

# Florida Department of Education



**DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)  
Form SIP-1**

Proposed for 2012-2013

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

**2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

**PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS**

**School Information**

School Name: Northwest Elementary	District Name: Pasco
Principal: Tracy Graziaplene	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: April Krupp	Date of School Board Approval: October, 2012

**Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:**

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

**Administrators**

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Tracy Graziaplene	BA,Counselor Ed. MA,Educational Leadership	6	17	2007-gradeA, AYP no; 2008, grade B, AYP no; 2009, grade C, AYP, no, 2010 grade C, AYP no, 2011 grade, C
Assistant Principal	Holly Oakes	MA,Elementary Ed. Educational Leadership	5	5	2007-gradeA, AYP no; 2008, grade B, AYP no; 2009, grade C, AYP, no, 2010 grade C, AYP no, grade C

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

## 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	Marie Soltz	B.A. Bus. Adm., Elem Ed, Cert in Reading, ESOL	3	3	2009, grade C AYP no, 2010, grade C, AYP no, 2011 grade C
Math	Anne Nero	B.A. Elem. Ed., ESE,ESOL	5	5	2007, grade A, AYP no, 2008, grade B AYP no, 2009, grade C, AYP no, 2010 grade C AYP no. 2011 Grade C
Math	Aimee Heintzelman	B.A. Elem. Ed. , ESOL,	7	4	2007, grade A, AYP no, 2008, grade B AYP no, 2009, grade C, AYP no, 2010 grade C AYP no. 2011, grade C.
Writing	Sue Cox	B.A, Elem. Ed. ESOL, NBPTS cert.	5	4	2007, grade A, AYP no, 2008, grade B AYP no, 2009, grade C, AYP no, 2010 grade C AYP no. 2011 Grade C

### Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. District Recruitment Procedures	Human Resources	On going
2. Teacher Evaluation System	Tracy Graziaplene/Holly Oakes	On going
3. On Site Professional Development	School based coaches/Admn.	On going
4. School and district wide celebrations and recognitions	District and School based Admn.	On going

**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/or who are NOT highly effective.

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
All teachers are NWES are currently teaching In-field. % of teachers are currently highly effective.	Professional Development will be offered to support key areas of performance outlined by the teacher evaluation system. Conferencing and support ( implementation of coaching cycle) will be offered by school based coaches as well as administration for teachers who are not highly effective.

***Staff Demographics***

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
58	5%	10%	69%	16%	15%	Not yet determined	5%	3%	70%

***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
Kim Withfoth	Megan Franco	Grade Level/ mentor has strong student performance record, Reading Endorsement	9 meetings to include PD and support on school wide goals, Informal observations with feedback sessions. Data reviews with support and feedback for next steps.

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

Christine Hollander	Amanda Ford	Grade level, Mentor success with student achievement, ESE/ESOL certified	9 meetings to include PD and support on school wide goals, Informal observations with feedback sessions, data reviews with support and feedback for next steps.

## 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.

Title I, Part A Part A funds will be used to provide professional development to meet the specific academic achievement needs of the school. This year these funds will be directed toward professional development and instructional materials that support Reading, Writing, and Math.
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III Part A funds will be used to provide professional development to meet the specific academic achievement needs of the school. This year these funds will be directed toward professional development in the areas of Reading, Writing, and Math.
Title X- Homeless Social worker to provide support to homeless families.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs Students receive free breakfast as well as a healthy snack each day through a grant funded program.
Housing Programs
Head Start Two Pre-K classrooms that serve students aged 3-5.
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Job Training
Other



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

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

#### School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

The school-based MTSS leadership team consists of Tracy Graziaplene, Principal, Holly Oakes, Assistant Principal, Marie Soltz, K-12 Literacy Coach, Angela Sheble, School Psychologist, Kim Witfoth, reading coach, Melinda Malkie, Behavior Specialist, Tammy Hickey, ESE teacher, Lisa Peart and Christine Cook, Guidance Counselors, Michelle Hall, Aimee Hientzelman, classroom teachers.

Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The MTSS team meets monthly to review assessment data and discuss goals for various students or teaching teams. At weekly meetings, MTSS team members meet with teachers to discuss student progress and current interventions. Recommendations for changes in instruction are made and dates for future assessment are made. The MTSS team members maintain documentation on the tiers of interventions being offered and the level of success/achievement for individual students. This team also meets quarterly to reflect on our school's status with full implementation of MTSS. Professional development opportunities are developed based on student data and staff feedback that is gained through surveys and meeting notes. School wide opportunities for data reflection are scheduled throughout the year in the context of Professional Learning Community meetings, grade level planning days, and team wide intervention meetings. School wide intervention meetings also take place monthly to discuss the students whose data indicates the most immediate need.

. Describe how the MTSS problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? Our MTSS team met in May of 2013 to discuss the progress our school had made as it related to the 2010-2011 school improvement plan. The team set preliminary goals for the 2012-2013 year with an additional meeting planned during the summer of 2011 to align these goals with FCAT student achievement scores as well as additional district and school based data.

#### MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. . Data sources used as part of the MTSS process include: FAIR data, Easy CBM reading data, FCAT scores, Weekly and unit assessments in reading , math, and science. Core K-12 assessments in math and science in grades 2-5, Pre and post tests in the areas of Reading, Math and Science, FCAT demand writing rubrics, and Intervention data such as fluency scores, and comprehension checks in the areas of reading, writing, math ,and science

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Northwest Elementary staff continues to expand knowledge of the MTSS process through meetings and reflection opportunities throughout the year that are supported by MTSS team members. Last year the NWES MTSS team members were trained in the area of Positive Behavior Supports in order to further our progress and knowledge of the MTSS behavior process. MTSS discussions take place throughout the year and support is offered to staff members as needed within the context of these conversations.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Full time school psychologist assists in the coordination and support of MTSS initiatives within the school. A problem solving/ reflection meeting is scheduled for Fall of 2012 in order to fine tune the MTSS process and receive feedback from instructional staff on their understanding and capability to support MTSS and their students.

### *Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)*

#### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). consists of the principal, assistant principal, literacy coach, reading resource teachers, and one teacher representative from each teaching team including ESE, as well as a guidance counselor, technology and media specialist.

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The school based LLT meets monthly to discuss school wide goals and initiatives in the areas of reading and writing. This team discusses data trends, develops observational rubrics based on best practices and acts as a sounding board for staff members on how we can best meet the needs of all students in the area of literacy. Periodic reflection on the School Improvement Plan takes place during LLT meetings and adjustments to school wide processes are made in response to data collected regarding the quality and impact of literacy instruction in the school.

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

During the 2012-2013 school year the focus of the Lead Literacy Team will be to improve the quality of core instruction through the implementation of best practices as outlined by our teacher evaluation tool in the areas of reading and writing. Improving the implementation of both reading and writing across the curriculum will also be a focus for this year. The goals of incorporating highly engaging teaching practices and finetuning intervention strategies with our lowest quartile will continue to be addressed by our LLT. Finally, supporting teachers in the transition to the Common Core State Standards will be a focus of the LLT for the 2012-2013 school year.

### *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.*

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

**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.

At Northwest Elementary School, all incoming Kindergarten students are assessed prior to or upon entering Kindergarten in order to determine individual and group needs and to assist in the development of effective, rigorous instructional and intervention programs. All students are assessed within the areas of Basic Skills/School Readiness, Oral Language/Syntax, Print/Letter knowledge, and Phonological Awareness/Processing.

Screening data will be collected and aggregated by the middle of September 2012. Data will be used to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students and for groups or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Core Kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice and independent practice of all academic and/or social emotional skills identified by screening data.

Specific screening tools our school will use include: FLKRS, FAIR assessments

***\*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.

**June 2012**

**Rule 6A-1.099811**

**Revised April 29, 2011**

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

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]).

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

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

<p><b>1A. FCAT 2.0:</b>  <b>Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b></p>	<p>1A.1.Tier one instruction in the area of Reading Application does not currently improve the percentage of students scoring 3 or above in a consistent manner.</p>	<p>1A.1.Weekly Professional Learning Community meetings will guide teachers in the process of reflecting on current data in this area by setting goals for student learning, and acquiring the needed knowledge to revise and improve instruction with the support of the school based literacy team. A standards driven collaborative planning model will be utilized to encourage both dialogue and</p>	<p>1A.1.Administration Literacy Coach</p>	<p>1A.1.Data reviews of formative and summative assessments that will measure the effectiveness of planned lessons will be administered throughout the research cycle.</p> <p>Follow up computer based reflection participation from training.</p>	<p>1A.1.FAIR data, Weekly and Unit assessments, Benchmark assessments, formative observation tools.</p>		
---	--	---	---	--	---	--	--

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

		planning for instruction A focus on transition to the Common Core State Standards will be inclusive in these meetings.					
<u>Reading Goal #1A:</u> <b>The % of students scoring level 3 in reading will increase from 24% to 34%.</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	24% (72 students)	<b>34%<i>5 102 students</i></b>					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

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

<p><b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b></p>	<p>1B.1. Teachers need better understanding of how best practices for instruction can be adapted to meet the individual needs of students who are intellectually disabled.</p>	<p>1B.1. Teachers of the Intellectually disabled will participate in a weekly PLC meeting that will provide professional development as well as a discussion forum in order to build capacity for best practices in instruction.</p>	<p>1B.1. Administration, district support personnel</p>	<p>1B.1. Administrative and peer observations and feedback with coaching supports as called for by teacher development needs.</p>	<p>1B.1. Florida Alternative Assessments, Reading Mastering Unit tests, other formative assessments.</p>		
<p><b>Reading Goal #1B: Students scoring at levels 4-6 in reading on the alternative assessment will improve from 13% to 18%.</b></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>13% (4 students)</i></p>	<p><i>18%(6 students)</i></p>					
		<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	
		<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	



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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b></p>	<p>2A.1. Students are not always aware of their progress toward meeting standards. They do not know which areas of reading are in need of improvement.</p>	<p>2A.1. Teachers will utilize a reflection tool with each student that allows the student to gauge current progress and set specific goals for improvement in the area of reading. Teachers will conference with students weekly on the gains being made in the goal areas that have been set by both teacher and student</p>	<p>2A.1. Administration k-12 Literacy Coach</p>	<p>2A.1. Progress made by students as reflected on the goal setting tool.</p>	<p>2A.1. FAIR data, Weekly and Unit assessments, Benchmark assessments, formative observation tools.</p>		

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

Reading Goal #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The % of students scoring level 4 or above on FCAT will improve from 23% to 33%.							
	<b>23% ( 69 students)</b>	<b>33% ( 99 students)</b>					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>	2B. Teacher expectations for achievement are sometimes set lower for intellectually disabled students.	2B.1. Teachers will utilize a data tracking tool with each student that will assist them in gauging progress and providing appropriate instruction based on individual student performance.	2B.1. Administration k-12 Literacy Coach	2B.1. Progress made by students as reflected on the goal setting tool.	2B.1. Florida Alternative Assessment, Access Points, Formative Assessment		

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

Reading Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Students scoring at or above a level 7 in reading as measured by the FAA will improve from 60% to 68%.</i>							
	<b>60% ( 18 students)</b>	<b>68% ( 20 students)</b>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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

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

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

<p><b>3A. FCAT 2.0:</b>  <b>Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>3A.1. Teachers are working to improve their understanding of how to align standards with best practices for highly engaging instruction.</p>	<p>3A.1. Coaching and support will be provided to teachers in order to improve the quality of teaching practices in the classroom. Opportunities for planning and discussion will be provided during quarterly grade level meetings and weekly team meetings that will be supported by a facilitator. A focus on transition to the Common Core State Standards will be inclusive in these meetings.</p>	<p>3A.1. K-12 Literacy Coach, Administration</p>	<p>3A.1. Teacher Evaluation process, Feedback from administrative and Literacy team walk throughs. Feedback provided within the planning framework.</p>	<p>3A.1. FAIR data, Weekly and Unit assessments, Benchmark assessments, formative observation tools.</p>		
--	---	---	--	---	--	--	--

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

<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<b>The % of students making learning gains in reading will improve from 71% to 79%</b>							
	<b>69% (207)</b>	<b>79% (187)</b>					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>	3B.1. Teachers are working to improve their understanding of how to align standards (access points) with best practices for highly engaging instruction.	3B.1 Coaching and support will be provided to teachers in order to improve the quality and of teaching practices in the classroom. Opportunities for planning and discussion will be provided during quarterly grade level meetings and weekly team meetings that will be supported by a facilitator.	3B.1. K-12 Literacy Coach, Administration	3B.1. Teacher Evaluation process, Feedback from administrative and Literacy team walk throughs. Feedback provided within the planning framework	3B.1. Progress monitoring on meeting Access Points and scores achieved on the Florida Alternative Assessment.		

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

Reading Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>The % of students making learning gains in reading who are measured by the FAA will improve from 55% to 60%</i>							
	<b>50% ( 15 students)</b>	<b>55% ( 17 students)</b>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	



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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>	4A.1. Students are not always receiving tier 2 interventions with consistency.	4A.1. A classroom log will be used to track the frequency and consistency of tier 2 interventions	4A.1. Literacy Coach, Admin.	4A.1. Review of logs during TBI and MTSS meetings or as needed during feedback sessions with staff members.	4A.1. Data review of intervention as well as summative assessments such as FAIR, unit assessments and benchmark assessments.		
<b>Reading Goal #4A:</b> <i>The % of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will improve from 83% to 88%</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>78% (135 students)</b>	<b>88% (152 students)</b>					

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

		4A.2. The content utilized for tier 2 and tier 3 interventions does not always meet student needs.	4A.2. Monthly meetings will take place on each teaching team that are supported by the literacy coach in order to determine the effectiveness of tier 2 and tier 3 interventions.	4A.2. Literacy Coach, Admin.	4A.2. Review of logs during TBIT and MTSS meetings or as needed during feedback sessions with staff members.	4A.2. Data review of intervention as well as summative assessments such as FAIR, unit assessments and benchmark assessments	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	
<b>4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>	4B.1. The content utilized for interventions does not always meet student needs.	4B.1. Monthly meetings will take place on each teaching team that are supported by the literacy coach in order to determine the effectiveness of interventions	4B.1. Literacy Coach, Admin.	4B.1. During TBIT and MTSS meetings or as needed during feedback sessions with staff members.	4B.1. Progress monitoring on meeting Access Points and scores achieved on the Florida Alternative Assessment.		

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

Reading Goal #4B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The % of students in the lowest 25% who are measured using FAA will improve from 23% to 33%							
	23% ( 5 students)	33% ( 9 students)					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>	<b>47% of students scoring 3 or above in reading</b>	<b>52% of students scoring 3 or above in reading</b>	<b>57% of students scoring 3 or above in reading</b>	<b>62% of students scoring 3 or above in reading</b>	<b>67% of students scoring 3 or above in reading</b>	<b>73% of students scoring 3 or above in reading</b>
<p><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u></p> <p><i>Through a strategic plan to build the professional capacity of teachers to consistently implement high quality instructional practices, core instruction will improve. Coaching and PLC professional development activities will serve to meet the goals outlined by the strategic plan. Monitoring will take place as well as frequent data reviews of student progress in the area of reading.</i></p>							

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>5B.1. White: Teachers are working to improve their understanding of how to align standards with best practices for highly engaging instruction Black: N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A</p>	<p>5B.1. Coaching and support will be provided to teachers in order to improve the quality of teaching practices in the classroom. Opportunities for planning and discussion will be provided during quarterly grade level meetings and weekly team meetings that will be supported by a facilitator. A focus on transition to the Common Core State Standards will be inclusive in these meetings.</p>	<p>5B.1. K-12 Literacy Coach Administration</p>	<p>5B.1. Teacher Evaluation process, Feedback from administrative and Literacy team walk throughs. Feedback provided within the planning framework.</p>	<p>5B.1. FAIR data, Weekly and Unit assessments, Benchmark assessments, formative observation tools.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5B:</u>  <i>White students scoring 3 or above in reading will improve from 52% to 58%</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>White:52% (141) Black: N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American N/A Indian:N/A</p>	<p>White:58% (171) Black: N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American N/A Indian: N/A</p>					
		<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	
		<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	

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



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

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

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

<p><b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>5D.1. Students are not always receiving tier 2 interventions with consistency.</p>	<p>5D.1. A classroom log will be used to track the frequency and consistency of tier 2 interventions.</p>	<p>5D.1. K-12 Literacy Coach Administration</p>	<p>5D.1. Review of logs during TBI and MTSS meetings or as needed during feedback sessions with staff members.</p>	<p>5D.1. summative assessments such as FAIR, unit assessments and benchmark assessments</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>  <i>The % of students with disabilities making adequate progress (3 or above) will increase from 45% to 58%</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>45%</b> <b>36 students</b></p>	<p><b>58%</b> <b>47 students</b></p>					
		<p>5D.2. The content utilized for tier 2 and tier 3 interventions does not always meet student needs.</p>	<p>5D.2. Monthly meetings will take place on each teaching team that are supported by the literacy coach in order to determine the effectiveness of tier 2 and tier 3 interventions.</p>	<p>5D.2. K-12 Literacy Coach Administration</p>	<p>5D.2. Review of logs during TBI and MTSS meetings or as needed during feedback sessions with staff members.</p>	<p>5D.2. summative assessments such as FAIR, unit assessments and benchmark assessments</p>	
		<p>5D.3.</p>	<p>5D.3.</p>	<p>5D.3.</p>	<p>5D.3.</p>	<p>5D.3.</p>	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5E.1. Students are not always receiving tier 2 interventions with consistency.	5E.1. A classroom log will be used to track the frequency and consistency of tier 2 interventions.	5E.1. K-12 Literacy Coach Administration	5E.1. Review of logs during TBI and MTSS meetings or as needed during feedback sessions with staff members.	5E.1. summative assessments such as FAIR, unit assessments and benchmark assessmen		
<u>Reading Goal #5E:</u>  <b>The % of FRL students making learning gains in reading will improve from 53% to 59%.</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		5E.2. The content utilized for tier 2 and tier 3 interventions does not always meet student needs.	5E.2. Monthly meetings will take place on each teaching team that are supported by the literacy coach in order to determine the effectiveness of tier 2 and tier 3 interventions.	5E.2. K-12 Literacy Coach Administration	5E.2. Review of logs during TBI and MTSS meetings or as needed during feedback sessions with staff members.	5E.2. summative assessments such as FAIR, unit assessments and benchmark assessmen	

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

		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--

**Reading Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b> 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
Standards Driven, backwards planning	k-5	Marie Soltz (k-12 coach) Holly Oakes (AP)	Grade level teams k-5	Weekly meetings	Teacher Evaluation, Walkthrough feedback, Discussion within PLC framework	Tracy Graziaplene, Principal Holly Oakes, Assistant Principal
Common Core Standards Training	k-5	Marie Soltz (k-12 coach) Holly Oakes (AP)	Grade level teams k-5	10 meetings scheduled within the first semester of 2012	Teacher Evaluation, Walkthrough feedback, Discussion within PLC framework	Tracy Graziaplene, Principal Holly Oakes, Assistant Principal
Lesson Study	4,5	Marie Soltz (k-12 coach) Holly Oakes (AP)	Teaching teams in grades 4 and 5	One round of lesson study each quarter ( 2 weeks per round)	Teacher Evaluation, Walkthrough feedback, Discussion within PLC framework	Tracy Graziaplene, Principal Holly Oakes, Assistant Principal

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

**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
Support Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions in reading	Reading Intervention Teacher	Title 1	33,400
<b>Subtotal:33,400</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reduce class size in grades K and 3 in order to provide improved individual student supports in reading.	Two classroom teachers	Title 1	74,000
<b>Subtotal:74,000</b>			
<b>Total:107,400</b>			

*End of Reading Goals*

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

**Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals**

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

<b>CELLA Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition</b>					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>	1.1. Students who are not proficient in English struggle with vocabulary and do not understand English at grade level.	1.1. An ESOL paraprofessional will meet with students with limited English proficiency by pushing in to their regular classroom and providing assistance with the core curriculum with an emphasis on vocabulary acquisition..	1.1. ESOL resource teacher, Administration.	1.1. On going progress monitoring will be provided through class assessment, FAIR testing and Benchmark exams. Interventions will be modified as indicated by the data.	1.1. FAIR, Benchmark Assessments, Weekly and Unit Assessments, CELLA test results.	
<b>CELLA Goal #1:</b> <i>The % of students scoring proficient in listening/speaking as measured by CELLA will improve from 30% to 40%</i>	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</b>					
	<b>30% ( 8 students).</b>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>	2.1. The content utilized for ESOL interventions does not always meet student needs.	2.1. Monthly meetings will take place on each teaching team that are supported by the literacy coach and ESOL resource teacher in order to determine the effectiveness of tier 2 and tier 3 interventions.	2.1. ESOL resource teacher, Administration.	2.1. On going progress monitoring will be provided through class assessment, FAIR testing and Benchmark exams. Interventions will be modified as indicated by the data.	2.1. FAIR, Benchmark Assessments, Weekly and Unit Assessments, CELLA test results.	
<p><u>CELLA Goal #2:</u> <i>The % of students proficient in reading as measured by CELLA will improve from 19% to 29%</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u></p>					
	<b>19% ( 5 students)</b>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.



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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>	2.1. ESOL students struggle to write with detail and using appropriate conventions of the English language.	2.1. An ESOL paraprofessional will meet with students with limited English proficiency by pushing in to their regular classroom and providing assistance with the core curriculum with opportunities to write in a guided environment with frequent feedback from the ESOL paraprofessional.	2.1. . ESOL resource teacher, Administration.	2.1. Writing rubrics and writing assessments from the reading series will be used to measure the effectiveness and progress of student writing. Student work will be discussed by the classroom teacher and ESOL resource teacher throughout the year.	2.1. 6 traits and FCAT writing rubrics. CELLA exam	
<b>CELLA Goal #3:</b>  <i>The number of students proficient in writing as measured by CELLA will improve from 7% to 17%</i>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					
	7% ( 2 students)					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

**CELLA Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Rosetta Stone	Technology program to promote English language proficiency	District Funds	500.00
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Interventions/Supports for ELL students	Materials provided by reading series	n/a	0
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
ELL para professional		district	22,000
Subtotal: 22,000			
<b>Total:22,500</b>			

*End of CELLA 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]).

<b>Elementary Mathematics Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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		
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>	1A.1. Teachers are not always using pre and post test data to drive core instruction in Math.	1A.1. Extended planning time will be utilized to disaggregate pre and post test data with the assistance of a school based math coach.	1A.1. Administration, Math Coaches	1A.1. Student and class wide progress will be monitored and discussed bi-weekly. Planning sessions will include both reflection and strategic planning of instructional practices.	1A.1. GO Math! Pre/post test scores, Core K-12 benchmark assessments.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>The % of students scoring level 3 in math will improve from 23% to 33%.</i>							
	<b>23% ( 69 students)</b>	<b>33% ( 99 students)</b>					
		1A.2. Teachers do not consistently utilize best practices as outlined by the teacher evaluation system.	1A.2. Within the extended planning framework, teachers will reflect on best practices for instruction and receive guidance and professional development as needed by school based math coaches.	1A.2. Administration, Math Coaches	1A.2. Feedback from walkthroughs and teacher evaluation observations will target areas for individual teacher improvement in the area of best practices for instruction.	1A.2. GO Math! Pre/post test scores, Core K-12 benchmark assessments	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

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

<p><b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>1B.1. Teachers do not consistently differentiate math instruction in order to provide appropriate supports for intellectually disabled students.</p>	<p>1B.1. Small group instruction as well as math centers that provide scaffolding, support and assistive technology will be utilized to teach core skills in math.</p>	<p>1B.1 Administration, Math Coaches</p>	<p>1B.1. Feedback from administrative walkthroughs and evaluations as well as support provided by math coaches within a discussion framework.</p>	<p>1B.1. GO Math! Pre/post test scores. benchmark assessments, Alternative Assessment Scores.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #1B</u> <i>Students scoring levels 4-6 on the FAA in math will improve from 3% to 10%</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>.03% ( 1 student)</i></p>	<p><i>10% ( 3 students)</i></p>					
		<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	
		<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>	2A.1. Teachers do not consistently differentiate math instruction in order to provide enrichment opportunities for students working above grade level.	2A.1. Small group instruction as well as project based math centers will be incorporated into core instruction. These structures will be planned with support from school based math coaches and administration.	2A.1. Administration, Math Coaches	2A.1. Feedback from administrative walkthroughs and evaluations as well as support provided by math coaches within a discussion framework.	2A.1. GO Math! Pre/post test scores. Core K-12 benchmark assessments.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u> The % of students scoring at levels 4 or 5 will improve from 37% to 47%	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>37% ( 111) students</b>	<b>47% (141) students</b>					

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

		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>	2B.1. . Teachers do not consistently differentiate math instruction in order to provide enrichment opportunities for students working above level 7 on the alternative assessment.	2B.1. . Small group instruction as well as project based math centers will be incorporated into core instruction.	2B.1. Administration, Math Coaches	2B.1. Feedback from administrative walkthroughs and evaluations as well as support provided by math coaches within a discussion framework.	2B.1. . GO Math! Pre/post test scores,Core K-12 benchmark assessments.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u> The % of students scoring level 7 or above as measured by FAA will improve from 60% to 70%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>60% ( 18 students)</b>	<b>70% ( 21 students)</b>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	



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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>3A.1. Teachers do not consistently utilize best practices as outlined by the teacher evaluation system.</p>	<p>3A.1. Within the extended planning framework, teachers will reflect on best practices for instruction and receive guidance and professional development as needed. These structures and efforts will be supported by school based math coaches as well as administration.</p>	<p>3A.1. Administration, Math Coaches</p>	<p>3A.1. Feedback from walkthroughs and teacher evaluation observations will target areas for individual teacher improvement in the area of best practices for instruction.</p>	<p>3A.1. GO Math! Pre/post test scores, Core K-12 benchmark assessments</p>		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
<i>The % of students making learning gains in math will improve from 63% to 73%</i>							
	<b>63% (189) students</b>	<b>73%(219) students</b>					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	3B.1. Teachers do not consistently utilize best practices as outlined by the teacher evaluation system.	3B.1. Within the extended planning framework, teachers will reflect on best practices for instruction and receive guidance and professional development as needed by school based math coaches.	3B.1. Administration, Math Coaches	3B.1. Feedback from walkthroughs and teacher evaluation observations will target areas for individual teacher improvement in the area of best practices for instruction.	3B.1. Alternative Assessment, Access Points, Go Math pre/post test scores, other formative assessments.		

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

Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The % of students making learning gains in math for students measured by the FAA will improve from 63% to 73%							
	<b>63% (10 students)</b>	<b>73% ( 12 students)</b>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

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

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

<p><b>4A. FCAT 2.0:</b>  <b>Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>4A.1. Intervention strategies are not always implemented with fidelity and delivery models are not always modified to meet student needs.</p>	<p>4A.1. Collaborative planning of interventions using a standards driven backward design model will be utilized by all teaching teams. Instruction within intervention groups will be modified based on progress monitoring data. School based math coaches will provide guidance and support as well as structures for reflection and next steps.</p>	<p>4A.1. Math Coaches, Administration</p>	<p>4A.1. Analysis of student data as well as formative assessments information will be utilized to adjust instructional practices as needed as determined by student need.</p>	<p>4A.1. GO Math! Pre/post test scores, Core K-12 benchmark assessments</p>		
--	--	---	---	--	---	--	--



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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#4A:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance*</u>					
<i>The % of students making learning gains in math who are in the lowest 25% will improve from 56% to 66%.</i>							
	<b>56% (42) students</b>	<b>66% (50) students</b>					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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

<p><b>4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>4B.1. Intervention strategies are not always implemented with fidelity and delivery models are not always modified to meet student needs.</p>	<p>4B.1. Collaborative planning of interventions using a standards driven backward design model will be utilized by all teaching teams. Instruction within intervention groups will be modified based on progress monitoring data.</p>	<p>4B.1. Math Coaches, Administration</p>	<p>4B.1. Analysis of student data as well as formative assessments information will be utilized to adjust instructional practices as needed as determined by student need.</p>	<p>4B.1. Alternative Assessment, Access Points, Go Math pre/post test scores, other formative assessments.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #4B:</u>  <i>The % of students in the lowest 25% measured by the FAA will improve from 26% to 36%.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>26% ( 8 students).</i></p>	<p><i>36% ( 11 students)</i></p>					
		<p>4B.2.</p>	<p>4B.2.</p>	<p>4B.2.</p>	<p>4B.2.</p>	<p>4B.2.</p>	

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

		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	Baseline data 2010-2011	34% of students score 3 or above as measured by FCAT	41% of students score 3 or above as measured by FCAT	48% of students score 3 or above as measured by FCAT	55% of students score 3 or above as measured by FCAT	62% of students score 3 or above as measured by FCAT	68% of students score 3 or above as measured by FCAT
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u></p> <p><i>Through the strategic use of a backward planning model that is rigorously aligned with the NGSS and CCSS, Northwest Elementary will reduce the achievement gap in math by 50%.</i></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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>5B.1. White: .Teachers do not consistently utilize best practices as outlined by the teacher evaluation system. Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p>5B.1. Within the extended planning framework, teachers will reflect on best practices for instruction and receive guidance and professional development as needed.</p>	<p>5B.1. Administration, Math Coaches</p>	<p>5B.1. Feedback from walkthroughs and teacher evaluation observations will target areas for individual teacher improvement in the area of best practices for instruction.</p>	<p>5B.1. GO Math! Pre/post test scores. Core K-12 benchmark assessments.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u>  <i>The % of white students making learning gains in math will improve from 63% to 73%</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>White: 63%(120) Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p>White: 73% ( 219) Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>					
		<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	
		<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	

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

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

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



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

<p><b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>5D.1. Intervention strategies are not always implemented with fidelity and delivery models are not always modified to meet student needs.</p>	<p>5D.1. Collaborative planning of interventions using a standards driven backward design model will be utilized by all teaching teams. Instruction within intervention groups will be modified based on progress monitoring data.</p>	<p>5D.1. Administration, Math Coaches</p>	<p>5D.1. Analysis of student data as well as formative assessments information will be utilized to adjust instructional practices as needed as determined by student need.</p>	<p>5D.1. GO Math! Pre/post test scores. Core K-12 benchmark assessments.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>  <i>The % of students with disabilities making learning gains in math will improve from</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
		<p>5D.2.</p>	<p>5D.2.</p>	<p>5D.2.</p>	<p>5D.2.</p>	<p>5D.2.</p>	

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

		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5E.1. Intervention strategies are not always implemented with fidelity and delivery models are not always modified to meet student needs.	5E.1. Collaborative planning of interventions using a standards driven backward design model will be utilized by all teaching teams. Instruction within intervention groups will be modified based on progress monitoring data.	5E.1. Administration, Math Coaches	5E.1. Analysis of student data as well as formative assessments information will be utilized to adjust instructional practices as needed as determined by student need.	5E.1. GO Math! Pre/post test scores. Core K-12 benchmark assessments.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5E:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
<i>The % of FRL students making learning gains in math will improve from 60% to 70%</i>							
	<b>60% ( 180)</b>	<b>70% ( 210)</b>					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

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

**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		
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
<b>Mathematics Goal #5E:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

*End of Middle School Mathematics Goals*

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



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

*End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals*

**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		
<b>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
<b>Geometry Goal #3E:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

**Mathematics Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional</b>							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

<b>Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b> 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
Implementation of CCSS in grades K and 1	K,1	Primary Math Coach	All teachers in grades k and 1	September 2012	Pre/post test data review and reflection sessions	Primary Math Coach, Administration
Understanding by Design ( backward planning)	K-5	Math Coaches/ Admin	School wide	September –December 2012	Monitoring of Lesson plans aligned with classroom observations	Math Coaches/Administrtion

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

**Mathematics Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Coaching and support for teachers	2 math coaches	Title 1	74,000
<b>Subtotal:74,000</b>			
<b>Total:74,000</b>			

*End of Mathematics Goals*

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

**Elementary and Middle School Science Goals**

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

<b>Elementary and Middle Science Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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		
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b>	1A.1. Planning for instruction in Science often takes place by teachers in isolation without full knowledge of the standards and curriculum calendar	1A.1. Collaborative planning for instruction using a standards driven design model will inform teachers and provide continuity across grade levels for consistent teaching practices.	1A.1. Administration	1A.1. Formative assessments as well as test scores on science tests and benchmark assessments will be disaggregated and areas for further instruction will be identified through a collaborative planning process.	1A.1. Chapter tests, formative assessments, Core K-12, FCAT		

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

Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>The % of students scoring level 3 on the science FCAT will improve from 44% to 50%</i>							
	<b>44% ( 34 students)</b>	<b>50% (44 students)</b>					
		1A.2. Students are not being exposed to vocabulary necessary for success in science on a consistent basis.	1A.2. Exposure to science vocabulary will take place across the curriculum with opportunities to discuss how various terms apply both within and outside of science.	1A.2. Administration	1A.2. Formative assessments as well as test scores on science tests and benchmark assessments will be disaggregated and areas for further instruction will be identified through a collaborative planning process.	1A.2. Chapter tests, formative assessments, Core K-12, FCAT	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

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

<p><b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b></p>	<p>1B.1. Planning for instruction in Science is often planned by teachers in isolation without full knowledge of the standards and curriculum calendar.</p>	<p>1B.1. Collaborative planning for instruction using a standards driven design model (access points) will inform teachers and provide continuity across grade levels within IND units for consistent teaching practices.</p>	<p>1B.1. Administration</p>	<p>1B.1. Formative assessments as well as test scores on science tests and benchmark assessments will be disaggregated and areas for further instruction will be identified through a collaborative planning process.</p>	<p>1B.1. Formative assessments, Access points, Florida Alternative Assessment.</p>		
<p>Science Goal #1B: <b>Students scoring at levels 4-6 in science as measured by FAA will improve from 0% to 28%</b></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>0% ( 0 students)</b></p>	<p><b>28% ( 2 students)</b></p>					
		<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	
		<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b></p>	<p>2A.1. Students are not being offered consistent opportunities to experience scientific concepts through hands on activities.</p>	<p>2A.1. Students in grades K-5 will take part in hands-on learning activities that support big ideas in science twice monthly. These efforts will be planned and supported by a school based science coach as well as administration.</p>	<p>2A.1. Administration, part time science coach</p>	<p>2A.1. Progress monitoring of science scores as well as information provided through formative assessments.</p>	<p>2A.1. Core k-12, chapter tests, formative assessments.</p>		



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

<p><u>Science Goal #2A:</u>  <i>The % of students scoring 4 or 5 on the science FCAT will improve from 6% to 16%</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>6% (6) students</b></p>	<p><b>16% (16) students</b></p>					
		<p>2A.2.</p>	<p>2A.2.</p>	<p>2A.2.</p>	<p>2A.2.</p>	<p>2A.2.</p>	
		<p>2A.3.</p>	<p>2A.3.</p>	<p>2A.3.</p>	<p>2A.3.</p>	<p>2A.3.</p>	
<p><b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b></p>	<p>2B.1. Students are not being offered consistent opportunities to experience scientific concepts through hands on activities.</p>	<p>2B.1. Students in grades K-5 will take part in hands-on learning activities that support big ideas in science twice monthly.</p>	<p>2B.1. Administration</p>	<p>2B.1. Progress monitoring of science scores as well as information provided through formative assessments.</p>	<p>2B.1. Access points, classroom assessments, Florida Alternative Assessment.</p>		

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

<u>Science Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Students scoring at level 7 or above in science as measured by the FAA will improve from 71% to 76%</i>							
	<b>71% ( 5 students)</b>	<b>76% ( 6 students)</b>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

*End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals*

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

Science Professional Development

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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
Planning for a comprehensive science program	5	District Facilitator	Fifth grade teachers	Quarterly throughout 2012-2013	Pre/post test monitoring, formative assessment reflection sessions by grade level	Administration, District science coach

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Teaching the scientific method through hands on experiences	Science consumable supplies	District funds	500.00
<b>Subtotal:500.00</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:500.00</b>			

*End of Science Goals*

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

**Writing Goals**

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

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

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

<p><b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b></p>	<p>1A.1.Oppor- tunities for students to apply the processes and conventions of writing across the curriculum are not being offered with consistency to students.</p>	<p>1A.1. Teachers will collaborativ- ely plan for instruction on grade level teams in order to provide authentic writing experiences for students in all content areas. Professional developmen- t, guidance while planning, and support will be provided by a school based writing coach.</p>	<p>1A.1. Administration, Writing Coach</p>	<p>1A.1.Teachers will participate in collaborative scoring and planning of student writing.</p>	<p>1A.1. FCAT and 6 trait writing rubrics, formative assessments based on an integrated literacy program.</p>		
<p><u>Writing Goal #1A:</u>  <i>The % of students scoring level 3 or above on the writing FCAT will improve from 69% to 79%.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	69% (69) students	79% (79) students					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b>	1B.1. . Opportunities for students to apply the processes and conventions of writing across the curriculum are not being offered with consistency to students.	1B.1. Teachers will collaboratively plan for instruction on grade level teams in order to provide authentic writing experiences for students in all content areas.	1B.1. Administration, Writing Coach	1B.1. Teachers will meet in their PLC group to discuss the various approaches to writing and assistive technology that can be used to promote improvements in writing.	1B.1. Florida Alternative Assessment, Access Points formative assessments.		
Writing Goal #1B: <i>The % of students scoring 4 or above on the writing FCAT will improve from 25% to 35%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	25% (25) students	35% (35) students					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	

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

		IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--



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

Writing Professional Development

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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
Writers Workshop Training	K-5	Writing Coach	School wide	August 2012	Coaching and support by writing coach	Administration Writing Coach

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount 42,000
School based writing coach	Coaching and support for teachers	Title 1	
<b>Subtotal:42,000</b>			
<b>Total:42,000</b>			

*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]).

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

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

<p><b>1. Attendance</b></p>	<p>1.1. A significant percentage of students are tardy or absent from school for more than 10 days per year due to poor parent support and lack of understanding about the impact that consistent attendance has on student learning.</p>	<p>1.1. Attendance case workers will be assigned to the students who are missing a significant number of school days or who are chronically tardy to school. Students will set goals with their case workers and will check in with them daily. Phone calls home will be made to families of students who are missing school or are consistently tardy.</p>	<p>1.1. Administration, Guidance , Attendance Case Workers.</p>	<p>1.1. Daily and weekly attendance data will be used to monitor student progress. Monthly attendance meetings will be scheduled to determine progress and next steps.</p>	<p>1.1. MTSS data base, Pasco Star, TERMS reports.</p>		
-----------------------------	---	---	---	--	--	--	--

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

<p><b>Attendance Goal #1:</b></p> <p><i>The attendance rate for Northwest Elementary will improve from 92% to 99%.</i></p> <p><i>Students missing 10 days or more will be reduced from 324 students to 291 students.</i></p> <p><i>Excessive tardies (10 or more) will be reduced from 97 students to 87 students</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>92%</b></p>	<p><b>99%</b></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>					
	<p><b>324 students</b></p>	<p><b>291 students</b></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p>					
	<p><b>97 students</b></p>	<p><b>87 students</b></p>					

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

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

**Attendance Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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
Training and support for the attendance support team	K-5	Admin/guidance	Various support personnel school wide	Monthly, year long	Attendance logs, phone call logs, attendance data	Administration/guidance

**Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

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

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:0</b>			

*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)).

<b>Suspension Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension</b>						
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		
<b>1. Suspension</b>	1.1. Some students who are in crisis or consistently experiencing stress are repeatedly suspended from school due to inappropriate behavior.	1.1. Students with a pattern of receiving two or more behavior referrals within a three month period will be identified and instruction in school success and social skills will be offered within a small group setting.	1.1. Administration, Guidance, Behavior Specialist	1.1. Behavior data paired with data review meetings and problem solving that will take place as part of our MTSS processes for behavior.	1.1. Pasco Star, MTSS, Referral Data		

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

Suspension Goal #1: <i>The total number of students receiving out of school suspensions will be reduced from 18 students to 14 students.</i>	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
	<i>0 students</i>	<i>0 students</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	<i>0 students</i>	<i>0 students</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	<i>24</i>	<i>14</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	<i>18 students</i>	<i>14 students</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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
PBS/MTSS training for behavior	K-5	Behavior Spec.	All staff	Quarterly, year long	Quarterly review of behavior data, FBA reviews/meetings	Behavior specialist/ Admin.

**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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:0</b>			

*End of Suspension Goals*

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

**Dropout Prevention Goal(s)**

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

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

<b>Dropout Prevention Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention</b>						
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		
<b>1. Dropout Prevention</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u>  N/A	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Dropout Prevention Professional Development**

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

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

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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

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

**Dropout Prevention Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

*End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*

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

**Parent Involvement Goal(s)**

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

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

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

<b>Parent Involvement Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement</b>						
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		
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>	1.1. Some families are reluctant to attend academic events that support school wide goals in the areas of reading, writing, math and science.	1.1. Academic activities will be piggybacked with entertainment or crafts events in order to improve family events that support our school wide goals.	1.1. Administration, School Support Team	1.1 Each family event will be advertised via school newsletter, flyers and Connect-ed phone calls to homes. Sign in sheets for each event as well as parent surveys will be analyzed to measure the success of each event.	1.1. Sign in sheets and Parent surveys.		



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

<b>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</b> <i>The number of parents who participate in academic school based activities will improve from 55% to 65%</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
	55% ( 380 parents)	65% ( 450 parents)					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Parent Involvement Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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
Family Involvement meetings	K-5	Admin	Teachers, volunteers K-5	Quarterly, year long	Parent survey data, Event attendance data	Administration

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

**Parent Involvement Budget**

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:0</b>			

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p><u>STEM Goal #1:</u></p> <p><i>Students meeting proficiency levels in both science and math are not currently at expected levels. The number of students achieving level 3 or above in these areas will improve at a rate of 6% per year over a 4 year period in order to meet state and district wide expectations.</i></p>	<p>1.1. Highly engaging real world learning opportunities that include opportunities to problem solve, think scientifically, and apply and test hypothesis are not offered consistently throughout the school.</p>	<p>1.1. Coaching and support provided by a district based science coach, as well as school based technology specialist and math coaches will be available in order to model, assist and support teachers in planning for highly engaging project based learning activities that integrate science, technology and mathematics.</p>	<p>1.1. Science coach, math coaches, technology specialist, administration.</p>	<p>1.1. School wide observations by support team members as well as formative and summative data in the areas of math, science and technology use will be utilized to measure program effectiveness.</p>	<p>1.1. Go math pre and post test data, Science weekly and unit assessments, Core K-12 data in science and math.</p>
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**STEM Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development</b>						
---------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

<b>(PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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
Standards based planning in math and science	K-5	Science/Math coach	All grade level teams	One meeting quarterly Beginning Oct. 2012	Lesson plan reviews supported by administrative walk throughs	Math and Science coaches, Administration
Integrating the scientific method into core instruction	K-5	Science Coach	All grade level teams	One meeting quarterly Beginning Oct. 2012	Lesson plan reviews supported by administrative walk throughs	Science Coach, Administration0

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

**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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:0</b>			

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

**Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)**

<b>CTE Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>CTE Goal #1:</b>  N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**CTE Professional Development**

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

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

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

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

**CTE Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of CTE Goal(s)*



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

**Additional Goal(s)**

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

<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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		
<b>1. Additional Goal</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<b>Additional Goal #1:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

**Additional Goals Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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

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

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

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

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

**Final Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total:107,400</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total:22,000</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total:74,000</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total:500</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total:42,000</b>
<b>Civics Budget</b>	<b>Total:n/a</b>
<b>U.S. History Budget</b>	<b>Total:n/a</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total:0</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total:0</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total:n/a</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total:0</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total:0</b>
<b>CTE Budget</b>	<b>Total:0</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total: 245,900</b>

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

<b>Grand Total:</b>

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

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

- 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 Northwest Elementary School Advisory Council will meet monthly in order to reflect on our School Improvement Plan and the student achievement data that support it. Ideas for continued improvement as well as activities and actions that will support student life at the school will be discussed. Student achievement data, along with updates on various activities and initiatives introduced within the school throughout the year are planned for and discussed by the School Advisory Council.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Instructional Materials	2,200