status.</p> <p>3rd Grade Instructor at Crookshank ES in 2008-2009: Grade B, Reading Mastery: 70%, Math Mastery: 70%, Science Mastery: 22%, Writing Mastery 75% AYP: CES met 87% of the subgroup proficiency categories to maintain Corrective 1 status. This is a 5% increase over the 2007-08 School Year.</p>
--	---------------------	---	-----------	----------	---

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

					3rd Grade Instructor in 2007-2008: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 81%, Math Mastery: 71%, Science Mastery:46% Writing Mastery: 59%, AYP: CES met 82% of the subgroup proficiency categories to maintain Corrective 1 status.

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Utilization of district PATS program	Jay Willets	Upon Posting
2. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Assistant Principal	On-going
3.		
4.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
52	4%(3)	33%(17)	57%(30)	6%(3)	16%(8)	100%(52)	20%(10)	12%(6)	52%(27)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Amanda Wolfe	Fiorella M. Verastegui	New Teacher	Daily mentorship of FCIM and classroom strategies implementation
Amanda Wolfe	Kayla Noftell	New Teacher	Daily mentorship of FCIM and classroom strategies implementation

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Cathy Werner	Bethany Hilbert	New Teacher	Daily mentorship of FCIM and classroom strategies implementation
Karle Hunter	Kristina Acosta	New to St. Johns County	Daily mentorship of FCIM and classroom strategies implementation
Renatta Russell	Christina Lemely	New to St. Johns County	Daily mentorship of FCIM and classroom strategies implementation
Rachel Preysz	Amber Veniard	New to Crookshank	Daily mentorship of FCIM and classroom strategies implementation

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

<p>Title I, Part A John A. Crookshank Elementary is a Title I-School-wide model due to the nearly 68% poverty rate as measured by the free and reduced lunch population. This federal program is coordinated under the direction of district Title I administration under the lead of Mr. George Leidigh and his staff. All compliance measures are implemented and documented through the Title I Work Papers and the St. Johns County School District County Administration. Superintendent Joseph Joyner and Special Programs Director Meredith Strickland meet with all Title I schools regularly to ensure compliance in meeting AYP/NCLB standards and benchmarks. Title I and II services also supported state and local curriculum services with the inclusion of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model staff in-service, Melissa Forney Writing workshop, Just Read Florida! Support and SJC District Fidelity Check programs. In addition, CES will be participating in a pilot program sponsored by Title IV to implement an anti-bullying campaign in conjunction with Safe and Drug-Free Schools. John A Crookshank also participates in Supplemental education services (SES) tutoring and extended school year services through the Title I initiative. Two other state supported programs are the Multi-Tiered Systems Approach (MTSS/RTI/MTSS) and the Positive Behavior Support (PBS) systems that are founded and cultivated by the University of South Florida. John A Crookshank Elementary school also has a local partnership with the St. Johns County Public Libraries to provide books and resources to students after school and during the summer with the “Book-mobile” project.</p>
<p>Title I, Part C- Migrant Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure student needs are met. These services are provided and monitored by SJCS D Student Services in conjunction with CES guidance and administration.</p>
<p>Title I, Part D</p>
<p>Title II CES receives Title II funds through district allocations based on FTE and program needs. Title II funds are spent on FCIM curriculum planning and leadership programing during the summer for the following school year.</p>
<p>Title III Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.</p>
<p>Title X- Homeless District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.</p>

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) CES will utilize the projected SAI funds through the use of targeted intervention materials (RAZ Kids, Reflex Math, Worldly Wise) during and after the school day to work with our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students as identified through FAIR and formative and summative assessments in grades K-3. In addition, SAI funds will also be used to extend our learning hours by providing transportation for after school tutoring as well as paying for instructional staff during this time.</p> <p>Students will be identified through summative CIM assessments and formative state and county benchmark tests. Children located in the lowest 25% in reading, math and behavior will be targeted for this extended learning opportunity. Due to the increased funding allocation, transportation will be provided to assist in the probability that our “at-risk” population will be able to attend after school activities for family convenience.</p>
<p>Violence Prevention Programs The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program that incorporates field trips, community service, and counseling. Through the implementation of the Positive Behavior Support (PBS) system, all behavioral data is tracked and monitored in order to implement effective strategies that target minor behaviors in the early stages. CES has a Behavioral Specialist who works directly with the students and staff in order to assist with the behavioral needs of our campus. CES also has a PCM response team who operates under state and district guidelines with the support and direction of a district Behavior Specialist, Ms. Cinda Grimes.</p>
<p>Nutrition Programs In addition to the CCSS focus on health and nutrition at every grade level, CES continuously applies for school garden grants as well as receiving supplemental nutritional programs from state and local agencies. The University of Florida Family Nutrition Program and the St. Johns County Agriculture Extension Office also develops curriculum, presentations, and training on how to provide healthier nutritional options for elementary school children. These supplemental garden and instructional support programs are underpinned by a renewed healthier options focus by St. Johns County School District Food Services Department.</p>
<p>Housing Programs</p>
<p>Head Start CES hosts one of four District Head Start early childhood transition programs. With two instructional houses serving approximately 36 pre-school aged students, Head Start services provide transitional services for our most needy students and families. In addition to classroom instruction, Head Start staff provides parental involvement through monthly events that assist in family inclusionary services with the community. Head start also participates with the Pre-K clinic in early identification of students’ difficulties in such a way that there is sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.</p>
<p>Adult Education N/A</p>
<p>Career and Technical Education N/A</p>
<p>Job Training N/A</p>

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Other

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RTI/MTSS)

School-Based MTSS/RTI/MTSS Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Behavior Specialist-District and School, Guidance, Literacy Coach, Title I Instructor, MTSS/RTI/MTSS Coach, Psychologist, Principal, Assistant Principal and LEA for CES. Principal and Assistant Principal: Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, which ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS/RTI/MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS/RTI/MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RTI/MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS/RTI/MTSS plans and activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teacher: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Instructional Coaches: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Reading Instructional Specialist and Title I Instructor: Provides guidance on K-5 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation Tier I, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologists: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systematic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The Leadership Team will focus meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our schools, our teachers, and in our students?

The team meets every Wednesday to engage in the following activities:

Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress-monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RTI/MTSS problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The John A. Crookshank instructional staff has been participating in the MTSS/RTI/MTSS pilot program with the University of South Florida for the past six (6) years. Through this training, the Instructional Leadership Team has assisted in the cultivation of the FCIM process that includes instructional focus calendars with enrichment and remediation components. Based on assessment probes developed from this process, instructional staff members have implemented the PDCA protocol under the guidance of the MTSS/RTI/MTSS program. Through the ILT core trainings with USF, baseline and maintenance training programs have been implemented throughout the past four years with the assistance of an on-site MTSS/RTI/MTSS Coach and Instructional and support staff have been trained in the use and application of the MTSS/RTI/MTSS instructional and monitoring process. To assist in the implementation and support for the instructional staff, weekly meetings and monthly trainings have been established based on FCIM data and instructor needs.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Baseline data: :Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessment of Instructional Reading (FAIR), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)

Progress Monitoring: PMRN, FCAT Simulation Discovery Education , FAIR, DRA(Diagnostic Reading Assessment)

Midyear: Discovery Education , FCAT Simulation tests, FAIR, DRA(Diagnostic Reading Assessment)

End of Year: FCAT, DRA, FAIR, Discovery Education

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The John A. Crookshank instructional staff has been participating in the MTSS/RTI/MTSS pilot program with the University of South Florida for the past six (6) years. Through this training, the Instructional Leadership Team has assisted in the cultivation of the FCIM process that includes instructional focus calendars with enrichment and remediation components. Based on assessment probes developed from this process, instructional staff has implemented the PDCA protocol under the guidance of the MTSS/RTI/MTSS program. Through the ILT core trainings with USF, baseline and maintenance training programs have been implemented throughout the past 6 years with the assistance of an on-site MTSS/RTI/MTSS Coach (Lorna Kirkam) Instructional and support staff have been trained in the use and application of the MTSS/RTI/MTSS instructional and monitoring process. To assist in the implementation and support for the instructional staff, weekly meetings and monthly trainings have been established based on FCIM data and instructor needs.

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

CES will support the new MTSS support system through the coordination and support of the MTSS Team and district Student Support Services in-service options. Weekly meetings will be documented for efficiency, accuracy and compliance with school, district and state expectations. Through maintaining the level of varied support professionals along with the use of electronic data storage, the MTSS system will be continuously reviewed each week and annually with the support of the University of South Florida MTSS support programs.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

Behavior Specialist, Guidance, Literacy Coach, Title I Instructor, MTSS/RTI/MTSS Coach, Psychologist, Principal, Assistant Principal and LEA for CES.

Principal and Assistant Principal: Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, which ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS/RTI/MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS/RTI/MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RTI/MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS/RTI/MTSS plans and activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teacher: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Instructional Coaches: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Reading Instructional Specialist and Title I Instructor: Provides guidance on K-5 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation Tier I, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologists: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systematic patterns of student need with respect to language skills

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The Leadership Team will focus meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our schools, our teachers, and in our students?

The team meets every Wednesday to engage in the following activities:

Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

Leadership team reviewed instructional data through FLDOE FCIM format to determine instructional goals. The team will also concentrate on supporting teachers with instructional strategies to differentiate instruction and to meet the needs of all subgroups and the lowest 25% of students.

The team provided the School Advisory Council (SAC) data used to develop the SIP. Data provided: Tier I,2,and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addresses; helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures.

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

***Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition**

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

John A. Crookshank Elementary School is participating in Voluntary Pre-K (VPK) along with Head Start programming. Students will be exposed to Pre-School curriculum in an effort to improve transition into the formal learning environment.

***Grades 6-12 Only** Sec. 1003.413 (2) (b) F.S

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

****High Schools Only***

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2) (g), (2) (j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#).

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student						

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	<p>IA.1. High mobility rate of students</p> <p>High percentage of ESE students.</p> <p>Teachers with less than five years of classroom experience.</p>	<p>IA.1. Tier I: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing FAIR assessment data, FCAT data and Discovery Education data for all students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/interventions within 90 minute reading block.</p>	<p>IA.1. Principal, Reading coach, Case manager and RTI/MTSS Team</p>	<p>IA.1. Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p> <p>IA.2. Discovery Education Data will be used to progress monitor student growth and achievement levels.</p>	<p>IA.1. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education data will also be used to monitor progress.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #1A:</u> <i>Using on-going progress monitoring and differentiated instruction, John A Crookshank Elementary school teachers will work to improve the number of students performing on grade level in reading by two percent.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	26% (72)	29% (74)					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>1A.1. High mobility rate of students</p> <p>High percentage of ESE students.</p> <p>Teachers with less than five years of classroom experience.</p>	<p>Tier II: Plan supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.</p>	<p>Principal, Reading coach, Case manager and RTI/MTSS Team</p>	<p>Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p> <p>Discovery Education data will be used to progress monitor student growth and achievement levels.</p>	<p>1A.2. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education data will also be used to monitor progress</p>	
		<p>1A.1. High mobility rate of students</p> <p>High percentage of ESE students.</p> <p>Teachers with less than five years of classroom experience.</p>	<p>Tier III: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core.</p> <p>Supplemental Education Services (SES) and Extended School Year (ESY) are offered to appropriate student populations in the fall, spring, and summer through district and SAI funding.</p>	<p>Principal, Reading coach, Case manager and RTI/MTSS Team</p>	<p>Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p> <p>Discovery Education Data will be used to progress monitor student growth and achievement levels.</p>	<p>FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education data will also be used to monitor progress</p>	
<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</p>							
<p>Reading Goal #1B:</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1. High mobility rate Diverse classrooms and student needs	2A.1. Tier I: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing FAIR assessment data for all students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within 90 minute reading block.	2A.1. Principal, Reading coach Principal, Reading coach , RTI/ MTSS Team, Case Manager	2A.1. Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.	2A.1. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will be used to determine growth		
Reading Goal #2A: <i>Faculty and staff at John A Crookshank Elementary will work to increase the DSS scores of students who remain at a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT by one percent. This will be done through differentiated instruction and enrichment during whole group and small group instruction time</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	28%(76)	31%(79)					

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		2A.2. High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience.	2A.2 Tier II: Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice	2A.2. .Principal, Reading coach Principal, Reading coach , RTI/ MTSS Team, Case Manager	2A.2. Student progress is assessed using FAIR OPM every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 2 supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.	2A.2. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will be used to determine growth	
		2A.3. High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience.	2A.3. Tier III: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core.	2A.3. Principal, Reading coach Principal, Reading coach , RTI/ MTSS Team, Case Manager	2A.3. Student progress is assessed using FAIR OPM every 20 days and/or DIBELS data bi-weekly for all students receiving Tier 3 targeted intervention. Adequate progress is determined by comparing student's trend line to aim line.	2A.3. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will be used to determine growth	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Reading Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3A.1 High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience.	3A.1. Tier I: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing FAIR assessment data for all Students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within 90 minute reading block.	3A.1. Principal, Reading coach , RTI/MTSS/MTSS Team, Case Manager	3A.1. Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.	3A.1. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will be used to determine growth.		
Reading Goal #3A: <i>John A Crookshank ES will work to increase the amount of students making learning gains in grades 4 and 5 by concentrating on differentiated instruction in whole and small group instruction.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	69%(195)	72%(217)					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		3A.2. High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience.	3A.2. Tier II: Plan supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.	3A.2. Principal, Reading coach , RTI/MTSS Team, Case Manager	3A.2. Student progress is assessed using FAIR OPM every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 2 supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.	3A.2. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will be used to determine growth	
		3A.3. High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience.	3A.3. Tier III: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction.	3A.3. Principal, Reading coach , RTI/MTSS Team, Case Manager	3A.3. Student progress is assessed using FAIR OPM every 20 days and/or DIBELS data bi-weekly for all students receiving Tier 3 targeted intervention. Adequate progress is determined by comparing student's trend line to aim line.	3A.3. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will be used to determine growth	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	N/A	<i>N/a</i>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
--	---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------	--	--

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>“Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>							
<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p>	<p>4A.1. High percentage of ESE students. High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience.</p>	<p>4A.1. Tier I: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing FAIR assessment data for all students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within 90 minute reading block.</p>	<p>4A.1. .Principal, Reading coach , RTI/MTSS Team, Case Manager</p>	<p>4A.1. Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p>	<p>4A.1. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will be used to determine growth.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #4:</u> <i>John A Crookshank Elem staff members and faculty members will work to increase the number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading from 62% to 65% by differentiating instruction, providing interventions in reading and tracking progress with fidelity.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>62%(49)</p>	<p>65%(52)</p>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>4A.2. High percentage of ESE students. High mobility rate</p> <p>Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience.</p>	<p>4A.2. Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.</p>	<p>4A.2. Principal, Reading coach , RTI/MTSS Team, Case Manager</p>	<p>4A.2. Student progress is assessed using FAIR OPM every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 2 supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p>	<p>4A.2. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will be used to determine growth</p>	
		<p>4A.3. High percentage of ESE students. High mobility rate</p> <p>Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience</p>	<p>4A.3. Tier III: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core.</p>	<p>4A.3. Principal, Reading coach , RTI/MTSS Team, Case Manager</p>	<p>4A.3. Student progress is assessed using FAIR OPM every 20 days and/or DIBELS data bi-weekly for all students receiving Tier 3 targeted intervention. Adequate progress is determined by comparing student's trend line to aim line.</p>	<p>4A.3. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will be used to determine growth</p>	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<p>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%</p>	<p>Baseline data 2010-2011 39%</p>	<p>-Implement Supplemental Improvement Plan for identified lower quartile, Level 1 and Level 2 students based on FCIM data. -Implement MTSS plan as directed by state and district procedural expectations. -Monitor progress of all Tier 2 and 3 students through the MTSS process. -Prepare for CCSS implementation into all subject areas K-2.</p>	<p>-Implement Supplemental Improvement Plan for identified lower quartile, Level 1 and Level 2 students based on FCIM data. -Implement MTSS plan as directed by state and district procedural expectations. -Monitor progress of all Tier 2 and 3 students through the MTSS process. -Increase after school tutoring program to include additional reading and math interventions as specified by MTSS selections and team approval. -Implement CCSS in Grades K,1,2 -Implement lesson plan format that aligns with Marzano protocols. Implement Team Planning format that aligns with CCSS and FCAT 2.0 Expectations.</p>	<p>-Implement Supplemental Improvement Plan for identified lower quartile, Level 1 and Level 2 students based on FCIM data. -Implement MTSS plan as directed by state and district procedural expectations. -Monitor progress of all Tier 2 and 3 students through the MTSS process. -Continue to identify after school tutoring programming as identified through the MTSS process. -Implement CCSS standards and assessments K-2</p>	<p>-Implement Supplemental Improvement Plan for identified lower quartile, Level 1 and Level 2 students based on FCIM data. -Implement MTSS plan as directed by state and district procedural expectations. -Monitor progress of all Tier 2 and 3 students through the MTSS process. -Continue to identify after school tutoring programming as identified through the MTSS process. -Implement CCSS standards and assessments K-5</p>	<p>Review prior goals and interventions prior to implementation.</p>	<p>Review prior goals and interventions prior to implementation.</p>
<p><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> To utilize curriculum planning, service implementation and support programs in order to reduce expected achievement gaps in the identified years. <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>							

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: High mobility rate High population of students with learning disabilities or needs. Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience.</p>	<p>5B.1. Tier I: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing FAIR assessment data for all students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/interventions within 90 minute reading block.</p>	<p>5B.1. Principal, Reading coach. RTI/MTSS Team, Case Manager</p>	<p>5B.1. Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p>	<p>5B.1. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will also be used to monitor student progress and growth.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> <i>John A Crookshank Elem staff members and faculty members will work to decrease the number of student ethnicity subgroups not making learning gains in reading. This will occur by differentiating instruction, providing interventions in reading and tracking progress with fidelity.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>Pending state provided data. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p>Pending state provided data. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		5B.2. High mobility rate High population of students with learning disabilities or needs. Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience.	5B.2. Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.	5B.2. .Principal, Reading coach. RTI/MTSS Team, Case Manager	5B.2. Student progress is assessed using FAIR OPM every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 2 supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.	5B.2. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will also be used to monitor student progress and growth.	
		5B.3. High mobility rate High population of students with learning disabilities or needs. Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience.	5B.3. Tier III: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction.	5B.3. Principal, Reading coach. RTI/MTSS Team, Case Manager	5B.3. Student progress is assessed using FAIR OPM every 20 days and/or DIBELS data bi-weekly for all students receiving Tier 3 targeted intervention. Adequate progress is determined by comparing student's trend line to aim line.	5B.3. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will also be used to monitor student progress and growth.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Pending state provided data</i>	<i>Pending state provided data</i>					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5D.1. High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of experience</p>	<p>5D.1. Tier I: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing FAIR assessment data for all students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/interventions within 90 minute reading block.</p>	<p>5D.1. 1Principal, Reading coach, RTI/MTSS Team, Case Manager</p>	<p>5D.1. Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p>	<p>5D.1. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will be used to determine benchmark progress and proficiency levels.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5D:</u> <i>John A Crookshank Elem staff members and faculty members will work to increase the number of students with disabilities (SWD) by making learning gains in reading from 26% to 79%. This will occur by differentiating instruction, providing interventions in reading and tracking progress with fidelity</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Pending state provided data</i></p>	<p><i>Pending state provided data</i></p>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		5D.2. High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of experience	5D.2. Tier II: Plan supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.	5D.2. Principal, Reading coach, RTI/MTSS Team, Case Manager	5D.2. Student progress is assessed using FAIR OPM every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 2 supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.	5D.2. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will be used to determine benchmark progress and proficiency levels.	
		5D.3. High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of experience	5D.3. Tier III: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core.	5D.3. Principal, Reading coach, RTI/MTSS Team, Case Manager	5D.3. Student progress is assessed using FAIR OPM every 20 days and/or DIBELS data bi-weekly for all students receiving Tier 3 targeted intervention. Adequate progress is determined by comparing student's trend line to aim line.	5D.3. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education Data will be used to determine benchmark progress and proficiency levels.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of experience Parental involvement.	5E.1. Tier I: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing FAIR assessment data for all students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within 90 minute reading block.	5E.1. .Principal, Reading coach , RTI/MTSS Team, Case Manager	5E.1. Student progress is assessed using FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.	5E.1. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education data will also be used to determine proficiency.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Reading Goal #5E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<p><i>John A Crookshank Elem staff members and faculty members will work to increase the number of economically disadvantaged students by making learning gains in reading from 54% to 79%. This will occur by differentiating instruction, providing interventions in reading and tracking progress with fidelity.</i></p>							
	<p>Pending state provided data</p>	<p>Pending state provided data</p>					
		<p>5E.2. High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of experience Parental involvement.</p>	<p>5E.2. Tier II: Plan supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.</p>	<p>5E.2. Principal, Reading coach , RTI/MTSS Team, Case Manager</p>	<p>5E.2. Student progress is assessed using FAIR OPM every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 2 supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p>	<p>5E.2. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education data will also be used to determine proficiency.</p>	
		<p>5E.3. High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of experience Parental involvement.</p>	<p>5E.3. Tier III: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core.</p>	<p>5E.3. Principal, Reading coach , RTI/MTSS Team, Case Manager</p>	<p>5E.3. Student progress is assessed using FAIR OPM every 20 days and/or DIBELS data bi-weekly for all students receiving Tier 3 targeted intervention. Adequate progress is determined by comparing student's trend line to aim line.</p>	<p>5E.3. FAIR OPM data will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Discovery Education data will also be used to determine proficiency.</p>	

Reading Professional Development

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FCIM Summer Training	Pre-K to 5 th	Julia Shatto Jay Willets	School wide	Summer 2012	FCIM Process to be conducted through grade level team meetings and WOW Wednesday data discussions	Jay Willets, Julie Shatto, grade level chair, classroom teacher
Text Complexity within CCSS	Pre-K to 5 th	Julia Shatto Jay Willets	School wide	Summer 2012	Grade level meetings, Data discussions, data comparisons, classroom visits and observations	Jay Willets, Julie Shatto, grade level chair, classroom teacher
Lesson Study PLC	Pre-K to 5 th	Julia Shatto Jay Willets	School wide	Summer 2012	Grade level meetings, Data discussions, data comparisons, classroom visits and observations	Jay Willets, Julie Shatto, grade level chair, classroom teacher

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reading Comprehension Skills Building	Reading A-Z	Title 1	2960.00
Reading Comprehension Skills Building	Accelerated Reader	Title 1	4523.09
Reading Comprehension Skills Building	Raz Kids	Title 1	2695.00
Vocabulary Skills Building	Worldly Wise	Title 1	4112.60
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
--------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. Mobility	1.1. Implement a consistent curriculum focus in conjunction with CCSS in an effort to reduce transitional time while moving from school to school.	1.1. Classroom teacher and administration.	1.1. Enrollment CELLA filters and documentation along with grade level focus calendars developed through the FCIM process.	1.1. Grade level probes, CELLA results, and formative assessment of ELL Paraprofessional.	
<u>CELLA Goal #1:</u> <i>CES will increase mastery levels of CELLA students by 3% in the 2012-13 School Year</i>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u>					
	63% (12)					
		1.2. Staff readiness/certification	1.2. Follow district HR policy/protocol for certification standards for ELL students. Utilize District ESOL instructional programs.	1.2. Classroom Teacher/Administration.	1.2. Certification process through district human resources.	1.2. State certification results
		1.3. Appropriate Curriculum Modifications.	1.3. Implementation of formative assessment as part of the FCIM process in conjunction with support and testing by the CES ELL Paraprofessional and Certified Classroom teacher.	1.3. Classroom teacher, administration.	1.3. Rosetta Stone reports along with formative probe assessment tools and intake screening documentation.	1.3. Rosetta Stone, DE, formative probe assessments.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1. Mobility	2.1. Implement a consistent curriculum focus in conjunction with CCSS in an effort to reduce transitional time while moving from school to school.	2.1. Classroom teacher and administration.	2.1. Enrollment CELLA filters and documentation along with grade level focus calendars developed through the FCIM process.	2.1. Grade level probes, CELLA results, and formative assessment of ELL Paraprofessional.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

CELLA Goal #2: <i>CES will increase mastery levels of CELLA students by 3% in the 2012-13 School Year.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	26%(5)					
		2.2. Staff readiness/certification	2.2. Appropriate Curriculum Modifications.	2.2. Classroom Teacher/ Administration.	2.2. Certification process through district human resources	2.2. State certification results
		2.3. Appropriate Curriculum Modifications.	2.3. Implementation of formative assessment as part of the FCIM process in conjunction with support and testing by the CES ELL Paraprofessional and Certified Classroom teacher.	2.3. Classroom Teacher/ Administration.	2.3. Rosetta Stone reports along with formative probe assessment tools and intake screening documentation.	2.3. Rosetta Stone, DE, formative probe assessments.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1. Mobility	2.1. Implement a consistent curriculum focus in conjunction with CCSS in an effort to reduce transitional time while moving from school to school.	2.1. Classroom teacher and administration.	2.1. Enrollment CELLA filters and documentation along with grade level focus calendars developed through the FCIM process.	2.1. Grade level probes, CELLA results, and formative assessment of ELL Paraprofessional.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

CELLA Goal #3: <i>CES will increase mastery levels of CELLA students by 3% in the 2012-13 School Year.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	16%(3)					
		2.2. Staff readiness/certification	2.2. Appropriate Curriculum Modifications.	2.2. Classroom Teacher/Administration.	2.2. Certification process through district human resources	2.2. State certification results.
		2.3. Appropriate Curriculum Modifications.	2.3. Implementation of formative assessment as part of the FCIM process in conjunction with support and testing by the CES ELL Paraprofessional and Certified Classroom teacher	2.3. Classroom Teacher/Administration.	2.3. Rosetta Stone reports along with formative probe assessment tools and intake screening documentation.	2.3. Rosetta Stone, DE, formative probe assessments

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Rosetta Stone	Computer Online Resource	Title 4	Per student allocation from district

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
District ESOL Coursework	District PD Offering for ESOL Certification	District Funded	N/A
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</p>	<p>1A.1. High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience Introduction to common core standards</p>	<p>1A.1. Tier I: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing Envision pre – test data and Discovery Education assessment data for all students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within 60 minute math block.</p>	<p>1A.1. RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal , instructional literacy coach</p>	<p>1A.1. Student progress is assessed using envision or “Do the Math” Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p>	<p>1A.1. Evaluation is based on Envision Math unit assessments, teacher developed tests, STAR Math, and standardized assessments (FCAT and SAT 10). Each student is given a pre and posttest analysis for each chapter. The pretest is used to determine differentiated instruction for each student. Posttests are evaluated and monitored for remediation. Discovery Education assessments as part of the FCIM process.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u> <i>John A Crookshank Elem staff members and faculty members will work to increase the percentage students meeting math proficiency from 31% to 34% by providing interventions in reading and tracking progress with fidelity.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>31%87</p>	<p>34% (89)</p>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>1A.2. High mobility rate</p> <p>Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience</p> <p>Introduction to common core standards</p>	<p>1A.2. Tier II: Plan supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction. The focus of instruction is determined by a review of the Discovery Education and envisions data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.</p>	<p>1A.2. RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal , instructional literacy coach</p>	<p>1A.2. Student progress is assessed using “Do the math” or envision assessments every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 2 supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p>	<p>1A.2. Evaluation is based on Envision Math unit assessments, teacher developed tests, STAR Math, and standardized assessments (FCAT and SAT 10). Each student is given a pre and posttest analysis for each chapter. The pretest is used to determine differentiated instruction for each student. Posttests are evaluated and monitored for remediation.</p> <p>Discovery Education assessments as part of the FCIM process.</p>	
		<p>1A.3. High mobility rate</p> <p>Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience</p> <p>Introduction to common core standards</p>	<p>1A.3. Tier III: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core.</p> <p>Supplemental Education Services (SES) and Extended School Year (ESY) are offered to appropriate student populations in the fall, spring, and summer.</p>	<p>1A.3. RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal , instructional literacy coach</p>	<p>1A.3. Student progress is assessed using Discovery Education, “Do the Math” or Envision assessments every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 3 targeted intervention. Adequate progress is determined by comparing student’s data to the perceived goal.</p>	<p>1A.3. Evaluation is based on Envision Math unit assessments, teacher developed tests, STAR Math, and standardized assessments (FCAT and SAT 10). Each student is given a pre and posttest analysis for each chapter. The pretest is used to determine differentiated instruction for each student. Posttests are evaluated and monitored for remediation.</p> <p>Discovery Education assessments as part of the FCIM process</p>	
<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</p>	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</p>	<p>2A.1. High mobility rate</p> <p>Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience</p> <p>New math standards or common core standards</p>	<p>2A.1. Tier I: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing Envision pre -test and Discovery Education assessment data for all students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within 60 minute math block.</p>	<p>2A.1. RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal, instructional coach</p>	<p>2A.1. Student progress is assessed using envision or “Do the Math” Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p>	<p>2A.1. Evaluation is based on Envision Math unit assessments, teacher developed tests, STAR Math, and standardized assessments (FCAT and SAT 10).</p> <p>Each student is given a pre and posttest analysis for each chapter. The pretest is used to determine differentiated instruction for each student. Posttests are evaluated and monitored for remediation.</p> <p>Discovery Education assessments as part of the FCIM process</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u></p> <p><i>John A Crookshank Elem staff members and faculty members will work to increase the percentage students achieving above proficiency in math by one percent by differentiating instruction, providing interventions in math and tracking progress with fidelity.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>18%(52)</p>	<p>21% (55)</p>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>2A.2. High mobility rate</p> <p>Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience</p> <p>New math standards or common core standards</p>	<p>2A.2. Tier II: Plan supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction. The focus of instructions are determined by a review of Discovery Education and envision data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.</p>	<p>2A.2.MTSS/RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal, instructional coach</p>	<p>2A.2. Student progress is assessed using “Do the math” or envision assessments every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 2 supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p>	<p>2A.2. Evaluation is based on Envision Math unit assessments, teacher developed tests, STAR Math, and standardized assessments (FCAT and SAT 10).</p> <p>Each student is given a pre and posttest analysis for each chapter. The pretest is used to determine differentiated instruction for each student. Posttests are evaluated and monitored for remediation.</p> <p>Discovery Education assessments as part of the FCIM process</p>	
		<p>2A.3. High mobility rate</p> <p>Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience</p> <p>New math standards or common core standards</p>	<p>2A.3. Tier III: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core.</p>	<p>2A.3. RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal, instructional coach</p>	<p>2A.3. Student progress is assessed using Discovery Education, “Do the Math” or Envision assessments every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 3 targeted intervention. Adequate progress is determined by comparing student’s data to the perceived goal.</p>	<p>2A.3. Evaluation is based on Envision Math unit assessments, teacher developed tests, STAR Math, and standardized assessments (FCAT and SAT 10).</p> <p>Each student is given a pre and posttest analysis for each chapter. The pretest is used to determine differentiated instruction for each student. Posttests are evaluated and monitored for remediation.</p> <p>Discovery Education assessments as part of the FCIM process</p>	
<p>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</p>	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	<p>3A.1. New math standards High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience</p>	<p>3A.1. Tier I: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing Envision pre-test and Discovery Education assessment data for all students Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within 60-minute math block.</p>	<p>3A.1. RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal, instructional coach</p>	<p>3A.1. Student progress is assessed using envision or “Do the Math” Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p>	<p>3A.1. Evaluation is based on Envision Math unit assessments, teacher developed tests, STAR Math, and standardized assessments (FCAT and SAT 10). Each student is given a pre and posttest analysis for each chapter. The pretest is used to determine differentiated instruction for each student. Posttests are evaluated and monitored for remediation. Discovery Education assessments as part of the FCIM process</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u> <i>John A Crookshank Elem staff members and faculty members will work to increase the percentage students making learning gains by three percent by differentiating instruction, providing interventions in math and tracking progress with fidelity.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>68%(184)</p>	<p>71%(188)</p>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>3A.2. New math standards High mobility rate</p> <p>Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience</p>	<p>3A.2. Tier II: Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. The focuses of instruction are determined by a review of Discovery Education and envision data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.</p>	<p>3A.2. RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal, instructional coach</p>	<p>3A.2. Student progress is assessed using “Do the math” or envision assessments every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 2 supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p>	<p>3A.2. 3.2. Evaluation is based on Envision Math unit assessments, teacher developed tests, STAR Math, and standardized assessments (FCAT and SAT 10).</p> <p>Each student is given a pre and posttest analysis for each chapter. The pretest is used to determine differentiated instruction for each student. Posttests are evaluated and monitored for remediation.</p> <p>Discovery Education assessments as part of the FCIM process.</p>	
		<p>3A.3. New math standards High mobility rate</p> <p>Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience</p>	<p>3A.3. Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. The focus of instruction is determined by reviewing envision and Discovery Education data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.</p>	<p>3A.3. RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal, instructional coach</p>	<p>3A.3. Student progress is assessed using Discovery Education, “Do the Math” or Envision assessments every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 3 targeted intervention. Adequate progress is determined by comparing student’s data to the perceived goal.</p>	<p>3A.3. Evaluation is based on Envision Math unit assessments, teacher developed tests, STAR Math, and standardized assessments (FCAT and SAT 10).</p> <p>Each student is given a pre and posttest analysis for each chapter. The pretest is used to determine differentiated instruction for each student. Posttests are evaluated and monitored for remediation.</p> <p>Discovery Education assessments as part of the FCIM process.</p>	
<p>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	<p>4A.1. New Math standards High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience</p>	<p>4A.1. Tier I: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing Envision pretest and Discovery Education assessment data for all students Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within 60-minute math block.</p>	<p>4A.1. RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal, instructional coach</p>	<p>4A.1. Student progress is assessed using envision or “Do the Math” Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p>	<p>4A.1. Evaluation is based on Envision Math unit assessments, teacher developed tests, STAR Math, and standardized assessments (FCAT and SAT 10). Each student is given a pre and posttest analysis for each chapter. The pretest is used to determine differentiated instruction for each student. Posttests are evaluated and monitored for remediation. Discovery Education assessments as part of the FCIM process</p>		
<p>Mathematics Goal #4: <i>John A Crookshank Elem staff members and faculty members will work to increase the number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains from 63% to 66% by differentiating instruction, providing interventions in math and tracking progress with fidelity.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>63%(59)</p>	<p>66%(63)</p>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>4A.2. New Math standards High mobility rate</p> <p>Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience</p>	<p>4A.2. Tier II: Plan supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction. The focuses of instruction are determined by a review of Discovery Education and envision data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.</p>	<p>4A.2. RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal, instructional coach</p>	<p>4A.2. Student progress is assessed using “Do the math” or envision assessments every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 2 supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p>	<p>4A.2. Evaluation is based on Envision Math unit assessments, teacher developed tests, STAR Math, and standardized assessments (FCAT and SAT 10).</p> <p>Each student is given a pre and posttest analysis for each chapter. The pretest is used to determine differentiated instruction for each student. Posttests are evaluated and monitored for remediation.</p> <p>Discovery Education assessments as part of the FCIM process</p>	
		<p>4A.3. New Math standards High mobility rate</p> <p>Teachers with less than five years of teaching experience</p>	<p>4A.3. Tier III: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core.</p>	<p>4A.3. RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal, instructional coach</p>	<p>4A.3. Student progress is assessed using Discovery Education, “Do the Math” or Envision assessments every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 3 targeted intervention. Adequate progress is determined by comparing student’s data to the perceived goal.</p>	<p>4A.3. Evaluation is based on Envision Math unit assessments, teacher developed tests, STAR Math, and standardized assessments (FCAT and SAT 10).</p> <p>Each student is given a pre and posttest analysis for each chapter. The pretest is used to determine differentiated instruction for each student. Posttests are evaluated and monitored for remediation.</p> <p>Discovery Education assessments as part of the FCIM process</p>	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 34%	31	28	25	22	19	17%
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> To utilize curriculum planning, service implementation and support programs in order to reduce expected achievement gaps in the identified years.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: . Low socio-economic status parental involvement students with learning disabilities	5B.1. Tier I: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing Envision pretest and Discovery Education assessment data for all students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/interventions within 60 minute math block.	5B.1. RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal, instructional coach	5B.1. Student progress is assessed using envision or “Do the Math” Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) every 20 days. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.	5B.1. Evaluation is based on Envision Math unit assessments, teacher developed tests, STAR Math, and standardized assessments (FCAT and SAT 10).		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
	<p>*Pending state provided data</p> <p>White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p>*Pending state provided data</p> <p>White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>				
		<p>5B.2. . Low socio-economic status parental involvement students with learning disabilities</p>	<p>5B.2. Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focuses of instruction are determined by a review of Discovery Education and envision data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.</p>	<p>5B.2. RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal, instructional coach</p>	<p>5B.2. Student progress is assessed using “Do the math” or envision assessments every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 2 supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmark is calculated.</p>	<p>5B.2. Each student is given a pre and posttest analysis for each chapter. The pretest is used to determine differentiated instruction for each student. Posttests are evaluated and monitored for remediation.</p> <p>Discovery Education assessments as part of the FCIM process</p>

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		5B.3. Low socio-economic status parental involvement students with learning disabilities	5B.3. Tier III: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core.	5B.3. RTI/MTSS team Principal Assistant Principal, instructional coach	5B.3. Student progress is assessed using Discovery Education, "Do the Math" or Envision assessments every 20 days for all students receiving Tier 3 targeted intervention. Adequate progress is determined by comparing student's data to the perceived goal.	5B.3. Each student is given a pre and posttest analysis for each chapter. The pretest is used to determine differentiated instruction for each student. Posttests are evaluated and monitored for remediation. Discovery Education assessments as part of the FCIM process	
--	--	--	---	--	---	---	--

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Pending state provided data</i>	<i>Pending state provided data</i>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Pending state provided data</i>	<i>Pending state provided data</i>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
--	---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------	--	--

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

subgroup:							
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Pending state provided data</i>	<i>Provided state provided data</i>					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Middle School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Middle School Mathematics	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

High School	Mathemat	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
	Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
	1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	Mathematics Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<u>Algebra Goal #2:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3A:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>Algebra 1 Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3D:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3E:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Geometry EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Geometry Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Geometry Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2011-2012						
<u>Geometry Goal #3A:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Geometry Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Geometry Goal #3C: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
<u>Geometry Goal #3D:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
<u>Geometry Goal #3E:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Continuous Improvement Model Training	Pre-K to 5 th	Julia Shatto Jay Willets	School wide	Summer 2012	WOW data meetings, grade level meetings, leadership and RTI/MTSS data review	Grade level chair, teacher, leadership team, instructional literacy coach
Lesson Study	Pre-K to 5 th	Julia Shatto Jay Willets	School wide	Summer 2012	WOW data meetings, grade level meetings, leadership and RTI/MTSS data review	Grade level chair, teacher, leadership team, instructional literacy coach

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Math Fluency Practice	Reflex Math	SAI	\$2695.00
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
\$2695.00 Total:			

End of Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</p>	<p>1A.1. New science benchmarks High Mobility rate</p>	<p>1. 1A.1. Utilize hands-on laboratory experiments three times per week using the 5 E model, science stations as part of the CCSS implementation in grades K-2 2. Science instructional focus through application reading and math CCSS in grades 3-5.</p>	<p>1A.1. Principal, Team Leaders, Teachers, instructional coach</p>	<p>1A.1. Instructional probes monitored through the FCIM process and Marzano classroom observations.</p>	<p>1A.1. Improvement on the science Discovery Education Probes. 3. Discovery Education Probes and FCAT assessment 1. Common assessments tied to Florida Science Standards administered weekly.</p>		
<p><u>Science Goal #1A:</u> John A Crookshank Elementary students will achieve at least 30% science proficiency by utilizing the new science block rotation and CCSS applications in all grade levels, working with differentiated instruction and monitoring progress with fidelity</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	27%(26)	30%(29)					
		1A.2. New science benchmarks High Mobility rate	1A.2. Provide real-world science experiences and engaging activities. 3. Creation of Science Focus Calendar based on New Generation Standards in grades K-5	1A.2. Principal, Team Leaders, Teachers, instructional coach	1A.2. Teachers will require students to read a National Geographic or other Science Journal article twice a week for homework. Homework log will be reviewed consistently by Principal 3. Science Probes based on NCSS	1A.2. Improvement on the science Discovery Education Probes. 3. Discovery Education Probes and FCAT assessment 1. Common assessments tied to Florida Science Standards administered weekly.	
		1A.3. New science benchmarks High Mobility rate	1A.3. Tier I: All students will complete hands-on lab activities weekly and use a common lab report format to document hands-on investigations. 2. Tier II: Students not responding adequately to core instruction will be provided supplemental, small group science instruction twice per week for 30 minutes during homeroom period or before/after school tutorial sessions. 3. Tier III: Students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction will receive targeted intervention developed with the problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence based, and provided in addition to core.	1A.3. Principal, Team Leaders, Teachers, instructional coach	1A.3. Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark (80% on common assessment). 2. Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every 4 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark (80% on common assessment). 3. Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data bi-weekly to determine progress toward benchmark (80% on common assessment).	1A.3. Improvement on the science Discovery Education Probes. 3. Discovery Education Probes and FCAT assessment 1. Common assessments tied to Florida Science Standards administered weekly.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<u>Science Goal #1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</p>	<p>2A.1. High mobility rate Lack of background knowledge in science</p>	<p>2A.1. 1. Utilize hands-on laboratory experiments three times per week using the 5 E model, science stations 2. Provide real-world science experiences and engaging activities. 3. Creation of Science Focus Calendar based on New Generation Standards in grades K-5</p>	<p>2A.1. Principal, classroom teacher, team leader, instructional coach</p>	<p>2A.1. Instructional probes monitored through the FCIM process and Marzano classroom observations And teachers will require students to read a National Geographic or other Science Journal article twice a week for homework. Homework log will be reviewed consistently by Principal 3.Science Probes based on IFC</p>	<p>2A.1. Differentiated assessments, checklists, observations and probe grades.</p>		
<p><u>Science Goal #2A:</u> John A Crookshank Elementary students scoring levels 4 and 5 will increase by one percent in science proficiency by utilizing the new science block rotation, working with differentiated instruction and monitoring progress with fidelity in preparation for CCSS and FCAT 2.0.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	18% (17)	21%(20)					
		2A.2. High mobility rate Lack of background knowledge in science	2A.2. 1 Enrichment activities in each science big idea provided after assessments.	2A.2. Principal, classroom teacher, team leader, instructional coach	2A.2. Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark (80% on common assessment). 2. Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every 4 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark (80% on common assessment). 3. Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data bi-weekly to determine progress toward benchmark (80% on common assessment).	2A.2. Differentiated assessments, checklists, observations and probe grades.	
		2A.3.	2A.3. 1.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Science Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

High School Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Science Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Science Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Biology 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Biology 1 Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Biology 1 Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Lesson Study	Pre-K to 5 th	Julia Shatto Jay Willets	School wide	Ongoing	WOW Wednesday meetings, RTI/ MTSS data review, team leader meetings and leadership team meetings	Classroom teacher, leadership team and team leader
Summer CIM	Pre-K to 5 th	Julia Shatto Jay Willets	Grade Level Teams	Summer 2012	WOW Wednesday meetings, RTI/ MTSS data review, team leader meetings and leadership team meetings	Classroom teacher, leadership team and team leader

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Science Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Writing Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</p>	<p>1A.1. High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of experience. New writing test requirements</p>	<p>1A.1. Writing prompts will be assigned once a week on Fridays during the last 3 months. Student and teacher groups will look at weekly and monthly prompts before that. We score prompts at the beginning of the year based on the skills that are taught- did they use transitions, simile, add 2 details, or any other topics taught that week, but expect them to also include what was taught previously. The papers are given the same score as if they would have written for the FCAT, i.e. 0-6, and also translated to a percentage.</p>	<p>1A.1. Principal, classroom teacher and Reading Coach</p>	<p>1A.1. Student writing samples will be reviewed and scored bi-weekly by teacher. Percent of students making adequate progress toward goal will be determined once every 6 weeks by comparing writing trend data to expected rate of growth (aim line),</p>	<p>1A.1. 1District prompts scored with specified grade level rubric in grades 3 and 4. 2.Progress between the Pretest Prompt and Mid-year Prompt 3.Progress between the Pretest Prompt and Mid-year Prompt Teacher observation and checklists.</p>		
--	---	---	---	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>Writing Goal #1A: <i>John A Crookshank elementary staff members will work to increase the percentage of students making AYP by in writing by 3%.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>58%(59)</p>	<p>61%(62)</p>					
		<p>1A.2. High mobility rate Teachers with less than five years of experience. New writing test requirements</p>	<p>1A.2. Students are placed in groups for 2 months before the FCAT to help students with their weaknesses. We divide them by what we think they need the most work on (Focus, organization, support, and elaboration/creativity).</p>	<p>1A.2. Principal, classroom teacher and Reading Coach</p>	<p>1A.2. Student writing samples will be reviewed and scored bi-weekly by teacher. Percent of students making adequate progress toward goal will be determined once every 6 weeks by comparing writing trend data to expected rate of growth (aim line),</p>	<p>1A.2. District prompts scored with specified grade level rubric in grades 3 and 4. 2. Progress between the Pretest Prompt and Mid-year Prompt 3. Progress between the Pretest Prompt and Mid-year Prompt Teacher observation and checklists.</p>	
		<p>1A.3.</p>	<p>1A.3.</p>	<p>1A.3.</p>	<p>1A.3.</p>	<p>1A.3.</p>	
<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Writing Goal #1B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Lesson Study PLC	Pre-K to 5 th	Julia Shatto Jay Willets	School wide	Ongoing	Wow Wednesday meetings, team meetings and probe reviews	Team leaders, classroom teachers, leadership team

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Continuous Improvement Model	Pre-K to 5 th	Julia Shatto Jay Willets	School wide	Summer 2012	Wow Wednesday meetings, team meetings and probe reviews	Team leaders, classroom teachers, leadership team
Melissa Forney	3-4 grade	Julie Shatto Melissa Forney	ILC and 3 rd and 4 th Grade Instructors	Summer 2012	Quarterly Prompts	Team leaders, classroom teachers, leadership team

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writers Workshop	TEACH Conference	Title 1	\$400.00
Intermediate Writing	Melissa Forney Writing	Title 1	\$1050.00
Subtotal: \$1450.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:\$1450.00			

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2014-2015)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Civics EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<u>Civics_Goal #1:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Civics Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Civics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

U.S. History EOC Goals	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

U.S. History Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
U.S. History Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

U.S. History Professional Development

<p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</p> <p>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</p>						
<p>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</p>	<p>Grade Level/ Subject</p>	<p>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</p>	<p>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</p>	<p>Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</p>	<p>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>

U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)

<p>Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.</p>			
<p>Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)</p>			
<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Description of Resources</p>	<p>Funding Source</p>	<p>Amount</p>
Subtotal:			
<p>Technology</p>			
<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Description of Resources</p>	<p>Funding Source</p>	<p>Amount</p>

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of U.S. History Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Attendance Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>1. Attendance</p>	<p>1.1. High mobility rate</p>	<p>1.1. The classroom teacher will contact parent about student absences and document first 4 absences. On the 5th absence, and all subsequent absences, the teacher will call the parent and send an email to the Guidance Counselor with the dates of contacts, types of contacts (telephone, email or conference), the person contacted, and the results of the contact. The Guidance Counselor will then collect the documentation on the excused and unexcused absences for each child.</p>	<p>1.1. Classroom teacher Guidance counselor Data operator Attendance Team</p>	<p>1.1. The attendance team will review attendance data on a monthly basis. Excused and non-excused absences will be reviewed with the team to determine grade levels and classrooms with possible issues.</p>	<p>1.1. ESIS reports, parent call logs, parent letters from attendance team.</p>		
<p><u>Attendance Goal #1:</u> <i>John A Crookshank Elementary staff members will strive to increase parental communication to decrease student absences by fifteen (15) percent.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p>					

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	95%	96%					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	243	240					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	173	170					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring
Positive Behavior Support Committee/ Covey	Pre-K to 5 th	Behavior Coach	School wide	On-going, monthly	Attendance data	Teachers, principals and behavior coach

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Attendance Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Suspension Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1.1. High mobility rate Low parental involvement	1.1. In conjunction with the RTI/MTSS program John A Crookshank Elementary will work with the Stephen Covey foundation and the seven habits to decrease student suspensions.	1.1. Behavioral RTI/MTSS team, Principal, Assistant Principal and behavior specialist.	1.1. Suspension data will be entered into the SWIS database by the data operator. The school leadership will then review the data with the positive behavior team to determine specific locations and times to ensure preventative measures are occurring.	1.1. SWIS data and ESIS data		
Suspension Goal #1:	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
<i>John A Crookshank Elementary faculty and staff members will work to follow the PBS and second step guidelines to decrease the number of student suspensions by at least 3%.</i>							
	N/A	N/A					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	<i>60</i>	<i>57</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	<i>43</i>	<i>40</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Positive Behavior Support Summer Training/Covey	All	Behavior Specialist	School wide	Monthly	SWIS Data Reporting, ESIS Data	Behavior Specialist, Principal

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Dropout Prevention	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><u>Dropout Prevention</u> <u>Goal #1:</u></p> <p><i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i></p>	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

<p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</p> <p>Please note that each Strategy does not require a</p>						

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content / Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.

Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>1. Parent Involvement</p>	<p>1.1. High mobility rate Low parental involvement</p>	<p>1.1. The PTO parents and Title I personnel will assist in recruiting families for membership and bringing parents into the school for meaningful and positive activities such as family literacy nights. Parents are able to review the school parental involvement policies online or may request one from the school. A schedule of activities that involve the whole family will be published. Parents are involved in the planning, review and improvement of school programs as well as the education of their children as equal partners with the faculty and staff. The principal will hold parent meetings to address academic and social development initiatives and concerns.</p>	<p>1.1. Reading Coach Principal and Leadership Team Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>1.1. Collect participation data and survey families with the needs assessment survey and the parent survey.</p>	<p>1.1. Parent Attendance Sigh-in sheets 2. SAC Parent Surveys</p>		
-------------------------------------	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		The Behavior Specialist will contact parents for specific needs.					
<u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i> John A Crookshank Elementary faculty and staff members will work to increase the percentage of parents involved in school activities by increasing communication and volunteer opportunities. Staff members will implement alternative forms of communication using newsletters, Alert Now Messages, and student backpack letters in order to increase the percentage of parents who agree with what is happening in their child's school.	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
	94%	97%					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>1.2. High mobility rate, low parental involvement</p>	<p>1.2. Teachers will consistently use the student planner and school newsletter to communicate with parents.</p> <p>Teachers emphasize importance of conferences by individual contact with parents. Teachers will encourage parents to participate in at least one teacher conference. Parents and teachers will review the state's assessments and will learn how to monitor their child's progress. Parents will also be able to monitor progress through frequent progress reports as well as interim reports and nine week report cards.</p> <p>Title 1 family nights are held several times each year to inform families on the school's participation in the Title 1 school wide project.</p>	<p>1.2..Reading Coach Principal and Leadership Team Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>1.2. Collect participation data and survey families with the needs assessment survey and the parent survey.</p>	<p>1.2. Parent Attendance Sigh-in sheets 2. SAC Parent Surveys</p>	
		<p>1.3. High mobility rate, low parental involvement</p>	<p>1.3. John A Crookshank Elementary will work to provide training to parents and community members with the seven habits of highly effective people. We will develop activities throughout the year that support and educate our parents with the seven leadership traits.</p>	<p>1.3. Reading Coach Principal and Leadership Team Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>1.3. Collect participation data and survey families with the needs assessment survey and the parent survey.</p>	<p>1.3. Parent Attendance Sigh-in sheets 2. SAC Parent Surveys</p>	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Positive Behavior Support and Parental Communication	All grades	Jay Willets and Wendy Daily	School Wide	Pre-Planning	Parental Meetings, Parental/ Community Surveys	Jay Willets and Wendy Daily
Covey 7 Habits	School Wide		School Wide	Pre-Planning	Parental Meetings and Surveys	Jay Willets and Wendy Daily

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parental Involvement Communication	Title 1-Student Planners	Title 1	2726.08
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			\$2726.08
Total:			\$2726.08

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>STEM Goal #1:</p> <p><i>Implementation of the New Generation Sunshine State Standards along with the new Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in grades k-5 as an integral component of each grade level focus.</i></p>	<p>1. 1.1. Implementation of a higher level of text complexity and rigor with science, math and ELA standards using the applicational model.</p>	<p>1. 1.1. Creation of a science focus calendar that is built on the FCIM model and monitored through formative and summative assessments.</p> <p>2. Implementation of curriculum content on a rotational basis throughout team members that will use</p> <p>3. Participation in the grades 3-5 STEM District Fair as part of the investigational science model.</p> <p>4. Implementation of a designated computer literacy block inside the specials schedule.</p> <p>K,1,2 CCSS utilization of science and mathematics focus inside ELA and math instructional blocks.</p>	<p>1.1. Grade level teachers, administration</p>	<p>1.1. Formative and summative evaluation probes/assessments along with Marzano observations</p>	<p>1.1. Discovery Education, grade level probes, district quarterly assessments and FCAT.</p>
	<p>1.2. Access to software and consistent/reliable platforms for electronic/digital access</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>
	<p>1.3. Cost of materials and resources</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>

STEM Professional Development

Professional					
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Lesson Study	K-5	Julia Shatto	K-5 Classroom teachers	Bi-Weekly, quarterly, tri-annual and annual	Team Minutes, DA reports, Probe Data, District Assessment Data	Classroom teacher, Administration
FCIM	K-5	Jay Willets, Julia Shatto	School wide	Summer 2012	Assessment calendar review at data point collection dates.	Administration

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of STEM Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity <small>Please note that each Strategy does not require a</small>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content / Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed) N/A

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of CTE Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Additional Goal	1.1. High mobility rate Low parental involvement	1.1. The 7 Habits Leadership Teaching is implemented weekly as to supplement the pillars of Character Counts.	1.1. Behavior Specialist Principal Assistant Principal	1.1.Success of this objective will be determined by lowering the percentage of parents indicating that the Character Counts Program and teaching of the 7 Habits makes a difference in their child's behavior as indicated on the annual needs survey.	1.1. Character Counts! program 7 Habits of Happy Kids Leadership Focus Response to Intervention (RTI/MTSS) Positive Behavior Support (PBS)		
<u>Additional Goal #1:</u> John A Crookshank faculty and staff will work to instill character counts and the seven habits into the school culture and curriculum.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	95%	98%					
		1.2. High mobility rate Low parental involvement	1.2. Local agencies provide mentors who provide support for targeted students. Students are recognized for good behaviors on a daily basis and more formally at recognition assemblies.	1.2. Principal Assistant Principal, Behavior Specialist and Guidance Counselor	1.2...Success of this objective will be determined by lowering the percentage of parents indicating that the Character Counts! Program makes a difference in their child's behavior as indicated on the annual needs survey	1.2. Character Counts! program 7 Habits Leadership teaching Response to Intervention (RTI/MTSS) Positive Behavior Support (PBS)	
		1.3.	1.3. Integrate Character Counts! Format into a positive "school-wide" behavior system that operates in conjunction with the RTI/MTSS format.	1.3. Principal Assistant Principal, Behavior Specialist and Guidance Counselor	1.3.. Success will be determined by reviewing data in the parent survey	1.3. Character Counts! program 7 Habits Leadership teaching Response to Intervention (RTI/MTSS) Positive Behavior Support (PBS)	

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>The student intervention coordinator, guidance counselor, Character Counts! Committee and administration will provide in services for faculty and staff on Character Counts! and Seven Habits programs.</p>	<p>School Wide</p>	<p>Principal, Assistant Principal and behavior specialist</p>	<p>School Wide</p>	<p>Pre-planning</p>	<p>Set up on-going proactive student groups: K Kids, student leader patrols and student ambassadors. Monitor targeted students regarding specific social and academic development</p>	
<p>Staff development of Character Counts! elements integrated into the positive behavior plan .</p>	<p>School Wide</p>	<p>Principal, Assistant Principal and behavior specialist</p>	<p>School wide</p>	<p>Pre-planning</p>	<p>Implement Positive Behavior System in a school wide Character Counts! Format. Increased positive interactions and student activities throughout the school environment Reduction of classroom off task behaviors</p>	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
7 Habits/Covey Online for teachers	Leadership Website for Teacher Collaboration	Title II	1000.00
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Living the 7 Habits	7 Habits Leadership Training	Title I	18,900.00
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:\$19,900.00			
Total: \$19,900.00			

End of Additional Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total:
CELLA Budget	Total:
Mathematics Budget	Total:
Science Budget	Total:
Writing Budget	Total:
Civics Budget	Total:
U.S. History Budget	Total:
Attendance Budget	Total:
Suspension Budget	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:
STEM Budget	Total:
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total:

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Grand Total:

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school’s DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under “Default value” header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an “x” in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

Are you reward school? Yes No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community members who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting *Yes* or *No* below.

Yes No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
Training on Seven Habits School wide reading/math initiatives Provide support for individual teacher needs

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Teacher Needs	1500.00
School Wide academic initiatives	1500.00