

Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

Name of School:

Area:

North Area

Holland Elementary

Principal:

Area Superintendent:

Dr. Ronald Bobay

Dr. Nancy West

SAC Chairperson:

Scott Culbreth

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

To help all students develop skills, concepts, attitudes and values which enable them to realize success as responsible adults.

Vision Statement:

Looking toward our children's future with challenging learning experiences that will lead to success.

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

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)*

According to an overall 5 year analysis of the percent of students meeting high standards on the Reading, Mathematics, and Writing FCAT we have had a substantial drop in scores on the 2012 FCAT. Our Reading scores ranged from 95% to 97% in between 2009-2011. In 2012 they dropped 15 percentage points to 81%. In between the years of 2009-2011 our Mathematics scores ranged from 95% to 97%. On the 2012 FCAT our Mathematics scores dropped 14 percentage points to 83%. Our 2012 FCAT Writing scores ranged from 2009 at 86% to 2011 at 98%. On the 2012 FCAT Writing our scores dropped 6 percentage points to 92%.

Further, a four year picture presents us with the following FCAT data of student reading proficiency levels;

| | | | | |
|---------|------|------|------|------|
| Year | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Percent | 97 | 95 | 96 | 81 |

Four years of FCAT data on student mathematics proficiency levels also signal a decline last year;

| | | | | |
|---------|------|------|------|------|
| Year | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Percent | 95 | 97 | 97 | 83 |

Although our Reading, Mathematics, and Writing FCAT scores dropped considerably on the 2012 FCAT we were one of 5 schools that did not have a drop in our school grade points. We made a 2 point increase from 365 to 367 in the points we scored for our school grade calculation. This was in part due to the overall learning gains that our students achieved on the FCAT, the increase in our level 4's and 5's, and our Science scores. With our focus on our lowest 25% reading abilities and stretching our level 3's to achieve a level 4 or 5 we were ranked 5th in Brevard County and were 34th in the state.

Brevard Public Schools overall performance on the 2012 FCAT was expected to drop due to the more stringent cut scores. On this FCAT it was much more difficult to score on or above grade level as seen in our overall Reading, Mathematics, and Writing scores. The changes to the FCAT Writing Assessment were also an area that even the state had to re-evaluate before setting what would be considered on grade level. Now with a new emphasis on Grammar we will need to relook at how we will prepare our students for the 2013 FCAT Writing Assessment. Even looking at CELLA scores for our ESOL students, reading is a concern. Listening, speaking, writing scores were at 71% but reading scored at 57%.

Looking back at the 2011-2012 School-Based Objective; Teachers will collaborate to identify three types of learners in their classrooms and differentiate instruction to maximize student achievement as implementation of our school wide enrichment model. We did accomplish this goal in part by looking at the increase in the number of level 5's we had from 2011 to 2012. In Reading our 4th graders increased from 12 level 5's in 3rd grade to 19 level 5's in 4th grade. Our level 5's from 4th to 5th in Reading were about the same, but from 5th to 6th grade in Reading we had 11 more level 5's from 17 to 28. Also, when analyzing the data of our lowest 25% we achieved our School-Based Objective. We had a 10 point increase in the number of students making learning gains from 66% to 76%. Our overall gains in Reading and Mathematics were about 10 points. In Reading we increased from 68% to 76% and in Mathematics we increased from 71% to 82%. These gains are only possible by differentiating instruction across the subject areas.

An analysis of the Reading Content Areas and Mathematics Content Areas of each grade level tested has given us a

clearer picture of where we will need to concentrate our efforts for this coming year. In 3rd and 5th grade the lowest areas were Reading Application and Informational Texts and Research Process. In 4th grade the lowest areas were Informational Texts and Research Process and Literary Analysis. In 6th grade the lowest areas were Reading Application and Literary Analysis. In Mathematics the lowest areas in 3rd grade were Fractions and Number: Operations, Problems, and Statistics. In 4th grade the lowest area was Number: Operations and Problems. In 5th grade the lowest areas were Geometry and Measurement and Expressions: Equations and Statistics. In 6th grade the lowest area was Geometry and Measurement.

More precisely, Reading FCAT is divided into four subsections or strands. They are; vocabulary, reading application, literary analysis and informational text and research process. At Holland students over all scored the highest in vocabulary. In grade 3, the average scores were 6 out of 7 correct on vocabulary, 14 out of 20 correct on reading application, 8 out of 10 correct on literary analysis and 6 out of 8 correct on informational text and research process. In grade four, students had average scores of 7 out of 8 on vocabulary, 13 out of 16 correct on reading application, 10 out of 13 correct on literary analysis and, on informational text and research process, students' scored an average of 6 out of 8 correctly. In grade 5, the average scores were 8 out of 9 correct on vocabulary, 11 out of 14 correct on reading application, 7 out of 8 correct on literary analysis and 11 out of 14 correct on informational text and research process. In grade 6, the average scores were 7 out of 8 correct on vocabulary, 13 out of 17 correct on reading application, 11 out of 14 correct on literary analysis and 5 out of 6 answered correctly on informational text and research process.

Math FCAT is also divided into strands that vary with the grade levels. In grade 3, the three strands were; number: operations, problems, & statistics, number: fractions, and geometry & measurement. Students scored respectively, on average, 17 out of 21, 8 out of 10 and 11 out of 13 correctly. In grade 4, the three strands were; number: operations & problems, number: base 10 & fractions, and geometry & measurement. Students' average scores respectively were; 14 out of 18 correct, 9 out of 10 correct and 10 out of 12 correct. In grade 5, the three strands were; number: base 10 & fractions, expressions: equations & statistics, and geometry & measurement. Students' average respective scores were; 16 out of 22 correct, 7 out of 10 correct, and 10 out of 14 correct. In grade 6, the three strands included; fractions, ratios, proportional relationships, & statistics, expressions: equations & statistics and geometry & measurement. Students' scored, on average, 15 out of 18 correct, 14 out of 17 correct and 7 out of 9 correctly in respective order.

Another source of data that we have included in this analysis came from the Parent Survey. From parent comments in reference to item number 15, Rate your satisfaction with classroom instruction, it was mentioned several times by parents that they would like to see teachers using less worksheets and more hands-on activities. As a faculty, we all have heard this from multiple sources and know that students are much more motivated when hands-on activities are used and more likely to retain information. Teachers at Holland Elementary use a variety of methods when teaching and hands-on activities are being used, but there are some teachers that are more traditional in their teaching and planning. Giving teachers an opportunity to plan together and include higher order questions will help with deeper understanding classroom activities. Also with item number 30, Rate how well your child is learning Math, parents made similar comments about hands-on activities. One also mentioned how she really liked that our 6th grade Mathematics teacher required the students to show their work. As we shift to the Common Core this will be something that is required of all students in all subject areas and supports our effort with using higher order questions.

After classroom observations and walkthroughs it was noted and discussed how we the administrators at Holland are still seeing a lot of worksheets and lower level questions being used on activities and assessments. We are seeing that teachers are beginning to have students analyze data in relation to the work they do in the classroom which is a higher order activity that many have put into their regular daily curriculum. We do feel that there is still a great need to incorporate higher order questions across the curriculum, especially in the Reading Curriculum. Most assessments are primarily filled with recall questions which do not help students extend their thinking and learning. During the start of the 2012-2013 school year we asked teachers to bring in either an assessment they had given or an activity they used with their class. Out of 15 documents we looked at only 5 were higher order skills and the other 10 were filled with primarily recall type questions. A few had one question or student activity that was considered to be higher order.

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

All but a few of the teachers at Holland Elementary have completed all the gifted coursework to add the endorsement to their certificates. Teachers have begun to integrate many of the gifted teaching strategies into their lessons allowing all students to get enrichment throughout all subject areas. They are using many of the BEST strategies with the focus on student led activities. Student data notebooks are in all of our classrooms in various degrees or levels of development. Student discussions are more abundant in the classrooms across the subject areas. More and more teachers are beginning to embrace student understanding over memorizing steps to find the answers. Teachers continue to implement independent study projects as Carnegie Mellon Institute for Talented Elementary and Secondary Students found this to increase student achievement.

Historically Holland used a pull out program to service gifted students. Students received gifted instruction that were not necessarily tied to the core curriculum. The gifted student program teacher would enrich student learning in a variety of ways by working in small groups of homogeneous students one day per week. Last year we changed this format with our intermediate students by rewriting their EP's to include a full time program in all subject areas. In the primary grades we continued to use the more traditional pull-out style program, but also incorporated various levels of gifted enrichment opportunities in their regular classrooms. Our gifted program teacher co-taught with various classroom teachers incorporating gifted strategies throughout lessons and independent project work. We will continue to offer our students similar services for this coming year. Something else to note is the large number of students that are being identified as gifted with using a streamlined approach that our gifted student teacher and guidance team has developed.

Independent Study Projects will continue to be a mainstay at Holland. Teachers, students, and parents have embraced this method of learning that is supported by data collected at Carnegie Mellon Institute for Talented Elementary and Secondary Students to raise student achievement. Something that we put into place last school year was teaching to the student's strength and understanding that no two brains are alike. When an educator does this correctly differentiation is taking place which is a B.E.S.T. strategy that increases student achievement.

We will continue to use a variety of ways to move our lowest 25% of students in Mathematics and English Language Arts. We do not have a school wide model or time that we implement interventions. We have and will continue to use the end of the day as a time for students to take part in an online program called Tune in to Reading that we have found very successful in raising student lexiles and reading levels. We have seen over a year and in some cases two years growth with students who have used this program with fidelity. We will be implementing a new delivery system for our Academic Support Program. Students will be enrolled into a prescriptive on-line program that places students into a specific learning path from the results of a pre assessment piece. We will offer this to all of our struggling students who are in the lowest 25% in hopes that even if they are unable to attend the program here at school they will participate in it from home. It has always been a challenge to get the students into the program due to time and location restraints.

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

Research tells us that we need to prioritize or use a curriculum mapping strategy that will allow us to spend more time on skills that students need to master and less time on skills that they already have or have mastered. There are three distinctions that need to be considered, Essentials which need to be mastered, Important which need to be introduced or extended, and Compact which need to be maintained. The allocated instructional time teachers should spend on the Essentials is between 70-75%. No more than 20% on the Important and 5-10% on the Compacted. Using this planning strategy will allow teachers to be more efficient with respect to covering the grade level benchmarks and standards.

Another important change is in lesson development. Creating Student Learning Maps with the focus on Essential Questions instead of objectives has shown to increase student achievement or understanding in all subject areas. Teachers use the maps to guide the learning and continually go back to the map as a way to review and answer the essential questions. Students use them to check for understanding and to help with maintaining their focus on what is the Key Learning.

There are two areas that are crucial in successfully transitioning to the Common Core. They are Extended Thinking and Summarizing. We need to continually extend thinking and not just have students read a story and answer questions at the end. We need to spend most of our more dissecting parts of a story, pulling information out to be used as evidence when answering questions that are posed throughout a story or selection. Students need to read and reread selections. They need to be able to put information into their own words as they summarize small sections of a story or selection. This more in depth approach to reading or extended thinking should be a new focus in our 90 minute Reading Block. Student discussion time needs to be much more structured and Higher Order Questions need to be the focus of these discussions. Extended thinking can only be achieved with Higher Order Questioning which will not only prepare our students for the much more rigorous testing that we are transitioning towards, but also helps students develop a rich and deep understanding of all subjects and content presented in classrooms.

Institute for the Education of At-Risk Youth (1999). *Practice in exemplary schools: What did they do and how did they get there?* Washington, DC: US Government Printing.

Reidl, Jim (2010) Power Curriculum: Transforming Standards Into Learning.

Thompson, Max, (2009) Connecting Extending Thinking. Learning Focused Publishing

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?)*

All teachers at Holland Elementary will implement a more rigorous curriculum by incorporating higher order thinking in the Reading content area.

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

| Barrier | Action Steps | Person Responsible | Timetable | Budget | In-Process Measure |
|-----------------------------|---|---|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Knowledge | 1.a. During Pre-planning introduce Quality Questioning resource booklet (green spiral) with examples of higher level questioning. 1.b. During Grade Level Data Team Meetings reintroduce Webb's Depth of Knowledge from B.E.S.T. Module. | 1.a. ELA Contact 1.b. Admin/ Reading Coach | Preplanning GLM | \$0.00 \$0.00 | Pre-planning Agenda GLM-Agenda |
| 2. Extended Planning Time | 2. Subs will be used to allow time for teacher planning to include higher order questioning in their Gifted Units. | 2. Teachers / Admin | Sept. – Oct. 2012 | \$400 | Substitute Log and Teacher Lessons |
| 3. New curriculum standards | 3. Teachers will use Student Learning Maps or Format Wheels to develop their lessons and that administration can use to collect data. | 3. Teachers/ Admin | Sept. – Oct. 2012 | \$0.00 | Completed Document |
| 4. Higher expectations | 4. Formative Checklist created by Leadership Team to help teachers plan Gifted Units. | 4. Leadership Team | Sept. – Oct. 2012 | \$0.00 | Teacher Peer Observations |
| 5. Peer Observations | 5. Teachers will observe other teachers using distributed summarizing, close reading and/or essential questions as part of gifted units of study or for another specific identified need area. | 5. Teachers / Admin | Oct. 2012 | \$ 400 | Teacher sign up sheets |
| 6. Reflection | 6. Teachers will reflect on gifted lessons and strategies used to impact student achievement. | 6. Teachers/ Admin | Oct.-Nov. | \$400 | Vertical team meeting notes |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------------|-------------|-------|-------------------------------------|
| 7. More time to collaborate | 7. Substitutes will be used so teachers will be able to develop a second gifted unit during second semester. | 7. Teachers/ Admin | Spring 2013 | \$800 | Substitute Logs and Teacher Lessons |
| | | | | | |

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes will be measured by our Formative Checklist which includes 9 essential elements of higher order thinking.

Qualitative Professional Practice Outcomes will be measured by gathering and analyzing data from the post observation meetings with teachers. The Principal and Assistant Principal will survey teachers regarding the inclusion of higher order thinking within their Growth Plans and Gifted Units.

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

We will increase our Level 3 Reading FCAT scores from 25% to 30% in 2013. We will increase our Levels 4 and 5 from 56% to 60% on FCAT Reading in 2013. Students will be surveyed on learning outcomes achieved from the “Gifted” Curriculum Units.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

| Reading Goal | 2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students) | 2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students) |
|---|---|---|
| 1. All teachers at Holland Elementary will implement a more rigorous curriculum by incorporating higher order processes in the Reading content area. | | |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <p>Anticipated Barrier(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 21% Black students scored below proficient on FCAT Reading 2012. 2. 15% Hispanic students scored below proficient on FCAT Reading 2012. 3. 60% ESE students scored below proficient on FCAT Reading 2012 4. 57% ELL students are proficient in Reading on Cella 2012. | | |
| <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify in collaborative groups who these students are so they can mentor children. | | |
| <p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at proficient Achievement Level 3</p> <p>Barrier(s): Higher level cut scores, more rigorous test,</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incorporate higher level questioning into Reading lessons. 2. Ensure that all students use books with higher level text complexity. 3. Scaffold learning so students using lower level texts get to on grade level texts. | <p>25% = 57 students</p> | <p>30% = 68 students</p> |
| <p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. | <p>NA</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): Higher level cut scores, more rigorous test</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incorporate higher level questioning into Reading lessons. 2. Ensure that all students use books with higher level text complexity. 3. Employ gifted units of study. 4. Purchase Junior Great Books and begin implementation. 5. Train faculty in reader's workshop | <p>56% = 126 students</p> | <p>60% = 135 students</p> |
| <p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. | <p>NA</p> | <p>NA</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p> | NA | NA |
| <p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): Higher level cut scores, more rigorous test</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Scaffold learning to incorporate higher level questioning into Reading lessons. 2. Scaffold learning to ensure that these students use books with higher level text complexity. 3. Use FAIR data and Decision Trees to identify students and the areas effecting reading comprehension. 4. Use Prescriptive online program for Academic Support Program. 5. Identify learning goal in collaborative groups.</p> <p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p> | 70% = 19 students | 80% = 22 students |
| <p>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</p> <p>Baseline data 2010-11:</p> | 81%=183 | 84%=189 |
| <p>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :</p> <p>1. Scaffold learning to incorporate higher level questioning into Reading lessons. 2. Scaffold learning to ensure that these students use books with higher level text complexity. 3. Use FAIR data and Decision Trees to identify students and the areas effecting reading comprehension. 4. Use Prescriptive online program for Academic Support Program.</p> <p>White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p> | <p>Enter numerical data for current level of performance</p> <p>18%=29 students 21%=3 students 15%=3 students 40%=2 students NA</p> | <p>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance</p> <p>12%=20 14%=2 8%=2 20%=1 NA</p> |
| <p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p> | 100%=1 student | 0%=0 students |

| | | |
|--|-----------------|--------|
| Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Attending the Academic Support Program at school. Strategy(s): 1. Use an online program for our Academic Support Program. 2. Monitor progress through weekly tests. 3. Use decision trees to diagnose and implement strategies. | 60%=15 students | 50%=12 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1. | 25%=18 students | 20%=14 |

Reading Professional Development

| PD Content/Topic/Focus | Target Dates/ Schedule | Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring |
|---|---------------------------|--|
| ELA/Distributed Summarizing and Practice/Across Content Areas | August 2012 | Grade Level Meetings/Discussion about implementation/Classroom Observations |
| ELA/Extended Thinking/ All Subjects | August/ September 2012 | *K-2 Comprehension Tool Kit – charts w/ sticky notes on walls *Grade Level Meetings/Discussion about implementation |
| Higher Level Questioning/ Essential Question | August 2012 | Essential Questions posted in the classroom and Gifted Unit Checklist |
| Differentiation Workshops | October 2012 PDD | Tiers I-III are in student maps and three tiers of vocabulary are accounted for in Gifted Units |
| | | |
| | | |

| CELLA GOAL | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person/Process/ Monitoring |
|--|---------------------|----------|-------------------------------|
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 71% | | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : 57% | Identifying Learning Gaps Closing Learning Gaps | Use Learning Today an online prescriptive Reading Program to supplement core curriculum. | Teacher/ Admin/Parents Pretest/Posttest Analyze quarterly reports |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 71% | | | |

| Mathematics Goal(s): | 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) |
|---|---|--|
| 1. All teachers at Holland Elementary will implement a more rigorous curriculum by integrating higher order reading processes into the mathematics content area. | | |
| Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. 21 % Black students scored below proficient on FCAT Math 2012. 2. 30 % Hispanic students scored below proficient on FCAT Math 2012. 3. 57 % ESE students scored below proficient on FCAT Math 2012 4. 0 % ELL students are proficient in Math on FCAT 2012. | | |
| Strategy(s): Identify in collaborative groups who these students are so they can mentor children. | | |
| FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at proficient Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s): Higher level cut scores, more rigorous test Strategy(s): 1 . Provide student "math talk" in lessons. 2. Ask teachers to provide evidence of the eight math practices in lessons. 3. Incorporate technology to help students learn basic facts. 4. Students monitor learning with data notebooks. 5. Write about math in student journals. | 24%= 55 students | 30%= 68 students |

| | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|
| Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1. | NA | NA |
| FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Higher level cut scores, more rigorous test Strategy(s): 1. Provide for student "math talk" in math lessons. 2. Monitor learning with student data notebooks. 3. Differentiate math lessons. 4. Write about math in student journals. 5. Integrate math in gifted units as appropriate. | 59%= 132 | 65%= 146 |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1. | NA | NA |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1. | NA | NA |
| FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): Higher level cut scores, more rigorous test Strategy(s): 1. Use an online math program for our ASP students. 2. Use diagnostic test to identify and fill in learning gaps. 3. Monitor progress with student data notebooks. 4. Write about math in student journals. 5. Identify learning goal in collaborative groups. | 64%= 16 students | 72%= 18 students |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1. | NA | NA |
| Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11: | 83%=187 85% | 88%=198 |

| | | | |
|---|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading : | White: | 16%=25 | 10%=16 |
| | Black: | 21%=3 | 14%=2 |
| | Hispanic: | 30%=6 | 20%=4 |
| | Asian: | 20%=1 | 0%=0 |
| | American Indian: | NA | NA |
| English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics | | 100%= 1 student | 0%= 0 students |
| Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics Barrier(s): Not attending the academic support program Strategy (s): 1. Use an online program for the Academic Support Program. 2. Monitor progress through weekly tests. 3. Use decision trees to diagnose and implement strategies. 4. Use diagnostic test to identify and fill in learning gaps. | | 76%= 19 students | 65%= 16 students |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics | | 8%= 6 students | 3% 2 students |

Mathematics Professional Development

| PD Content/Topic/Focus | Target Dates/ Schedule | Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring |
|--|---------------------------|--|
| "Going deeper with Common Core" and "Fun math activities and strategies for improving FCAT" scores | Oct. 12, 2012 | Develop tiered lessons and share at grade level meetings |
| Number operations, problems and statistics | Feb. 18, 2012 | Student math journals as evidence |

| | | |
|----------------|---|--|
| Writing | 2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage) | 2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of |
|----------------|---|--|

| | reflects) | students that percentage reflects) |
|--|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1. | | |
| FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing | 92%= 49 students | 97% 51 students |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing | NA | NA |

| Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) 1. | 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) |
|---|---|--|
| Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1. | | |
| FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science: | 56% 35 students | 60% 31 students |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science | NA | NA |
| FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science: | 35%= 22 students | 40% 25 students |

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)
 Sherry Dugan, Guidance Counselor
 Lynn Roley, Teacher
 Dan Hicks, School Psychologist
 Joanne Guertin, Staffing Specialist
 Judy Vizzini, Teacher
 Nancy West, Principal
 Grade levels met weekly at data meetings to analyze and discuss student data. Grade level chairs were the case managers that ran the meetings. During IPST Meetings, discussion about individual students ensured a problem solving approach was used with measurable outcomes. We will continue to use this

format this year.

The RTI Team's primary purpose is to monitor student growth and achievement in academics. There are designed strategies evident throughout this paper to be implemented by Holland Teachers. In order for this to happen, the RTI Team first had to review and analyze school data to target strategies that are used.

The Florida FAIR Assessment is given to students at Holland and is then used to help monitor ongoing progress. Reading Decision Trees are then reviewed with teachers in order to help determine initial placement of a student in the Tier system and to monitor the fluid movement of a student as progress is realized. Data collection helps a teacher monitor progress for each student and to analyze movement needed in the Tiered System as learning gains are either increased or decreased dependent on the different strategies that are used.

Holland was a Stage Two school according to the District's RTI plan for all schools last year. As such, the RTI team began training three summers ago. The School Psychologist and Staffing Specialist were trained and worked with the Principal to direct efforts in this area last year. This year we have a new staffing specialist who will need to be trained and our new school psychologist was trained last year. He will meet with the faculty and go over the new documents that were developed by the county at a faculty meeting on September 27, 2012.

New for 2012-2013 we are helping teachers incorporate higher level questioning and distributed summarizing and practice through the vehicle of gifted units. These gifted units will have three tiers so teachers can differentiate instruction for all learners. It is the belief at Holland that a gifted education is good for all students. New this year an OM team has been established and 5th grade students are involved in Future Problem Solving tournament.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

Last school year 149 parents participated in the online parent survey. Our volunteer hours dropped from approximately 6000 hours to 3000 hours. We had a small group of parents who volunteered regularly, but not to the extent that we have had in the past. Several of our older volunteers that would typically spend entire days here at Holland no longer volunteer. We held a volunteer orientation where approximately 25 parents attended. We held our Celebrate America celebration, Book Fairs, Science Fair Night, Grade Level Musical Programs, Living Biography Programs, and Strings and Orchestra Programs. We added an invention convention program and Colonial Day program where parents were encouraged to attend. We will continue with all of these programs this year and have added a Character program for parents. We have also added a Math Night with Publix, one of our business sponsors. A parent workshop in January will address Thinking Maps and Study Skills as was indicated as a need on our parent survey. We will continue to partnership with Satellite High School which will continue to send high school students over to support teachers in their classrooms and fulfill their course requirements.

ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)

Our attendance rate is currently at 96.97% which is higher than the district average and above the district goal of 95%. Last year we closed out the school year with an attendance rate of 94.85% which was approximately .5% lower than the district average. This year we will recognize students with perfect attendance quarterly by giving them a certificate with their progress report that has been donated by a local business sponsor. We will continue to include a school health initiative that incorporates healthy habits across all grade levels. Teachers have included washing hands in their daily procedures prior to lunch and sanitizing hands after using computers as a proactive measure against the spread of germs.

SUSPENSION:

During the 2011-2012 school year we suspended 18 students. We reported 23 total events meaning that we had several students that were suspended more than one time. Looking over the names of the students that were suspended only 5 of those students are still here at Holland Elementary. Out of the 5 remaining students only one was suspended more than one time. Last year our bullying reporting increased and by approximately 6 times from the prior year. To be more proactive this year we have implemented a Formal Character Education program that we in-serviced all teachers on during pre-planning. We have incorporated a Character Recognition Program that will include weekly recognition of students on our Hornet TV show. We are planning to have annual recognition of two students per classroom with certificates and an end of the year program that parents will be invited to attend.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only): NA

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.)

NA