

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

| | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| School Name: Bond Elementary School | District Name: Leon |
| Principal: Regina Browning | Superintendent: Jackie Pons |
| SAC Chair: Jamie Steed | Date of School Board Approval: |

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.

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

| 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) |
|---------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Principal | Regina Browning | B.S. in Political Science w/ Certification in Social Science Masters of Education in Administration and Supervision | 2 | 11 | <p>Kate Sullivan Elementary <u>2007-08 School Grade A</u> <u>2008-09 School Grade B</u> Prevent 1 Subgroups not meeting AYP: African American and Economically Disadvantaged Students in Reading and Math <u>2009-10 School Grade B</u> Prevent 1 Subgroups not meeting AYP: African American and Economically Disadvantaged Students in Reading and Math <u>2010-11 School Grade B</u> Correct 1 Subgroups not meeting AYP: African American and Economically Disadvantaged Students in Reading and Math</p> <p>Bond Elementary <u>2011-12 School Grade C</u> 34%-Reading, 42%-Math 64%- Learning Gains in Reading, 72%- Learning Gains in Math, 74%- Lowest 25th in Reading, 74%, Lowest 25th in Math, 80%-Writing, 37% Science</p> |
| Assistant Principal | Sylvia Myers | B.S. in Elementary Education and Exceptional Student Education Masters of Education in Educational Leadership ESOL Endorsement | 0 | 0 | |

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

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) |
|--------------|-------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Reading | Jamie Steed | B.S. Biology Masters of Education in Biology <u>Certifications</u> Elementary Education K-6, General Science 5-9, Middle Grade Integrated Curriculum 5-9 Reading Endorsement | 7 | 6 | <u>2006-07 School Grade D</u> 56%- Reading, 69%-Math, 61%- Learning Gains in Reading, 43% Learning Gains in Math, 63%-Lowest 25 th % in Reading, 39%-Lowest 25 th %in Math, 76%-Writing, 21%-Science, AYP:77%; Did not make AYP in Reading and Math <u>2008-09 School Grade C</u> 58%- Reading, 64%-Math, 58%- Learning Gains in Reading, 57% Learning Gains in Math, 65%-Lowest 25 th % in Reading, 78%-Lowest 25 th %in Math, 83%-Writing, 17%-Science, AYP:95%; Did not make AYP in Reading and Math <u>2009-10 School Grade B</u> 56%- Reading, 69%-Math, 63%- Learning Gains in Reading, 62% Learning Gains in Math, 55%-Lowest 25 th % in Reading, 76%-Lowest 25 th %in Math, 98%-Writing, 23%-Science, AYP:79%; Did not make AYP in Reading and Math <u>2010-11 School Grade B</u> 57%- Reading, 57%-Math, 58%- Learning Gains in Reading, 55% Learning Gains in Math, 51%-Lowest 25 th % in Reading, 56%-Lowest 25 th %in Math, 83%-Writing, 39%-Science, AYP:92%; Did not make AYP in Reading <u>2011-12 School Grade C</u> 34%-Reading, 42%-Math 64%- Learning Gains in Reading, 72%- Learning Gains in Math, 74%- Lowest 25 th in Reading, 74%, Lowest 25 th in Math, 80%-Writing, 37% Science |

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

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. A team of teachers will be involved in the interview process to hire new teachers. | Administrative Team/Teachers | May 2013 |
| 2. Professional Learning Communities will meet to provide support to new teachers. | Administrative Team/Teachers | May 2013 |
| 3. Beginning teacher program at the school site will be used to provide additional support to new teachers. | Administrative Team/Teachers | May 2013 |
| 4. The administrative team will conduct Classroom Walkthroughs and provide feedback to teachers. | Administrative Team/Teachers | May 2013 |
| 5. Highly qualified veteran teachers will mentor new teachers. | Administrative Team/Teachers | May 2013 |
| 6. Beginning teachers are assigned mentors that meet with them regularly to provide positive support and assist in areas of need. | Administrative Team/Teachers | May 2013 |
| 7. Beginning teachers receive formal and informal evaluations within the first 45 days of employment. The data collected during the evaluation is used to identify strengths and areas of need. Professional development and support is provided based on the evaluation. | Administrative Team/Teachers/Mentors | May 2013 |

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 |
| 8% (4) | Teachers will work towards meeting ESOL requirements. |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| 45 | 8% (4) | 18% (8) | 49% (22) | 24% (11) | 33% (15) | 100% (44) | 13% (6) | 2% (1) | 16% (7) |

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 |
|---------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Warnick Lewis | Jessica Chance | Ms. Chance is still getting acclimated to the grade level. Mrs. Lewis has years of experience and has been able to show student growth and effective ways to manage and educate students with high quality instruction. | Report Cards, parent conferences, classroom management, grade level meetings, mentor/mentee conferences and feedback sessions, planning lessons, progress monitoring, data disaggregation, observations, |

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

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | professional learning community meetings, and trainings. |
| Stephanie Mullings and Jamie Steed | Latoria Oliver | Mrs. Oliver is still getting acclimated to the grade level and needs additional support. Mrs. Mullings and Mrs. Steed have years of experience and have been able to show student growth and effective ways to manage and educate students with high quality instruction. | Report Cards, parent conferences, classroom management, grade level meetings, mentor/mentee conferences and feedback sessions, planning lessons, progress monitoring, data disaggregation, observations, professional learning community meetings, and trainings. |
| Rhonda Harden and Jamie Steed | Tyffany Fulmore | Ms. Fulmore is still getting acclimated with teaching music. Mrs. Harden and Mrs. Steed have years of experience and has been able to show student growth and effective ways to manage and educate students with high quality instruction. | Report Cards, parent conferences, classroom management, grade level meetings, mentor/mentee conferences and feedback sessions, planning lessons, progress monitoring, data disaggregation, observations, professional learning community meetings, and trainings. |
| Myoshi Walker and Jamie Steed | Alicia Holmes | Mrs. Holmes is still getting acclimated with the duties and responsibilities of a Speech Pathologist. Mrs. Walker and Mrs. Steed have years of experience and have been able to show student growth and effective ways to manage and educate students with high quality instruction. | Report Cards, parent conferences, classroom management, grade level meetings, mentor/mentee conferences and feedback sessions, planning lessons, progress monitoring, data disaggregation, observations, professional learning community meetings, and trainings. |
| Rhonda Harden | Niah Hatcher | Mrs. Hatcher is new to Bond Elementary School. Mrs. Harden has years of experience and has been able to show student growth and effective ways to manage and educate students with high quality instruction. | Report Cards, parent conferences, classroom management, grade level meetings, mentor/mentee conferences and feedback sessions, planning lessons, progress monitoring, data disaggregation, observations, professional learning community meetings, and trainings. |
| Myoshi Walker and Jamie Steed | Simone Henry | Ms. Henry is a new ESE teacher. Mrs. Walker and Mrs. Steed have years of experience and have been able to show student growth and effective ways to manage and educate students with high quality instruction. | Report Cards, parent conferences, classroom management, grade level meetings, mentor/mentee conferences and feedback sessions, |

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

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------|---|---|
| | | | planning lessons, progress monitoring, data disaggregation, observations, professional learning community meetings, and trainings. |
| Myioshi Walker and Jamie Steed | Vernon Wilder | Mr. Wilder is a new ESE teacher. Mrs. Walker and Mrs. Steed have years of experience and have been able to show student growth and effective ways to manage and educate students with high quality instruction. | Report Cards, parent conferences, classroom management, grade level meetings, mentor/mentee conferences and feedback sessions, planning lessons, progress monitoring, data disaggregation, observations, professional learning community meetings, and trainings. |
| Stephanie Mullings | Tracie Henning | Mrs. Henning is a new teacher. Mrs. Mullings has years of experience and has been able to show student growth and effective ways to manage and educate students with high quality instruction. | Report Cards, parent conferences, classroom management, grade level meetings, mentor/mentee conferences and feedback sessions, planning lessons, progress monitoring, data disaggregation, observations, professional learning community meetings, and trainings. |
| Myioshi Walker | Javad Davis | Mr. Davis is a new teacher. Mrs. Walker has years of experience and has been able to show student growth and effective ways to manage and educate students with high quality instruction. | Report Cards, parent conferences, classroom management, grade level meetings, mentor/mentee conferences and feedback sessions, planning lessons, progress monitoring, data disaggregation, observations, professional learning community meetings, and trainings. |
| Aimee Tricquet and Brandon Clayton | Sherronda Sailor | Ms. Sailor is beginning her first year teaching elementary school. Ms. Tricquet and Mr. Clayton have years of experience and have been able to show student growth and effective ways to manage and educate students with high quality instruction. | Report Cards, parent conferences, classroom management, grade level meetings, mentor/mentee conferences and feedback sessions, planning lessons, progress monitoring, data disaggregation, observations, professional learning community meetings, and trainings. |

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 Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after school programs or summer reading academy. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided.</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.</p> |
| <p>Title I, Part D District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention and Neglected and Delinquent programs.</p> |
| <p>Title II District receives supplemental funds for improving basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. New technology in classrooms will increase the instructional strategies provided to students and new instructional software will enhance literacy and math skills of struggling students. Funds at Bond Elementary School are used to provide professional development and progress monitoring. Supplemental funds are also used to provide staff development on site and at professional learning community conferences. Teachers who utilize their planning times to provide additional academic instruction (interventions) will also be compensated by Title II funds.</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, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. Title I provides a resource teacher to support Title I students in non-Title I schools.</p> |
| <p>Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds will be used to provide an early intervention First Grade Summer Reading Academy for Level 1 readers. 21st Century After School funds will be used to expand supplemental services after school and during the summer to support Level 1 and Level 2 students.</p> |
| <p>Violence Prevention Programs The School Resource Officer conducts classes on violence prevention, gang and cyber bullying, drug resistance, and other topics to increase awareness and prevention. The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporate field trips, community service, drug tests, and counseling.</p> |
| <p>Nutrition Programs Our school was awarded Provision 2 status by the United States Department of Agriculture. Provision 2 must serve meals from the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and/or School Breakfast Program (SBP) to all participating children at no charge. The School Food Service Program serves a school breakfast, lunch, snack and an after school snack, following the Health Food and Beverage Guideline and the District Wellness Policy.</p> |
| <p>Housing Programs</p> |
| <p>Head Start</p> |

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

| |
|--------------------------------|
| Adult Education |
| Career and Technical Education |
| Job Training |
| Other |

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

DRAFT

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

| School-Based MTSS/RtI Team |
|--|
| <p>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.</p> <p><u>Principal & Assistant Principal</u>: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.</p> <p><u>Referral Coordinator</u>: Provides expertise on fundamentals and implications of RtI. Assists classroom teachers with development of assessment and interventions with individual students. Provides information to parents on community agencies. Maintains records of RtI Team meetings and decisions.</p> <p><u>General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate)</u>: Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.</p> <p><u>Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers</u>: 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.</p> <p><u>Reading Coach</u>: Provides guidance on K-12 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 of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.</p> <p><u>ESE Staffing Specialist</u>: Provides expertise on fundamentals and implications of RtI. Assists classroom teachers with development of assessment and interventions with individual students. Provides information to parents on community agencies. Maintains records of RtI Team meetings and decisions.</p> <p><u>School Psychologist</u>: 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.</p> <p><u>Speech Language Pathologist</u>: 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 systemic patterns of student needs with respect to language skills</p> <p><u>School Social Worker</u>: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.</p> |
| <p>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?</p> <p>The school RtI Leadership team focuses on developing and maintaining a problem-solving system to ensure optimal student achievement for all students. The RtI 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 weekly 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 at risk and guide instructional decisions. Based on the information received, the team will identify prescriptive research-based interventions. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills.</p> |
| <p>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 problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?</p> <p>The RtI Leadership Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; 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.</p> |
| MTSS Implementation |
| <p>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.</p> <p>Baseline data is obtained through the FAIR assessment and previous test information. The data is made available through the use of the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN). Progress Monitoring is obtained through the administration of FAIR, Curriculum Based Measurements, Success Maker, Data Director, Write Score, and other FCAT simulation assessments. Midyear data is obtained through FAIR assessments, AIMS Web, Curriculum Based Measurements, Success Maker, Data Director, Write Score and other FCAT simulation assessments.</p> |

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

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

End of year data is obtained through FAIR, FCAT, Success Maker, AIMS Web, Data Director, and Write Score.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the year. The RtI team will also evaluate additional staff professional development needs during the weekly RtI Leadership Team meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Professional development will be provided by teacher leaders, advocates, and reading coach on staff.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The reading coach, Mrs. Jamie Steed, chairs the Literacy Team. One teacher from each grade level, the media specialist, the assistant principal, and the principal serves on the team. The purpose of the Literacy Leadership Team is to promote and support high quality literacy within the school building and community.

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

The principal, assistant principal, reading coach, media specialist, and a literacy teacher from each team serve on the reading leadership team. The team will meet monthly to discuss literacy needs at the school, in the classroom, with parents, and for student levels. Professional development for reading will be determined by the Literacy Leadership Team. We focus on strengthening home-school connections, evaluating staffing needs, and monitoring instructional practices. Additionally, we collect student data and measure instructional materials as compared to the first- and second-year baseline data. The leadership team analyzes this information to improve student achievement.

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

The Bond Elementary Literacy Team works to achieve the following goals:

- Host Muffins for Moms and Donuts for Dads Breakfast Workshop on reading and writing strategies that parents can use at home.
- Curriculum Night is a workshop that provides parents with the best test-taking, reading, writing, math, and science strategies to enhance student achievement.
- Provide trainings for teachers on interventions and workshop/centers to promote quality instruction.

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.

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

**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.

Pre-K parents and students are invited to attend Kindergarten Orientation hosted in the spring. Parents and students may also tour the school campus by appointments. Area preschool and Head Start programs are invited to participate in spring field trips to Bond Elementary School to introduce Pre-K students to our Kindergarten teachers and Kindergarten program.

Parents are encouraged to bring their students to school for our Kindergarten screening. During the screening, parents are able to tour the school. The new Kindergarten students receive a backpack and school supplies after completing the kindergarten screening.

Kindergarten parents are also strongly encouraged to attend the orientation day prior to the first day of school.

FLKRS assessment is administered to our Kindergarten students. The Florida Assessment in Reading is a screener that is also utilized to diagnose and prescribe interventions that will assist those Kindergartners that are struggling. This test assesses phonemic awareness and fluency. The data is used to determine the instructional needs of the Kindergartners.

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

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](#).

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

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 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. | | | 1A.1. Lack of teaching with fidelity. | 1A.1. In addition to the 90 minutes of core reading instruction, students will receive an additional 30 minutes of reading instruction for the purpose of remediation, skills practice, or enrichment. | 1A.1. Administrative Team Reading Coach Teachers | 1A.1. On-going progress monitoring Focused classroom observations on strategies and student engagement | 1A.1. Common assessments |
| Reading Goal #1A: In grades 3-5, 93% (255) of the students will achieve proficiency (Level 3) in reading on the 2013 FCAT or there will be a 6% increase - 59% (162) of students scoring at proficiency. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 34% (77) of students were proficient in Reading, scoring a Level 3 or better. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 59% (162) of students will be proficient in Reading, scoring a Level 3 or better. | 1A.2. Ineffective small group instruction | 1A.2. Teachers will receive specific training on interventions/differentiated instruction. | 1A.2. Administrative Team Reading Coach Teachers | 1A.2. On-going progress monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs | 1A.2. Common assessments |
| | | | 1A.3. Time to align current materials and common assessments with standards applicable to each grade level. | 1A.3. Teachers, administrators, and reading coach will develop an Instructional Focus Calendar (IFC) aligning materials, curriculum, and assessments to applicable standards based on the grade level. | 1A.3. Administrative Team Reading Coach Teachers Literacy Team | 1A.3. On-going progress monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs | 1A.3. Common assessments |
| | | | 1B.1. Cognition | 1B.1. Teachers will use Unique | 1B.1. Administrative Team | 1B.1. Progress Monitoring | 1B.1. Assessments |

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|------------------------------------|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| <p>Reading Goal #1B: In 2013, 100% of students will be proficient in reading as evidenced by performance on the Florida Alternative Assessment.</p> | <p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>In 2012, 100% (6) of students were proficient in reading as evidenced by performance on the Florida Alternative Assessment.</p> | <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>In 2013, 100% of students will be proficient in reading as evidenced by performance on the Florida Alternative Assessment.</p> | | Curriculum with fidelity | Exceptional Student Education Teacher | Classroom Walkthroughs and Observations | Skills Checklist |
| | | | 1B.2. Lack of parental involvement | 1B.2. Conduct make and take workshops for parents to assist students at home. | 1B.2. Administrative Team Exceptional Student Education Teacher | 1B.2. Progress Monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs and Observations | 1B.2. Assessments Skills Checklist |
| | | | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. |

DRAFT

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. Lack of teaching with fidelity | 2A.1. In addition to the 90 minutes of core reading instruction, students will receive an additional 30 minutes of reading instruction for the purpose of remediation, skills practice, or enrichment. | 2A.1. Administrative Team Reading Coach Teachers Literacy Team | 2A.1. On-going progress monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs | 2A.1. Common Assessments |
| Reading Goal #2A: In grades 3-5, 20% (55) of the students will score a Level 4 or above in Reading. That is 8% more than scored a Level 4 or above on Reading in the 2011-12 school year. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> * | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> * | | | | | |
| | 12% (28) of students in 3-5, scored a Level 4 or above in Reading. | 20% (55) of students in 3-5, will score a Level 4 or above in 2012-13. | | | | | |
| | | | 2A.2. Ineffective small group instruction | 2A.2. Teachers will be trained to utilize small group time to provide enrichment activities for students. | 2A.2. Administrative Team Reading Coach Teachers Literacy Team | 2A.2. On-going progress monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs | 2A.2. Common Assessments |
| | | | 2A.3. Lesson plans lack a variety of complexity and rigor | 2A.3. Teachers will be encouraged to write lesson plans that include high complexity tasks and rigor. | 2A.3. Administrative Team Team Leaders | 2A.3. On-going progress monitoring Classroom Observations Lesson Plan Reviews Peer-Teacher Groups | 2A.3. Common Assessments |
| 2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading. | | | 2B.1. Cognition | 2B.1. Teachers will develop lessons that align real world applications with the curriculum. | 2B.1. Administrative Team Team Leader | 2B.1. Progress Monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs and Observations | 2B.1. Assessments Skills Checklist |
| Reading Goal #2B: Identified students | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> * | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> * | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| proficient in reading will increase by at least 1% as evidenced by performance on the FAA. In 2013, 72% (7) of students will score a Level 7 or above in reading according to the FAA. | In 2012, 67% (4) of students scored a Level 7 or above in reading. | In 2013, 72% (7) of students will score a Level 7 or above in reading according to the FAA. | | | Exceptional Student Education Teacher | | |
| | | 2B.2. Lack of Parental Involvement | 2B.2. Conduct make and take workshops for parents to assist students at home. | 2B.2. Administrative Team Exceptional Student Education Teacher | 2B.2. Progress Monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs and Observations | 2B.2. Assessments Skills Checklist | |
| | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | |

DRAFT

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. Awareness of academic expectations | 3A.1. Student achievement conferences will be conducted with all students following common assessments. | 3A.1. Administrative Team Teachers | 3A.1. On-going progress monitoring | 3A.1. Common Assessments Observations Report Cards |
| Reading Goal #3A: In grades 4&5, 75% (101) of students will achieve learning gains on the 2013 administration of FCAT Reading. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 64% (90) of the students achieved learning gains in Reading. | 75% (203) of students will achieve learning gains in Reading. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 3A.2. Lack of individualized instruction | 3A.2. Based on common assessment data and on-going progress monitoring, teachers will provide students with opportunities to work on skills that meet their individual needs. | 3A.2. Administrative Team Reading Coach Teachers | 3A.2. Progress monitoring monthly meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | 3A.2. Common Assessments |
| | | | 3A.3. Training is needed in disaggregating data. | 3A.3. Teachers will use disaggregated data to place students in small groups and to provide effective instruction. | 3A.3. Administrative Team Reading Coach Teachers | 3A.3. Progress monitoring monthly meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | 3A.3. Common Assessments |
| 3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. | | | 3B.1. Cognition | 3B.1. Teachers will develop lessons that align real world applications with the curriculum. | 3B.1. Administrative Team Exceptional Student Education Teacher | 3B.1. Progress Monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs | 3B.1. Assessments Skills Checklist |
| Reading Goal #3B: Identified students achieving learning gains in reading will be 100% (5) as demonstrated by their performance on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | In 2012, 100% of students tested achieved learning gains in reading. | Identified students achieving learning gains in reading will be 100% (5). | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | 3B.2. Lack of parental involvement | 3B.2. Conduct make and take workshops for parents to assist students at home. | 3B.2. Administrative Team Exceptional Student Education Teacher | 3B.2. Progress Monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs | 3B.2. Assessments Skills Checklist |
| | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. |

DRAFT

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>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #4: In grade 3-5, 85% (58) of students in the Lowest 25th percentile, will achieve learning gains in Reading.</p> | <p>2012 Current Level of Performance: *</p> | <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance: *</p> | 4A.1. Ineffective small group instruction | 4A.1. Students in the Lowest 25 th percentile will receive intervention through supplemental reading programs during small group instruction based on their individual needs. | 4A.1. Administrative Team Reading Coach Teachers and Support Staff RTI Team | 4A.1. Monthly progress monitoring meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | 4A.1. Common Assessments Lesson Plans |
| | 74% (33) of students in the Lowest 25 th percentile achieved learning gains in Reading. | 85% (58) of students in the Lowest 25 th percentile will achieve learning gains in reading. | 4A.2. Lack of teaching with fidelity | 4A.2. In addition to the 90 minutes of core reading instruction, students will receive an additional 30 minutes of reading instruction for the purpose of remediation, skills practice, or enrichment. | 4A.2. Administrative Team Reading Coach Teachers Literacy Team | 4A.2. On-going progress monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs | 4A.2. Common Assessments Lesson Plans |
| | | | 4A.3. Lack of individualized instruction | 4A.3. Based on common assessment data and on-going progress monitoring, teachers will provide students with opportunities to work on skills that meet their individual needs. | 4A.3. Administrative Team Reading Coach Teachers | 4A.3. On-going progress monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs | 4A.3. Common Assessments Lesson Plans |

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 | | In 2011-2012, at least 42% of students were proficient in reading. | In 2012-2013, at least 47% (162) of students will be proficient in reading. | In 2013-2014, at least 52% of students will be proficient in reading. | In 2014-2015, at least 57% of students will be proficient in reading. | In 2015-2016 at least 62% of students will be proficient in reading. | In 2016-2017, at least 69% of students will be proficient in reading. |
| | <u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> In six years, 69% of students will be proficient in reading. | | | | | | | |
| 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 reading. | | | 5B.1. Black: Differentiating instruction to meet the needs of students. | 5B.1. Determine the instructional needs based on results of assessment data for all black students, Plan differentiated instruction using researched based intervention and enrichment programs for an additional 30 minutes per day in reading. | 5B.1. Administration Reading Coach Teachers | 5B.1. Progress Monitoring Meetings Classroom Observations Lesson Plans | 5B.1. Common Assessments | |
| <u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> In grades 3-5, 58% (139) of Black students will achieve proficiency (Level 3) on FCAT reading. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | | |
| | White: N/A Black: 34% Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A | Fifty-eight percent (139) of Black students will achieve proficiency on FCAT Reading. | | | | | | |
| | | | 5B.2. Utilizing small group instruction school-wide. | 5B.2. Provide teachers with trainings to utilize intervention and enrichment materials during small group instruction. Planning a uniformed reading workshop time for grades 3-5. | 5B.2. Administrative Team Reading Coach Teachers RTI Team | 5B.2. Progress Monitoring Meetings Classroom Observations | 5B.2. Common Assessments | |
| | | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.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 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 reading. | | | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. |
| Reading Goal #5C: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 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 reading. | | | 5D.1. Lack of using intervention with fidelity if students are not successful with the core curriculum. | 5D.1. Students who are not achieving using the core curriculum materials will receive interventions to meet their individual needs. | 5D.1. Administrative Team Teachers RTI Teams Reading Coach | 5D.1. Progress monitoring meetings Classroom Observations Peer/Teacher Groups | 5D.1. Common Assessments |
| Reading Goal #5D: In grades 3-5, 35% (13) of students with disabilities will score Level 3 or above on FCAT Reading. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | In grades 3-5, 11% students with disabilities were proficient (Level 3) in Reading. | In grades 3-5, 35% (13) of students with disabilities were proficient (Level 3) in Reading. | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. Differentiating the instruction to meet the needs of students with disabilities. | 5D.2. Plan differentiated instruction using researched based intervention and enrichment programs for an additional 30 minutes per day in reading. | 5D.2. Administrative Team Teachers RTI Teams Reading Coach | 5D.2. Progress monitoring meetings Classroom Observations Peer/Teacher Groups | 5D.2. Common Assessments |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| | | 5D.3. Providing interventions with fidelity that meet the needs of students with disabilities. | 5D.3. Planning a uniformed reading workshop time for grades 3-5 to provide interventions to students with disabilities with fidelity. | 5D.3. Administrative Team Teachers RTI Teams Reading Coach | 5D.3. Progress monitoring meetings Classroom Observations Peer/Teacher Groups | 5D.3. Common Assessments |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|

| 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 | 5E.1. Utilize district wide assessment data to determine the needs of students who are economically disadvantaged. | 5E.1. Administrative Team Teachers RTI Teams Reading Coach | 5E.1. Progress Monitoring | 5E.1. Common Assessments |
| Reading Goal #5E: In grades 3-5, 51% (130) of economically disadvantaged students will achieve proficiency (Level 3) on FCAT reading. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* In grades 3-5, 34% of economically disadvantaged students were proficient in reading. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In grades 3-5, 51% (130) of economically disadvantaged students will achieve proficiency in reading. | Lack of parental involvement | | | | |
| | | | 5E.2. Students with disabilities are at one or more years below grade level. | 5E.2. Students who are not achieving using the core curriculum materials will receive interventions to meet their individual needs. | 5E.2. Administrative Team Teachers RTI Teams | 5E.2. Progress Monitoring | 5E.2. Common Assessments |
| | | | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. |

Reading Professional Development

| 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 |

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

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|---------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| Provide Clear Learning Goals and Rubrics | Pre-K-5 | Teacher Leader | All Teachers | Team Meetings once a month; Once a month faculty meetings. | iObservation Documentation Teacher Portfolio | Principal/Assistant Principal |
| Intensive Interventions | Pre-K-5 | Reading Coach | All Teachers | August 2012/Monthly Meetings and Workshops | Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk-Throughs, and Progress Monitoring | Principal/Assistant Principal and Reading Coach |
| NGSSS and Common Core | Pre-K-5 | Administrative Team | All Teachers | August 2012/Monthly Meetings | Lesson Plans, Classroom Observations, and Progress Monitoring Meetings | Principal/Assistant Principal and Reading Coach |
| Book Study-"Teach Like a Champion" | Pre-K-5 | Reading Coach Teacher Leaders | All Teachers | August 2012-May 2013 | Book Study and Team Meetings | Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Coach |
| Read-Aloud Strategies | Pre-K-2 | Reading Coach | All Pre-K-2 Teachers | Monthly | Lesson Plans; Classroom Observations | Administrators; Reading Coach |
| Re-Teaching after Benchmark Assessment/Differentiating Instruction | PreK-5 | Lead Teacher | All academic teachers | At least once each nine weeks | Lesson Plans; Data Evaluation; Classroom Observations | Administrators; Reading Coach |

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 |
|---------------|--|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Reading Goals | Early Interventions in Reading, Corrective Reading Program, FOCUS and Reading Laboratory | Textbook Allocation | \$15,931.20 |
| | | | \$738.53 (Supplemental Materials) |
| | | Title I | \$4,677.75 (Write Score) |
| | | | \$17,140.25 (Curriculum Associates) |

Subtotal:

Technology

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|---------------|---|------------------------|----------|
| Reading Goals | Successmaker 5, Imagine-It e-Suite, Accelerated Reader, and Gizmo | Technology and Title I | \$750.00 |

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

| Subtotal: | | | |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Developing appropriate learning goals and rubrics | Facilitator; time for planning and collaboration | Title I TEC Funds School Improvement Dollars | \$10,500.00 |
| Supplemental Instructional Materials | Imagine-It, Corrective, and SRA Reading Laboratory Training | Title I | \$0 |
| Track student progress through administrating benchmark assessments | FCAT Test Maker Pro Data Director | | \$3000.00 \$1000.00 |
| Develop an Instructional Focus Calendar for Reading | Wonderful Wednesday and Instructional Focus Days | Title I TEC Funds School Improvement Dollars | \$6000.00 |
| Determine intervention and core instructional needs by reviewing Imagine-It , FAIR, and AIMS Web assessment data | Progress Monitoring | Title I | |
| | | | Subtotal: \$59,737. 73 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

End of Reading Goals

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

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 |
| 1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. | | | 1A.1. Lack of student exposure to the standards relevant to the grade level. | 1A.1. Teachers will engage students in complex tasks that require them to generate and test a hypothesis. | 1A.1. Administrative Team Teachers | 1A.1. Progress monitoring monthly meetings Classroom Observations | 1A.1. Common Assessments |
| Mathematics Goal | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| #1A: | In grades 3-5, 93% (237) of the students will achieve proficiency (Level 3) in math on the 2013 FCAT or there will be a 16% increase -58% (148) of students scoring at proficiency. | In grades 3-5, 42% (94) of the students scored a Level 3 or above in FCAT Math. | | | | | |
| | In grades 3-5, 58% (148) of the students will score a Level 3 or above in FCAT Math. | | | | | | |
| | | | 1A.2. Lack of teacher knowledge of standards relevant to the grade levels. | 1A.2. Provide professional development on the new standards. | 1A.2. Administrative Team Teachers | 1A.2. Progress Monitoring Monthly Meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | 1A.2. Common Assessments |
| | | | 1A.3. Instructional rigor across the grade levels. | 1A.3. In addition to the regular curriculum, differentiated instruction will be provided through the enrichment portion of the core materials. Use STEM strategies to enhance math achievement. | 1A.3. Administrative Team Teachers | 1A.3. Progress Monitoring Monthly Meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | 1A.3. Common Assessments |
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. | | | 1B.1. Cognition | 1B.1. Teachers will use Unique Curriculum with fidelity. | 1B.1. Administrative Team Teachers | 1B.1. Progress Monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs and Observations | 1B.1. Assessments Skills Checklist |
| Mathematics Goal | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| #1B: | | | | | | | |

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| In 2013, 61% (6) will be proficient in math as evidenced by performance on the FAA. | In 2012, 60% (3) of students were proficient in math as evidenced by performance on the FAA. | In 2013, 61% (6) of identified students will be proficient in math as evidenced by performance on the FAA. | | | | | |
| | | | 1B.2. Lack of Parent Involvement | 1B.2. Teachers will conduct make and take workshops for parents to assist students at home. | 1B.2. Administrative Team Exceptional Student Education Teacher | 1B.2. Progress Monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs and Observations | 1B.2. Assessments Skills Checklist |
| | | | 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 |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|
| 2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics. | | | 2A.1. Lack of student exposure to the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. | 2A.1. Teachers will engage students in complex task that require them to generate and test hypothesis directly related to the NGSSS. | 2A.1. Administrative Team Teachers | 2A.1. Progress Monitoring Meetings Walkthroughs and Observations Lesson Plans | 2A.1. Common Assessments |
| Mathematics Goal #2A: In grades 3-5, 38% (97) of the students will achieve a Level 4 or 5 in math. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> * | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> * | | | | | |
| | In grades 3-5, 14% (31) of the students achieved a Level 4 or 5 on FCAT math. | In grades 3-5, 38% (97) of the students will achieve a Level 4 or 5 in math. | 2A.2. Lack of teacher knowledge of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. | 2A.2. Provide professional development on the new NGSSS that includes how to engage students in complex task that require them to | 2A.2. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 2A.2. Progress Monitoring Meetings Walkthroughs and Observations | 2A.2. Common Assessments |

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

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

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | | generate and test hypothesis. | | Lesson Plans | | | | | | | |
| | | 2A.3. Instructional rigor across the grade level. | 2A.3. In addition to the regular curriculum, differentiated instruction will be provided through the enrichment portion of the core materials. Use STEM strategies to enhance math achievement. | 2A.3. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 2A.3. Progress Monitoring Meetings Walkthroughs and Observations Lesson Plans | 2A.3. Common Assessments | | | | | | |
| <p>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Mathematics Goal</td> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance:</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>#2B: In 2013, 41% (4) of students will score a Level 7 or above on the Florida Alternative Assessment.</td> <td>* In 2012, 40% (2) of students scored a Level 7 or above on the Florida Alternative Assessment.</td> <td>* In 2013, 41% (4) of students will score a Level 7 or above on the Florida Alternative Assessment.</td> </tr> </table> | | Mathematics Goal | 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | #2B: In 2013, 41% (4) of students will score a Level 7 or above on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | * In 2012, 40% (2) of students scored a Level 7 or above on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | * In 2013, 41% (4) of students will score a Level 7 or above on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | 2B.1. Cognition | 2B.1. Teachers will align real-world learning experiences with the curriculum. | 2B.1. Administrative Team Exceptional Student Education Teacher | 2B.1. Progress Monitoring Meetings Walkthroughs and Observations Lesson Plans | 2B.1. Assessments Skill Checklist |
| Mathematics Goal | 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | | | | | | | |
| #2B: In 2013, 41% (4) of students will score a Level 7 or above on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | * In 2012, 40% (2) of students scored a Level 7 or above on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | * In 2013, 41% (4) of students will score a Level 7 or above on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 2B.2. Lack of parental involvement | 2B.2. Teachers will facilitate make and take workshops for parents to help assist students at home. | 2B.2. Administrative Team Team Leader Exceptional Student Education Teacher | 2B.2. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 2B.2. Assessments Skill Checklist | | | | | | |
| | | 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 mathematics. | | | 3A.1. Lack of student exposure to the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. | 3A.1. Teachers will engage students in complex task that require them to generate and test hypothesis directly related to the NGSSS. | 3A.1. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 3A.1. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 3A.1. Common Assessments |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u> In grade 3-5, 81% (109) of students will achieve learning gains in math. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> In 2012, 72% (100) of students achieved learning gains in math. | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> In 2013, 81% (109) of students will achieve learning gains in math. | 3A.2. Lack of teacher knowledge of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. | 3A.2. Provide professional development on the new NGSSS that includes how to engage students in complex task that require them to generate and test hypothesis. | 3A.2. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 3A.2. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations Lesson Plans | 3A.2. Common Assessments |
| | | | 3A.3. Lack of instructional skill focus and evaluation | 3A.3. Develop an Instructional Focus Calendar for Mathematics Mini-lesson assessments Utilize the continuous improvement model | 3A.3. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 3A.3. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 3A.3. Common Assessments |
| | | | | 3B.1. Cognition | 3B.1. Teachers will align real-world learning experiences with the curriculum. | 3B.1. Administrative Team Exceptional Student Education Teacher | 3B.1. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations Lesson Plans |
| 3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u> In 2013, 100% (10) of students will achieve learning gains in math as evidenced by performance on the | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> In 2012, 100% of students achieved learning gains in math as | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> In 2013, 100% (10) of students will achieve learning gains | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------|--|--|---|--|
| Florida Alternative Assessment | evidenced by performance on the FAA. | in math as evidenced by performance on the FAA. | | | | | |
| | | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. Teachers will facilitate make and take workshops for parents to help assist students at home. | 3B.2. Administrative Team Team Leader Exceptional Student Education Teacher | 3B.2. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 3B.2. Assessments Skills Checklist |
| | | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. |

DRAFT

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. Mathematics Goal #4: Students in grade 3-5, 81% (30) of students in the lowest 25 th percentile will achieve learning gains in math according to the 2013 FCAT. | 2012 Current Level of Performance: * | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: * | 4A.1. Lack of exposure to the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. | 4A.1. Teachers will engage students in complex task that require them to generate and test hypothesis directly related to the NGSSS. | 4A.1. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 4A.1. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 4A.1. Classroom Assessments | |
| | In 2012, 74% of students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25 th percentile achieved learning gains. | In 2013, 81% (30) of students in grade 3-5 in the lowest 25 th percentile will achieve learning gains. | 4A.2. Lack of teacher knowledge of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. | 4A.2. Provide professional development on the new NGSSS that includes how to engage students in complex task that require them to generate and test hypothesis. | 4A.2. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 4A.2. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 4A.2. Classroom Assessments | |
| | | | 4A.3. Lack of opportunities for individualized needs of students to be met. | 4A.3. Provide professional development on differentiating instruction and facilitating small groups based on student need. | 4A.3. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 4A.3. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 4A.3. Classroom Assessments | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | In 2011-2012, 52% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in math. | In 2012-2013, 58% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in math. | In 2013-2014, 63% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in math. | In 2014-2015, 68% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in math. | In 2015-2016, 73% of students in grades 3-5 | In 2016-2017, 78% of students in grade 3-5 | |

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> In 2017, 78% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in math.</p> | | | | | | | will be proficient in math. | will be proficient in math. |
| <p>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:</p> | | | 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 mathematics.</p> | | | 5B.1. Black: Lack of exposure to the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. | 5B.1. Teachers will engage students in complex task that require them to generate and test hypothesis directly related to the NGSSS. | 5B.1. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 5B.1. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 5B.1. Classroom Assessments | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> In grades 3-5, 58% (136) of Black students will be proficient in math, scoring a Level 3 or higher.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Black: In grades 3-5, 32% of Black students were proficient in math, scoring a Level 3 or higher.</p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Black: In grades 3-5, 58% (136) of Black students will be proficient in math, scoring a Level 3 or higher.</p> | 5B.2. Lack of teacher knowledge of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. | 5B.2. Provide professional development on the new NGSSS that includes how to engage students in complex task that require them to generate and test hypothesis. | 5B.2. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 5B.2. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 5B.2. Classroom Assessments | |
| | | | 5B.3. Lack of opportunities for student s' individualized needs to be met. | 5B.3. Provide professional development on differentiating instruction and facilitating small groups based on student need. | 5B.3. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 5B.3. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 5B.3. Classroom Assessments | |

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. |
| Mathematics Goal #5C: Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | 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. Lack of exposure to the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. | 5D.1. Teachers will engage students in complex task that require them to generate and test hypothesis directly related to the NGSSS. | 5D.1. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 5D.1. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 5D.1. Classroom Assessments |
| Mathematics Goal #5D: In grades 3-5, 41% (16) of Students With Disabilities will be proficient in math, scoring a Level 3 or higher. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* In grades 3-5, 21% of SWD will be proficient in math, scoring a Level 3 or higher. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In grades 3-5, 41% (16) of SWD will be proficient in math, scoring Level 3 or higher. | 5D.2. Lack of teacher knowledge of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. | 5D.2. Provide professional development on the new NGSSS that includes how to engage students in complex task that require them to generate and test hypothesis. | 5D.2. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 5D.2. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 5D.2. Classroom Assessments |
| | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--------------------------------|
| | | 5D.3. Lack of opportunities for student s' individualized needs to be met. | 5D.3. Provide professional development on differentiating instruction and facilitating small groups based on student need. | 5D.3. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 5D.3. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 5D.3. Classroom Assessments |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--------------------------------|

| 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. Lack of exposure to the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. | 5E.1. Teachers will engage students in complex task that require them to generate and test hypothesis directly related to the NGSSS. | 5E.1. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 5E.1. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 5E.1. Classroom Assessments |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u> In grades 3-5, 58% (148) of students who are Economically Disadvantaged will be proficient in math, scoring a Level 3 or higher. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> In grades 3-5, 32% of students who are Economically Disadvantaged were proficient in math, scoring a Level 3 or higher. | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> In grades 3-5, 58% (148) of students who are Economically Disadvantaged will be proficient in math, scoring a Level 3 or higher. | 5E.2. Lack of teacher knowledge of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. | 5E.2. Provide professional development on the new NGSSS that includes how to engage students in complex task that require them to generate and test hypothesis. | 5E.2. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 5E.2. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 5E.2. Classroom Assessments |
| | | | 5E.3. Lack of opportunities for student s' individualized needs to be met. | 5E.3. Provide professional development on differentiating instruction and facilitating small groups based on student need. | 5E.3. Administrative Team Math SIP Committee Teachers | 5E.3. Progress Monitoring Walkthroughs and Observations | 5E.3. Classroom Assessments |

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Mathematics Professional Development

| 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 |
| Levels of Complexity | PreK-5 | Team Leader/Math Advocate | All teachers | Bi-Monthly | Classroom Observations | Administrative Team |
| NGSSS Go Math! Trainings | K-5 | Math Advocate | All teachers | Ongoing Monthly Meetings | Classroom Walkthroughs and Progress Monitoring Meetings | Administrative Team |
| Differentiating Instruction | PreK-5 | Assistant Principal and Reading Coach | All teachers | Ongoing Monthly Meetings | Working with teachers on managing effective small groups, classroom walkthroughs, and progress monitoring meetings | Administrative Team |

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 |
| Math Goals 1-5D Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to the core curriculum. Include supplement intense interventions. | Go Math! | Title 1 | \$0 |
| Math Goals 1-5D Include/foster higher order thinking questions in lesson plans. | Florida Ready | Title 1 | \$3,025.43 |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Utilize technology to foster higher-order thinking questions. | FCAT Test Maker, Successmaker 5, Go Math! Gizmo | Technology Title 1 | \$0 |
| | | | |

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

| Subtotal: | | | |
|---|--|----------------------|------------|
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Common assessments to monitor student progression. | FCAT Test Maker Pearson | Title 1 | \$750.00 |
| Include/foster higher order thinking questions in lesson plans | Center for Data Driven Reform with Mark Rolewski | Title 1 TEC Funds | \$2,000.00 |
| Identify and closely monitor the progress of the 35 th percentile consistently, and revise instruction and intervention groups as indicated by student progress. | Instructional Focus Days (Summer Workshops and Wonderful Wednesday) | Title 1 TEC Funds | \$6,000.00 |
| Plan supplemental instruction/interventions for students not responding to core instruction. | Intensive Intervention Training | Title 1 | \$0 |
| Understanding levels of complexity in mathematics problem solving | Professional Learning Community-time to meet and plan together (subs provide); training from the outside (Wonderful Wednesday) | Title II | \$2,000.00 |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$13,775.43 | | | |
| Total: | | | |

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary 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 |
| 1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. | | | 1A.1. Students lack skills that enable them to look for errors in logic or reasoning | 1A.1. Students will receive instruction in the core curriculum for at least one hour. The teacher helps students deepen their knowledge of informational content by helping them construct ways to examine their own reasoning or the logic of the information presented. | 1A.1. Administrative Team Teachers | 1A.1. Progress monitoring monthly meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | 1A.1. Common assessments |
| Science Goal #1A: In June of 2013, 50% (39) of the students will score at or above proficiency. (Level 3) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | In June of 2012, 37% of the students scored at or above proficiency. (Level 3) | In June of 2013, 50% (39) of the students will score at or above proficiency. (Level 3) | | | | | |
| | | | 1A.2. Provide interventions with fidelity to students that match their instructional needs. | 1A.2. Develop an Instructional Focus Calendar for Science Mini-lessons assessments | 1A.2. Administrative Team Teachers | 1A.2. Progress monitoring monthly meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | 1A.2. Common assessments |
| | | | 1A.3. Lack of instructional rigor across the grade level. | 1A.3. In addition of the regular curriculum, differentiated instruction will be provided through the enrichment portion of the core materials. Use the STEM, GEMS, and Snapshot strategies to enhance science achievement. | 1A.3. Administrative Team Teachers | 1A.3. Progress monitoring monthly meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | 1A.3. Common assessments |
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. | | | 1B.1. Lack of background knowledge | 1B.1. Teachers will link science | 1B.1. Administrative Team | 1B.1. Progress monitoring monthly | 1B.1. Assessments |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Science Goal #1B: In 2013, 51% (2) of students will be proficient in science as evidenced by performance on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | 2012 Current Level of Performance: * In 2012, 50% (1) of students were proficient in science as evidenced by performance on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: * In 2013, 51% (2) of students will be proficient in science as evidenced by performance on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | | concepts to real-world experiences. | Exceptional Student Education Teacher | meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | Skills Checklist |
| | | | 1B.2. Cognition | 1B.2. Teachers will utilize Unique Curriculum to enhance the reading and math skills needed to understand science concepts. | 1B.2. Administrative Team Exceptional Student Education Teacher | 1B.2. Progress monitoring monthly meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | 1B.2. Assessments Skills Checklist |
| | | | 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 science. | | | 2A.1. Lack of prerequisite science benchmarks | 2A.1. Students will receive instruction in the core curriculum for at least one hour. | 2A.1. Administrative Team Teachers | 2A.1. Progress monitoring monthly meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | 2A.1. Common Assessments |
| Science Goal #2A: In June of 2013, 20% (16) of the students will score a Level 4 or 5. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | In June of 2012, 11% of the students scored a Level 4 or 5. | In June of 2013, 20% (16) of the students will score at proficiency. (Level 4 and 5) | | | | | |
| | | | 2A.2. Provide interventions with fidelity to students that match their instructional needs. | 2A.2. Develop an Instructional Focus Calendar for Science Mini-lessons assessments | 2A.2. Administrative Team Teachers | 2A.2. Progress monitoring monthly meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | 2A.2. Common Assessments |
| | | | 2A.3. Lack of instructional rigor throughout the grade level. | 2A.3. In addition of the regular curriculum, differentiated instruction will be provided through the enrichment portion of the core materials. Use the STEM, GEMS, and Gizmo strategies to enhance science achievement. | 2A.3. Administrative Team Teachers | 2A.3. Progress monitoring monthly meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | 2A.3. Common Assessments |
| 2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. | | | 2B.1. Lack of background knowledge | 2B.1. Teachers will link science concepts to real-world experiences. | 2B.1. Administrative Team Teachers | 2B.1. Progress monitoring monthly meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | 2B.1. Assessments Skills Checklist |
| Science Goal #2B: In 2013, 51% (2) of students will score 7 or above in science as evidenced by | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | In 2012, 50% of students scored a 7 or | In 2013, 51% (2) of | | | | | |

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| performance on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | above in science as evidenced by performance on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | students will score 7 or above in science as evidenced by performance on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | | | | | |
| | | | 2B.2. Cognition | 2B.2. Teachers will utilize Unique Curriculum to enhance the reading and math skills needed to understand science concepts. | 2B.2. Administrative Team Teachers | 2B.2. Progress monitoring monthly meetings Classroom Walk-Throughs | 2B.2. Assessments Skills Checklist |
| | | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. |

End of Elementary Science Goals

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 |
| Science Goals 1-2 Examining Errors in Reasoning | 3-5 | Team Leader/Science Advocate | All 3-5 Teachers | Initial training in November, follow-up throughout the year. | Team meeting notes; classroom observations | Administrative Team |
| Differentiating Instruction | 3-5 | Assistant Principal | K-5 Teachers | Monthly Meetings | Working with teachers on managing effective small groups, classroom walkthroughs, and progress monitoring meetings | Administrative Team |
| Intensive Interventions | 3-5 | Assistant Principal | 3-5 Teachers | Monthly Meetings | Lesson Plans, classroom walkthroughs, and progress monitoring meetings | Administrative Team |
| GEMS, STEMS, and Gizmo | K-5 | District | K-5 Teachers | August 2012-May 2013 | Lesson plans, classroom walk-throughs and observations | Administrative Team |

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.

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

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

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Science Goals 1 and 2 Strategies will be implemented including objectives and higher order thinking questions | Write Score | Title I | \$2,079.00 |
| | Passwords | Title I | \$1,510.50 |
| | Fusion | Textbook Allocation | \$13,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Science Goals 1 and 2 Strategies will be implemented including objectives and higher order thinking questions | Snapshots Videos, Fusion Interactive Online Component, FCAT Test Maker Pro, and Gizmo | Title I | \$0 |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Teachers develop skills that enable students to examine their own reasoning or logic of information. | Training; lesson study | Title II STEM | \$2,000.00 (District Funds) |
| Utilize the FCIM to identify students in the core curriculum needing interventions and enrichment. | Intensive Interventions | Title I | \$0 |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | Total: \$ 18,589.50 |

End of Science Goals

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

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 |
| 1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. | | | 1A.1. Lack of prerequisite writing skills | 1A.1. Students will receive instruction in the core curriculum for at least one hour | 1A.1. Administrative Team | 1A.1. Progress Monitoring | 1A.1. Common Assessments |
| Writing Goal #1A: In 2013, 90% (55) of the 4 th grade students will score a Level 4 or higher on FCAT Writing | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* In 2012, 83% (52) of students scored a Level 3 or higher on FCAT Writing. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In 2013, 90% (55) of the 4 th grade students will score a Level 4 or above. | | | Teachers | Classroom walkthroughs and observations | |
| | | | | | 1A.2. Provide interventions with fidelity to students that match their instructional needs | 1A.2. Implement the district Focus Calendar/timeline for Writing Mini-Assessments Conferencing with students to provide one on one instruction | |
| | | | 1A.3. Lack of instructional rigor across the grade level | 1A.3. In addition to the regular curriculum, differentiated instruction will be provided through The enrichment portion of the core materials. | 1A.3. Administrative Team Teachers | 1A.3. Progress Monitoring Classroom walkthroughs and observations | |
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. | | | 1B.1 Cognition | 1B.1. Teachers will use Unique Curriculum to teach writing skills. | 1B.1. Administrative Team | 1B.1. Progress Monitoring | 1B.1. Assessments |
| Writing Goal #1B: In writing 100% (2) of | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | Exceptional Student Education Teachers | Classroom walkthroughs and observations | |

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| students will score a Level 4 in writing on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | In 2012, 100% of the students scored a 4 or more in writing on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | In writing 100% (2) of students will score a Level 4 in writing on the Florida Alternative Assessment. | | | | | |
| | | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. |
| | | | 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 |
| Intensive Interventions | PreK-5 | Assistant Principal | PreK-5 Teachers | September 2012-Ongoing Meetings | Lesson plans, classroom visits, and progress monitoring meetings | Administrative Team Writing Committee |
| Strategies for Teaching Writing | 3 rd and 4 th | Liz Greenberg Teacher Leader | 3 rd and 4 th grade teachers | September 2012-Ongoing Meetings | Lesson plans, classroom visits, and progress monitoring meetings | Administrative Team Writing Committee |
| Scoring Writing | 3 rd and 4 th | Liz Greenberg Teacher Leader | 3 rd and 4 th grade teachers | September and October 2012 | Lesson plans, classroom visits, and progress monitoring meetings | Administrative Team Writing Committee |

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

| 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 |
| Writing Goals #1 Instructional Focus Calendar for Writing to include mini-lessons and assessments in order to monitor student progress | Write Score | Title I | \$3,412.48 |
| Strategies will be implemented including objectives, higher-order thinking questions, and homework assignments | Buckle Down | Title I | \$2,400.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Identify students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment | Write Score | Title I | \$0 |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: \$5,812.48 |

End of Writing 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 |
| 1. Attendance | | | 1.1. Lack of parental support | 1.1. The school will monitor attendance | 1.1. Administrative Team | 1.1. Administrators and the Attendance Secretary will monitor monthly attendance reports from Pinpoint. | 1.1. Review attendance reports, auto-dialer and report cards. |
| Attendance Goal #1: Our goal for this year is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences by 5% | <u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u> Our current attendance rate is 94% (629) | <u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u> Our goal for 2013 is to reduce the attendance rate from 94% to 98% | | Attendance correspondences through Open House, SAC, PTO, newsletters, school website, List Serv, phone messages, and District Intervention Office. | Teachers Attendance Secretary RtI Team | | |
| | <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> | | | | | |
| | In 2012, 265 students had 10 or more absences. | In 2013, 252 students are expected to have 10 or more excessive absences | | | | | |
| | <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> | | | | | |

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| | | more) | | | | | |
| | In 2012, 204 students had 10 or more tardies. | In 2013, 194 students are expected to have 10 or more tardies. | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. Lack of understanding of the impact of attendance on student achievement. | 1.2. The students with excessive absences will be referred to the intervention team to have a plan developed to improve attendance. Educate parents through extended parent conference night (parent/teacher conferences) of the impact of school attendance on student achievement. | 1.2. Administrative Team Teachers Attendance Secretary | 1.2. Quarterly awards for students with perfect attendance | 1.2. Review attendance reports, auto-dialer and report cards. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

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 | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Professional Development in Attendance Policies and Procedures | PreK-5 | Attendance Secretary, Administrator s & Dr. Kathleen Rodgers | School-wide | Weekly Team Meetings Progress Monitoring Meetings Monthly Faculty Meetings | Administrators will monitor the attendance and tardies for all students. | Attendance Secretary and Administrative Team |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| 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 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. Students lack of appropriate social skills. | 1.1. Improve expected behavior through Positive Behavior Support Program. | 1.1. Classroom teachers, guidance counselors, RTI team and Administration. | 1.1. Monthly monitoring through PBS Team. | 1.1. Educator's Handbook |
| Suspension Goal #1: Our goal for the 2012-2013 school- year is to decrease the total number of out of school suspensions by 10% (39). | 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | | | |
| | 44 | 40 | | | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | | | | | | |
| 35 | 31 | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. Parental Support and students having clear expectations of appropriate behavior. | 1.2. School-wide rules Celebrate positive behavior Model expected positive behavior Manage conflicts calmly | 1.2. Administration Teachers RtI Team | 1.2. Review discipline data at PBS meetings and track disciplinary progress. | 1.2. Educator's Handbook |
| | | | 1.3. Lack of preventative practices school-wide to decrease disciplinary | 1.3. Communicate high expectations for appropriate student | 1.3. Administration Teachers | 1.3. Review discipline data at PBS meetings and track disciplinary progress. | 1.3. Educator's Handbook |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------|--|----------|--|--|
| | | infractions. | behavior. School leaders are visible, accessible, and supportive. Teachers are expected to handle routine discipline problems. | RtI Team | | |
|--|--|--------------|--|----------|--|--|

DRAFT

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 |
| Educator's Handbook | All grade levels | Austin Jackson | All teachers | November 2012 | Train teachers in Educator's Handbook | Administrative Team |
| Positive Behavior Support | All grade levels | PBS Committee | All teachers | Monthly | Administrators will monitor the implementation of this instructional strategy utilizing the Classroom Walk Through process and Lesson Plans. | Administrative Team PBS Committee |
| | | | | | | |

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

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

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

End of Suspension Goals

DRAFT

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 |
| 1. Parent Involvement | | | 1.1. Lack of consistent communication between school and parents. | 1.1. Develop methods to clearly communicate with parents, including: simplified report cards, regular updates on students' grades, quick return of test results, email correspondences, return phone calls, positive note home, and weekly progress reports. | 1.1. PIRC Committee Parent Liaison Administrative Team | 1.1. Increase in communication and involvement from parents. Parent Involvement Notebook and sign-in sheet | 1.1. Sign-in sheet |
| <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> In the 2012-2013 school year, parental involvement will increase by 25%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> In 2012, Parental Involvement was low. | <u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> In the 2012-2013 school year, parental involvement will increase by 25%. | 1.2. Low participation at workshops and trainings | 1.2. Create a Parent Involvement Advisory Council (PIRC) that meets monthly to serve as a liaison between school and parents. | 1.2. PIRC Committee Parent Liaison Administrative Team | 1.2. Sign-in sheet Reports Cards Student academic improvement | 1.2. Sign-in sheet |
| | | | 1.3. Lack of knowledge of NGSSS | 1.3. Provide workshops for parents that will help them support students at home. | 1.3. PIRC Committee Parent Liaison Administrative Team | 1.3. Sign-in sheet Reports Cards Student academic improvement | 1.3. Sign-in sheet |
| | | | | | | | |

Parent Involvement 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.

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

| 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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Extended Parent Conference Night | All teachers | Administrators | Parents, teacher, staff, and students | October 2012 and March 2013 | Monitor the level of parental involvement | Administrative Team |
| Extended Curriculum Nights | K-5 | Administrators | Parents, teacher, staff, and students | December, February, and March | Monitor the level of parental involvement in school-wide functions and the progression of student achievement | Administrative Team |
| | | | | | | |

Parent Involvement Budget

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Parent Involvement Goal #1 | Parental Workshops and Consultants | Title I | \$6,000.00 |
| | | | |
| | | | 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 |
| | | | |

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 |
| STEM Goal #1: In 2013, Our STEM goal is to use Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math to achieve our math and science goals. | 1.1. Lack of knowledge of the alignment of the NGSSS and STEM activities | 1.1. Providing professional development opportunities to teachers, helping them plan and implement STEM lessons aligned with the standards. | 1.1. Administrative Team Math and Science Advocates Teachers | 1.1. Progress Monitoring | 1.1. Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs and Observations |
| | 1.2. Lack of time to implement STEM activities throughout the day. | 1.2. Teachers will integrate science and math to incorporate STEM activities throughout the school day. | 1.2. Administrative Team Math and Science Advocates Teachers | 1.2. Progress Monitoring | 1.2. Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs and Observations |
| | 1.3. Lack of student proficiency in math or science | 1.3. Teachers will provide opportunities for guided instruction and cooperative learning when teaching the complex STEM tasks. | 1.3. Administrative Team Math and Science Advocates Teachers | 1.3. Progress Monitoring | 1.3. Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs and Observations |

STEM 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.

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

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

| 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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| STEM PLC | K-5 | Science or Math Advocate | All Teachers | January 2013 | Progress Monitoring | Administrative Team |
| | | | | | | |

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 |
| STEM Goal | Teacher Training | | \$0 |
| | | | |
| | | | 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: \$0 |

End of STEM 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 | \$59,737.73 Total: |
| CELLA Budget | Total: |
| Mathematics Budget | \$13,775.43 Total: |
| Science Budget | \$18,589.50 Total: |
| Writing Budget | \$5,812.48 Total: |
| Civics Budget | Total: |
| U.S. History Budget | Total: |
| Attendance Budget | Total: |
| Suspension Budget | Total: |
| Dropout Prevention Budget | Total: |
| Parent Involvement Budget | \$6,000.00 Total: |
| STEM Budget | Total: |
| CTE Budget | Total: |
| Additional Goals | Total: |
| | \$97,915.14 Grand Total: |

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 checked="" 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. |
| The School Advisory Council is the organizational structure for the preparation and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). It is made up of faculty, staff, parents, and business/community members. The School Advisory meets to insure that all school improvement goals are being addressed. They are kept abreast of certain issues and school wide curriculum. The members of the School Advisory Council (SAC) assist with the writing, approval, and continuous monitoring and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan. The SAC conducts regular meetings, reviews the school's budget as well as determines how School Improvement allocations are spent. |

| | |
|--|--------|
| Describe the projected use of SAC funds. | Amount |
| | |