

# Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

**Name of School:**

**Area:**

Central

Fairglen Elementary

**Principal:**

**Area Superintendent:**

Sandy Demmon

Lynn Francisco

**SAC Chairperson:**

Sue Bradin

**Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli**

**Mission Statement:**

We, the students, staff, parents, and community of Fairglen Elementary, work together as a team, to provide a nurturing and safe environment that promotes academic, character and personal excellence, encourages independent thinkers and inspires young minds to reach their full potential.

**Vision Statement:**

Fairglen Elementary's School Vision is to develop well-rounded, productive and successful citizens, who are career and college ready, by serving every student with excellence as the standard.



# Brevard County Public Schools

## School Improvement Plan

### 2012-2013

#### RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

Fairglen's FCAT data trend for 2010-12 shows a slight increase in math achievement specifically with the lowest quartile subgroup scoring respectively 52%, 56% and 58%. Science proficiency declined from 72% to 60% from 2011 to 2012. Student achievement has increased over the past three years respectively with 62%, 63% and 70% of students making an annual learning gain in math. Reading achievement has decreased with students making gains in grades 4-6, 74% in 2010, 68% in 2011 and 64% in 2012 and the lowest quartile subgroup 73% in 2010, 59% in 2011 and 69% in 2012. The percentage of students scoring proficient in reading has been 91%, 85% and 68%. The percentage of students scoring proficient in math has been 87%, 86% and 66%. This stark decline in both reading and math proficiency is attributed to the new cut scores used by FL DOE for 2012.

\*The FAIR assessment 3 for grade 2 requires students to read a list of 80 words in 45 seconds. Our FAIR data is misleading when compared with our Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) for Grade 2 students. Students show significant progress with SRI May 2012 averages that fall within an on-grade level/proficient range at each grade level, including Grade 2. The K and first grade FAIR assessments show consistent progress.

The following is FAIR data from 2011-12 for grades K, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup>:

Grade K	Assess. 1 – 50% proficient	Assess. 2 – 48%	Assess. 3 – 52%
Grade 1	Assess. 1 – 34% proficient	Assess. 2 – 57%	Assess. 3 – 62%
Grade 2	Assess. 1 – 16% proficient	Assess. 2 – 17%	*Assess. 3 – 7%

\*(82% scored between 60% and 84% and this is the level before proficient – 85%)

Scholastic Reading Inventory data:

<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>															


The Scholastic Math Inventory (SMI) data in the chart below shows significant progress at each grade level, 2-6, for the 2011-12 school year.

		SMI	
		Aug 2011	May 2012
	Grade 2	154.7	328.24
	Grade 3	346.52	567.77
	Grade 4	471.93	617.59
	Grade 5	628.09	755.94
	Grade 6	768.56	833.24

Administrators and teachers collaboratively analyzed strand scores in reading and math to determine the specific instructional focus needed along with corresponding staff development for the 2011-12 school year and agreed that a focus on differentiated instruction in all core areas with an emphasis on using Singapore Math strategies and more hands-on activities in math instruction was needed to improve our schools overall success with students making a learning gain in math. Our most recent achievement scores for 2012 in math achievement show improvement overall so we will continue to incorporate differentiated instruction daily in the core content areas.

As we analyzed our current scores the most obvious issue is our decline in the percentage of students scoring proficient in reading, math, writing and science. We have collaboratively decided to implement Extended Thinking Strategies in our classrooms, and we studied the research to support the use of these strategies in daily instruction. We know more use of this strategy will increase our students' achievement.

Teachers completed two surveys during preplanning. One survey assessed our School Culture specifically reflecting on creating a high-performance culture. A second survey was a self-assessment survey on "What I Believe" specific to the ability of our students to learn and what is essential in order for a student to be successful in the learning process.

The "School Culture" survey consisted of 12 statements which was rated 1 to 10; 10 being "Top-Notch" and 1 being "Toxic." Statement 1 addressed being "Caring and Supportive of Others" and received a weighted average of an 8.32 based on 44 responses; no scores below a 5 were given. Statement 2 addressed "Opportunity Minded "(positive) and received a weighted average of a 7.73 based on 40 responses; no score below a 5 was given. Statement 3 addressed having "Efficacious, 'Can-Do' Attitude" and received a weighted average of 7.90 based on 42 responses; no score below a 4 was given. Statement 4 addressed "Energetic" and received a weighted average of 7.71 based on 42 responses; no score below a 5 was given. Statement 5 addressed "Shared Leadership" and received a weighted average of 7.28 based on 39 responses; no score below a 3 was given. Statement 6 addressed "Focus on Student and Adult Learning" and received a weighted average of 8.26 based on 42 responses; only 1 score below a 5 was given. Statement 7 addressed "Focus on Excellence, High Expectations" and received a weighted average of 8.57 based on 44 responses; no score

below a 6 was given. Statement 8 addressed being “Hopeful and Optimistic” and received a weighted average of 7.91 based on 44 responses; only 1 score below a 6 was given. Statement 9 addressed being “Innovative” and received a weighted average of 8.12 based on 42 responses; no score below a 6 was given. Statement 10 addressed how “Interdependent and Collaborative” we are and received a weighted average of 7.5 based on 42 responses; 2 scores below a 5 were given. Statement 11 addressed being “Respectful” and received a weighted average of 7.93 based on 42 responses; no score below a 5 was given. Statement 12 addressed being “Trusting” and received a weighted average of 7.90 based on 42 responses; 3 scores below a 5 were given.

The “What I Believe” survey, consisted of 6 statements related to “Ability and Achievement,” 6 statements related to “Power and Control “ and 6 statements related to “Efficacy and Effort. “ Each statement was rated 1 to 5; 5 being essential for learner success and 1 being not at all important as to what the teacher believes is essential for student learning. A second score identified the extent that the teacher feels these items are practiced in our school. The statements speaking to “Ability and Achievement” received a weighted average of 4.63 for what teachers feel is essential for student learning and a 3.99 on the extent teachers feel this is practiced in our school. The statements speaking to “Power and Control” received a weighted average of 4.68 for what teachers feel is essential for student learning and a 3.79 on the extent teachers feel this is practiced in our school. The statements speaking to “Efficacy and Effort “ received a weighted average of 4.72 for what teachers feel is essential for student learning and a 3.71 on the extent teachers feel this is practiced in our school.

The qualitative data gleaned from the “School Culture” identifies that our teachers feel that we have a fairly “top-notch” school culture. The two areas which were rated the lowest and where we will need to focus our attention are related to “Energetic “and “Shared Leadership.” Teachers also feel that all of the statements on the “What I Believe” survey are essential for student learner success and yet they are only being practiced at our school marginally. The lowest ratings were given in the “Efficacy and Effort “ statements, specifically in the areas of: A. Students believe that hard work pays off; that their learning and achievement will reflect the effort they expend; B. All students in the school know how to set goals for their own learning. Teachers provide them with feedback regularly and help them assess their progress toward their goals; C. Parents believe that the time and effort their children invest in studying are related to achievement as reflected by test scores, report card grades, and other measures; and D. All teachers experience autonomy, mastery, and purpose.

These results indicate we need to increase our effort with parental involvement and meet the needs of our parents as specified in the Parent Survey results. The results also indicate teachers want to provide more input and participate in leadership roles/tasks.

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

An increase of using differentiated instruction is evident in classroom instruction, and instructional staff continue to seek professional development to increase their knowledge and effectiveness with this strategy. For the previous two school years Fairglen has implemented a school based objective to increase differentiated instruction with a focus on the use of formative assessments. Teachers targeted specific instructional strategies that involve differentiated instruction on their PGPs last year, for example, implementation of Singapore math strategies. Fairglen’s Literacy Coach modeled reading instruction for primary grade teachers aligned to their PGP goals of increasing student reading readiness, skills and comprehension. Several K and 1<sup>st</sup> grade teachers implemented a Walk to Intervention time daily for reading intervention/enrichment.

The use of technology is implemented at Fairglen to differentiate instruction. Fairglen has three Title 1 labs that utilize

various programs. Programs for reading are Scholastic System 44, Scholastic READ 180, Scholastic Read About and SuccessMaker. Computer programs for math are FastMath and SuccessMaker. These programs assess students and then place them on their instructional level. The students work on their individual level instructionally. Students are monitored daily and reports are run weekly to assure student progress.

Currently teachers are focused on increasing their use of Extended Thinking Strategies as they teach with alignment to the concept or skill being taught. Teachers received training during preplanning and will continue to seek professional development focused on the use of Extended Thinking Strategies. Our goal is to pinpoint students who scored at the high range of their level on FCAT so these students improve their level by 1. We also believe our focus on Extended Thinking Strategies will increase our overall school percentage of students scoring proficient on FCAT Reading, Math, Science and Writing.

We will continue to offer the Academic Support Program (ASP) classes after school two days a week, Tues/Thurs, beginning January 2012, for students who are in our lowest quartiles for reading and math grades 1-6. We will also provide Science class support in March 2013. Fairglen will also facilitate Supplemental Educational Services (SES) for students grades 4-6 who scored Level 1 or 2 in Reading, Math and Science.

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

Bob Marzano, ASCD and the US Department of Education have all conducted research and concluded that using Extended Thinking Strategies regularly is the number one strategy leading to increased student achievement. According to LEARNING-FOCUSED the following Thinking Strategies are: abstracting, classifying/categorizing, constructing support, analyzing perspectives, deductive reasoning, inductive reasoning, error analysis, and comparing/contrasting. Imbedding these strategies in our instruction will increase our percentage of students scoring proficient in reading, math, writing and science. Fairglen teachers and administrators recognize the need to increase students' higher order thinking/ processes as well as factoring in the new cut scores and school grade calculation changes. We also recognize the high impact on student achievement linked to collaborative teams (aka professional learning communities). We will continue to meet and work together in collaborative teams to share lesson development and implementation of Extended Thinking Strategies. Teams will also share other related instructional practices that are a part of our school culture, for example, differentiating instruction. There is countless research to support collaboration among teachers and the following is just one study. Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005, conducted research and documented factors that positively influence student achievement and the factors identified were: effective feedback, cooperation, collegiality, practice-oriented staff development, a culture of shared beliefs and relationships.

## CONTENT AREA:

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

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

Extended Thinking Strategies will be implemented in daily instruction. All teachers will identify which specific strategies to use aligned with the concept/skill their students are learning.

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

<i>Barrier</i>	<i>Action Steps</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Timetable</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>In-Process Measure</i>
1. Professional development specific to each Extended Thinking Strategies	1. Schedule/ attend PD for strategies.	School administration and Title 1 Teachers	October, September and February inservice days	0	Inservice records
2. Time to develop and plan lessons aligned with Extended Thinking Strategies	2. Increase frequency of team meetings for lesson plan development	School Administration and teachers	August through May	Sub funds	Meeting minutes
3. Collaboration is a work in progress and at varying levels within each collaborative team.	3. Planned agendas for team meetings to foster collaborative discussion within each team	Grade level contacts and school administration	September through May	0	Meeting agendas



4.Limited number of Success Maker student licenses	4. Purchase additional licenses so a minimum of two classes can use this program simultaneously	School Administration	August-September 2012	Title 1 – 25 licenses for approx. 22,500.00	PO for SuccessMaker licenses
5. Professional Development specific to implementing the Common Core Standards grades K-2	5. Schedule for Oct 2012 PD district day	School Admin and ELA and Math CCS teacher teams	October 2012	0	Inservice records
6. Increase use of higher order questioning during instruction	6. Train teachers using the Quality Questioning booklet	School Administration and Literacy Coach	October 2012	0	Inservice records
7.	7.				
8.	8.				

**EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection**

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

Teachers will note implementation of Extended Thinking Strategies in their lesson plans and share their plans at team meetings scheduled 2-3 times monthly. Team and/or Faculty meeting agendas/minutes will reflect sharing lesson plans and discussion of implementation of the strategies.

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

Teachers targeted instructional strategies to increase achievement for our lowest performing students, and they were successful. Our percentage of students making gains in reading and math, specifically our lowest performing students, increased from 2011 to 2012.

## APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

<p align="center"><b>Reading Goal</b></p> <p>1. <b>75%=291 of students in grades 3-6 will score satisfactory on FCAT Reading 2013.</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>2012 Current Level of Performance</b></p> <p align="center"><small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)</small></p>	<p align="center"><b>2013 Expected Level of Performance</b></p> <p align="center"><small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)</small></p>
<p>1. <b>Anticipated Barrier(s):</b></p> <p>2.</p>		
<p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <p>1.</p>		
<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at Achievement Level 3</p> <p><b>Barrier(s): Instructional time to establish, group and individualize student instructional plans.</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <p>1. <b>Pinpoint students who scored at the top point range for their level, and individualize their instructional activities to increase their achievement to the next level.</b></p>	<p align="center">68% = 264</p>	<p align="center">75%=291</p>
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <p>1.</p>	<p align="center">level 6 = 1 student (3<sup>rd</sup> grade)</p>	

<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s): Instructional time to establish, group and individualize student instructional plans.</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. <b>Pinpoint students who scored at the top point range for their level, and individualize their instructional activities to increase their achievement to the next level.</b></p>	<p>31%=121</p>	
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p>	<p>na</p>	
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p>	<p>NA - Only one 3<sup>rd</sup> grade student tested</p>	
<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b> Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p> <p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p>	<p>69%=67</p> <p>NA - Only one 3<sup>rd</sup> grade student tested</p>	
<p><b>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</b></p> <p><b>Baseline data 2010-11:</b></p>		

<b>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :</b>  White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	Enter numerical data for current level of performance  32%=103 46%=9 32%=6  	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance  25%=81 30%=6 24%=5 
<b>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading</b> <b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.	na	
<b>Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading</b> <b>Barrier(s): Ratio of ESE students to ESE teachers</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. An additional ESE teacher was added to the faculty for 2012-13.	69%=42	52%=32
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b> Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading <b>Barrier(s): Lack of home support with homework and parental involvement</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. Additional goal to increase parental involvement is part of this SIP.	38%=94	30%=74

### Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Culture School Team	July 2012	Action Plan implementation
Common Core Training	July 2012	Training provided via CC team during August 2012 with follow up during first semester
Training on planning and implementing Extended Thinking Strategies	September, Oct and Feb In-Service days	Teachers will seek and attend training focused on Extended Thinking Strategies

<b>CELLA GOAL</b>	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Person/Process/Monitoring</b>
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Listening/Speaking:</b>  40%=2			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Reading:</b>  40%=2			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Writing:</b>  40%=2			

<b>Mathematics Goal(s):</b> 1. <b>73%=283 of students in grades 3-6 will score satisfactory on FCAT Math 2013.</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance</b> (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance</b> (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
<b>Anticipated Barrier(s):</b> 1.		
<b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.		

<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 <b>Barrier(s): Instructional time to establish, group and individualize student instructional plans.</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. <b>Pinpoint students who scored at the top point range for their level, and individualize their instructional activities to increase their achievement to the next level.</b></p>	<p><b>66%=257</b></p>	<p><b>73%=283</b></p>
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p>	<p><b>One student – level 4</b></p>	
<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s): Instructional time to establish, group and individualize student instructional plans.</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. <b>Pinpoint students who scored at the top point range for their level, and individualize their instructional activities to increase their achievement to the next level.</b></p>	<p><b>31%=121</b></p>	
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p>	<p><b>na</b></p>	
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p>	<p><b>NA - Only one 3<sup>rd</sup> grade student tested</b></p>	
<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b> Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p>	<p><b>58%=56</b></p>	
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.</p>	<p><b>NA - Only one 3<sup>rd</sup> grade student tested</b></p>	

<b>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</b>		
<b>Baseline Data 2010-11:</b>		
<b>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress :</b>		
White:	35%=113	27%87
Black:	46%=9	61%(used DOE target)=12
Hispanic:	32%=6	32%(used DOE target)=6
Asian:		
American Indian:		
<b>English Language Learners (ELL)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	0%	
<b>Students with Disabilities (SWD)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	72%=44	52%=32
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b> Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	42%=104	34%=84

### Mathematics Professional Development

<b>PD Content/Topic/Focus</b>	<b>Target Dates/ Schedule</b>	<b>Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring</b>
Culture School Team	July 2012	Action Plan implementation
Common Core Training	July 2012	Training provided via CC team during August 2012 with follow up during first semester
Training on planning and implementing Extended Thinking Strategies	September, Oct and Feb inservice days	Teachers will seek and attend training focused on Extended Thinking Strategies

<b>Writing of students in grades 3-6 will score satisfactory on FCAT Writes 2013.</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage)</b>
---	---	---

		<b>reflects)</b>
<b>Barrier(s): Instructional time for grammar, spelling and punctuation</b>		
<b>Strategy(s):</b> 1. <b>Additional computer lab time used by fourth grade teachers to pull small groups for this focused instruction</b>		
<b>FCAT:</b> Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	72%=68	
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	na	

<b>Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle)</b> 1. <b>65%=67 of students in grades 3-6 will score satisfactory on FCAT Science</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>
<b>Barrier(s):</b>		
<b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.		
<b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:	60%=62	
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	na	
<b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	20%=21	
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading	na	

<b>1. Science Goal(s) (High School)</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>
---	---	--



<b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1.</b>		
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  <p style="text-align: right;"><b>White:</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Black:</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Hispanic:</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Asian:</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>American Indian:</b></p>		
<b>English Language Learners (ELL)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
<b>Students with Disabilities (SWD)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

## APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
<b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1.</b>		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:		
<b>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11</b>		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  <div style="text-align: right;"> <b>White:</b>   <b>Black:</b>   <b>Hispanic:</b> </div>		
<b>English Language Learners (ELL)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
<b>Students with Disabilities (SWD)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

<b>Geometry EOC Goal</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>
<b>Barrier(s):</b> <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1.</b>		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:		
<b>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11</b>		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  <p style="text-align: right;"><b>White:</b> <b>Black:</b> <b>Hispanic:</b></p>		
<b>English Language Learners (ELL)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
<b>Students with Disabilities (SWD)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b> not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		

<b>Biology EOC Goal</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Biology:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology:		

<b>Civics EOC</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>

		<b>reflects)</b>
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Civics:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics:		

<b>U.S. History EOC</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in U. S. History:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History:		

<b>Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)</b>	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Person/Process/Monitoring</b>
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:  <b>Goal 1:</b>  <b>Goal 2:</b>			

<b>Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)</b>	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Person/Process/Monitoring</b>
---	----------------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:  <b>Goal 1:</b>  <b>Goal 2:</b>			
---	--	--	--

<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Person/Process/Monitoring</b>
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:  <b>Goal 1: Increase attendance of parents to parental involvement events</b>  <b>Goal 2:</b>	Lack of motivation to attend and actively participate in their child's education	Several forms of communication prior to each school event are dispersed to encourage attendance. Small group sessions on helping students with homework will be offered. This is based on specific feedback from the client survey from 2011-12.	Title 1 Teachers School Administration

## APPENDIX C

### (TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

#### **Highly Effective Teachers**

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

<b>Descriptions of Strategy</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Projected Completion Date</b>
---------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------------

1. Hiring procedures for the district are strictly followed.	School Administration	Used when positions are available.
2. A large number of quality applicants apply when teaching positions are posted for Fairglen. This provides the opportunity to interview and find the best fit for our students' needs.	School Administration and teacher leaders	Diligence is practiced to review resumes, check references and hire as soon as the job posting closes.
3.		

**Non-Highly Effective Instructors**

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are not highly effective. \*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

<b>Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly effective</b>	<b>Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective</b>
0	

*For the following areas, please write a brief narrative that includes the data for the year 2011-12 and a description of changes you intend to incorporate to improve the data for the year 2012-13.*

**MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI** (Identify the MTSS leadership team and its role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)  
**Fairglen's MTSS leadership team is comprised of Debbie Joca, ESE Contact, district assigned school psychologist, staffing specialist and behavior analyst, and an ESE and General Education teacher specific to the student brought to the team. The MTSS gave input on the development of our SIP through their collaborative teams. The team reviewed FCAT data and the team along with all ESE teachers received training from district staff in May 2012 on ESE and MTSS procedures. Data sources include SuccssMaker, System 44, Read 180, Waterford, Scholastic Math Inventory, FastMath, FAIR, Scholastic Reading Inventory, Running Records, Academic Support Program assessments and monitoring individual behavior plans.**

**PARENT INVOLVEMENT:** Evening events continue to be planned and implemented to increase parental involvement at Fairglen. Attendance has increased slightly during the last two years and the first event held for 2012-13 again showed a significant increase in attendance. Our first parent involvement event for the school year 2011-12 had 72 parents in attendance. This year, 2012-12, we had 98 parents in attendance. Parents have strongly indicated a need for ways to assist their students with homework. Results from the 2011-12 Parent Survey for topics parents would like to see presented at school were: 53% homework help and 55% study skills. These were the largest responses by our parents. For the two upcoming parental involvement evenings teachers will conduct parent workshops by grade level and teach parents way to assist their students. The subject area targeted will be math and teachers will instruct parents on upcoming concepts/skills

**ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)** Attendance average for 2010-11 was 95.02 and for 2011-12 it was 95.21. Teachers and administration continue to be vigilant in monitoring excessive tardies and absences. Individual students are put on plans to improve poor attendance/tardiness. When necessary, the district Truancy Officer is contacted for additional support with individual cases.

**SUSPENSION:** Discipline referrals were analyzed for the 2011-12 school year. A total of 459 behavior referrals were processed and of those 17% resulted in in-school suspension used and 5% out of school suspension used. The goal for 2012-13 will be to reduce the number of total referrals by 10%.

**DROP-OUT (High Schools only):**

**POSTSECONDARY READINESS:** (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? Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.)