

Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

Name of School:

Area:

North

Atlantis Elementary School

Principal:

Area Superintendent:

Dr. Ron Bobay

Cynthia L. Adams

SAC Chairperson:

Cynthia Parsons-Gass

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

To meet the individual educational and social needs of all students through high expectations; therefore, promoting citizens of character and life-long learners in a positive and safe environment.

Vision Statement:

Working together to launch life-long learners with excellence as our standard.

Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

After review of our 2011-2012 school year FCAT school-wide data, we find that school-wide:

School-Wide FCAT One Year Only

Reading	High Performing	69 %
Reading	Learning Gains	63 %
Reading	Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains	61 %
Math	High Performing	64 %
Math	Learning Gains	67 %
Math	Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains	63 %
Writing	High Performing	63 %
Science	High Performing	54 %

By grade level over the past 4 years: (FCAT)

3rd Grade

Grade & Subject	% scoring a level 3 or higher	Grade & Subject	% scoring a level 3 or higher
3 rd Grade Reading 2009	81	3 rd Grade Math 2009	87
3 rd Grade Reading 2010	83	3 rd Grade Math 2010	93
3 rd Grade Reading 2011	82	3 rd Grade Math 2011	89
3rd Grade Reading 2012	77	3rd Grade Math 2012	69

4th grade

Grade & Subject	% scoring a level 3 or higher	Grade & Subject	% scoring a level 3 or higher	Grade & Subject	Average Score	% scoring a level 3 or higher
4th Grade Reading 2009	86	4th Grade Math 2009	81	4th Grade Writing 2009	3.9	
4th Grade Reading 2010	82	4th Grade Math 2010	88	4th Grade Writing 2010	3.5	91
4th Grade Reading 2011	78	4th Grade Math 2011	80	4th Grade Writing 2011	3.8	95
4th Grade Reading 2012	65	4th Grade Math 2012	56	4th Grade Writing 2012	3.0	63

5th Grade

Grade & Subject	% scoring a level 3 or higher	Grade & Subject	% scoring a level 3 or higher	Grade & Subject	% scoring a level 3 or higher
5th Grade Reading 2009	85	5th Grade Math 2009	80	5th Grade Science 2009	71
5th Grade Reading 2010	76	5th Grade Math 2010	70	5th Grade Science 2010	68
5th Grade Reading 2011	72	5th Grade Math 2011	69	5th Grade Science 2011	60
5th Grade Reading 2012	58	5th Grade Math 2012	57	5th Grade Science 2012	54

6th Grade

Grade & Subject	% scoring a level 3 or higher	Grade & Subject	% scoring a level 3 or higher
6th Grade Reading 2009	84	6th Grade Math 2009	74
6th Grade Reading 2010	82	6th Grade Math 2010	80
6th Grade Reading 2011	76	6th Grade Math 2011	71
6th Grade Reading 2012	71	6th Grade Math 2012	70

During the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 assessment, cut scores were increased as well as the rigor of the test. Therefore, direct comparisons are difficult to make, yet the tables above show the changes that occurred from 2011 to 2012. Notable declines in student achievement would be evident if direct comparisons were able to be made (especially within 5th grade science & 4th grade math). Regardless of the transition frameworks of the test and/or requirements, we need to use what information we have at the moment to make observations and recommendations for the future. Many of our grade level and school-wide data points are below 70% proficiency. Yet we see many gains in students who prior had achieved below grade level status. Therefore, our efforts this school year will be in effective core instruction, where we will expect that 70% of our students will show mastery in gained skills from presented lesson plans and objectives. Based upon our most recent FCAT scores, we earned a total number of points that resulted in a school grade of a B. For the 2012-2013, we would like to increase our student's academic achievement to a level that will earn us a school grade of an A. An A would mean to us that our core students are learning skills successfully and our teachers are employing and utilizing strategies that lead to increased student achievement for all students.

When we analysis district required measurements, we notice that we are making progress and meeting expectations within the academic subjects of reading, writing, and science by the county's target goals. In math, grades 3-5 meet the 70% or higher proficiency target, yet our 6th grade math scores were slightly below that mark with the average being 63%.

As we look at our FAIR data, which is a state assessment, our data points are not where we would like to be. Reading Comprehension percentile averages are at 65 or lower. The percentiles we aim for are between the 40th to 60th percentile, this would be within an average range. This confirms that our core instruction within the 90 minute reading block must be of high quality.

Detailed data is depicted in the table below

Through this analysis it is evident that our school is in need of improvement in all of our academic subjects, especially as measured by FCAT.

FAIR Reading Comprehension average percentile (End Of Year)			
Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
3	69	44	57
4	68	42	55
5	69	35	52
6	70	38	65

DRLA Reading Proficiency average percent (End Of Year)			
Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
3	78	79	81
4	81	78	79
5	82	80	81
6	82	80	82

Reading Running Record average level (End Of Year)			
Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
K	3.9	4.7	5

1	20.3	19.5	23.3
2	38.8	39.1	39.5

Science BOK Earth/ Space, Physical, Life			
Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
5	80,77,77	77,76,79	76,77,70

Writing (End Of Year)			
Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
4	4.1	3.5	4.1

Mathematics (End Of Year)			
Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
3	76	80	80
4	79	74	76
5	69	71	71
6	89	60	63

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

“The most powerful strategy for improving student learning is for teachers to work together in collaborative teams to:

- Clarify what students must learn
- Gather evidence of student learning
- Analyze that evidence
- Identify the most powerful teaching strategies

Reflective teaching must be based on evidence of student learning and reflection is most powerful when it is collaborative” – Hattie

“The most promising strategy for sustained, substantive school improvement is building the capacity of school personnel to function as a professional learning community. The path to change in the classroom lies within and through professional learning communities” – DeFour

“The quality of any school system cannot exceed the quality of the people within it. Therefore,

the most effective school systems in the world use the Professional Learning Community (PLC) concept to provide the ongoing, collaborative, data-driven, job-embedded professional development essential to continual adult learning” – Sir Michael Barber

“It should be no surprise that the result of the multiplicity of activities in the districts that doubled student achievement was a collaborative professional learning culture – commonly referred to as a professional learning community (PLC). The culture was a product of the activities rather than something created before engaging in the process” – Odden and Archibold

“The PLC process plays a vital role in improving schools across a district. People who work collaboratively in PLCs go beyond mere support groups. They require group members to reflect honestly and openly about their own practice, intentionally seeking ways to do their work better, and continually building their capacity to do better” – Anneberg Institute for School Reform

“The most successful corporation of the future will be a learning organization” – Peter Senge

“Every enterprise has to become a learning institution [and] a teaching institution. Organizations that build in continuous learning in jobs will dominate the twenty-first century” – Peter Drucker

“The commission recommends that schools be restructured to become genuine learning organizations for both students and teachers; organizations that respect learning, honor teaching, and teach for understanding” – Linda Darling-Hammond

All of the works of the giants in educational reform in the world point to Professional Learning Communities as the vehicle to maximize student potential through a continuous improvement process. Moving away from the traditional school structure of independent “kingdoms” to a cohesive school organized into interdependent collaborative teams united by a Professional Learning Community Foundation.

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

At Atlantis Elementary School, Professional Learning Communities are data informed and meet together to connect data to best practice. We programmatically look and practice self-analysis which allows us to identify areas of strength and areas for growth.

The four questions that guide our Professional Learning Communities include:

1. What do we want students to learn?
2. How will we know that they have learned it?
3. What will we do if they don't learn it?
4. What will we do if they have already learned it?

We are working collaboratively with our colleagues to build shared knowledge in regards to essential common learning in subject areas and learning strategies that will lead to increased student academic achievement.

Teachers work together in teams with common planning time to focus on increased student learning. This collaboration is successful through honoring team norms, supporting each other's professional development needs and sharing best practice. Every teacher develops an individualized Professional Growth Plan (PGP) which encourages teachers to improve upon their craft of teaching which will yield progress towards student academic achievement measures.

We track our students' progress on measures such as FAIR results, Reading Diagnostic Tools, District Required Assessments, and Success Maker levels. We track this data on a school-wide Data Wall (shared common space). We also utilize individual teacher Data Sheets. Through the use of these two tools, we are able to constantly know how are students are performing and are able to enter discussions that address what is working for students, and what isn't, and where we need to go; we are making decisions regarding our next steps.

Another tool that assists us in gathering information and graphing it, or comparing an individual student's growth to that of the class' is A3.

Our teachers collaboratively work together, and are assigned to students within the lowest 25%, and work to increase their academic learning gains

We have academic support programs where lower performing students receive additional assistance during the school day. Teachers also hold after school tutoring programs after school hours.

We offer a variety of Enriching Clubs to meet the needs of the whole child. Some include Art Club, Chorus and Strings in music, Student Government, Environmental Club, Future Problem Solvers, Lego Robotics, Book Club, Safety Patrols, TV Announcement Anchor Crew, Canine Commandos, Deaf Pal, National Elementary Honor Society, Yearbook, and Tech Team.

Our school is a Positive Behavior Support School and we focus and encourage students to display the character traits of Respect, Responsibility, Trustworthiness, Citizenship, Fairness, and Caring. Each morning students recite a Character Pledge to remind them of this goal. When students display these traits they are awarded with links. This is a school-wide initiative. Students earn links and collect them to "purchase" rewards of their choosing. Students are encouraged, expected, and rewarded to behave in a positive manner.

Awards Received:

- Florida Power Library 2009-2012
- Excellence in Visual Arts 2007-2013
- Excellence in Physical Education Award 2011-2014
- National Model School of Professional Learning Communities at Work
- School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Model School 2010-2011 Silver Level
- Energy Star

- Golden School Award: School Volunteer Program 2010
- Five Star School Award
- 10 current National Board Certified teachers
- Florida Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Dance, & Sport 2012
- National Elementary Honor Society participant

CONTENT AREA:

Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Parental Involvement	Drop-out Programs
---------	------	---------	---------	-------------------------	-------------------

Language Arts	Social Studies	Arts/PE	Other:		
---------------	----------------	---------	--------	--	--

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

Professional Learning Communities will be used as the means of improving our process of using research based teaching strategies to focus on Higher Order Thinking: essential questions, higher order questioning, and writing across content. PLCs will monitor student progress, based on the careful analysis of student needs which will result in increased student achievement.

Strategies: Essential Questions

<i>Barrier</i>	<i>Action Steps</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Timetable</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>In-Process Measure</i>
1.Primary K-2 teachers implementing new Common Core Standards	1. Grade Level PLC planning	Administration/ Leadership Team/ Launch Team	August - May		Administrative participation in PLC
2.Not all K-2 teachers are trained in Common Core Standards	2.Professional Development training in PLC	Leadership Team/ Launch Team	2012-13 school year		Administrative observations
3.Knowledge of writing essential questions.	3.Professional Development training in PLC	Leadership Team	1 st semester		Evidence of using essential questioning

Strategies: Higher Order Questioning

<i>Barrier</i>	<i>Action Steps</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Timetable</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>In-Process Measure</i>
----------------	---------------------	---------------------------	------------------	---------------	---------------------------

1. Not all Teachers are familiar with Higher Order Questioning Techniques	1. Professional Development training in PLC	Leadership Team	1 st semester		Evidence of using Higher Order Questioning Techniques
---	---	-----------------	--------------------------	--	---

Strategies: Writing Across Content

<i>Barrier</i>	<i>Action Steps</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Timetable</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>In-Process Measure</i>
1. All teachers not trained in utilization of graphic organizers	1. All teachers trained to use Thinking Maps	Leadership Team	Pre-planning Fall 2012		Evidence of utilization of graphic organizers
2. Teachers primarily focused on writing only during writing block	2.a. Implementing writing across the content areas	All Instructional Personal	2012-13		Evidence of writing across the content areas
	2.b. Professional Development for teaching effective strategies for writing across the content.	Leadership Team	January and February		Evidence of writing across the content areas

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

Teachers will develop their professional knowledge and implement within their classrooms using the following strategies of higher order thinking: essential questions, higher order questioning, and writing across content areas.

Qualitative Outcome –Exit slips will be utilized as professional development topics are introduced.
PGP self-reflection components.

Quantitative Outcome – Attendance in professional development opportunities. Evidence will be noted during instructional staff observations and performance evaluations.

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

Qualitative Expectations - teacher observations and monitoring of student participation and engagement of higher order thinking skills

Quantitative Expectations - Data analysis as based upon the academic achievement assessments of FCAT,

FAIR, district assessments of reading, writing, science, & Math, and summative assessments within the classroom. Specific outcome indicators as based upon FCAT, FAA, and CELLA are detailed within Appendix A of this document.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance
1. Fidelity within the 90 minute reading block with Tier 1 instruction	(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)	(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. Improvement within lesson planning and implementation		

<p>Strategy(s): 1. Teachers will plan and implement quality lessons to yield learning gains.</p>		
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 (for the 2012-2012 school year data we are including 340 students within grades 3-6)</p> <p>Barrier(s): lack of vocabulary development</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.implementing higher order thinking questions and teachers to plan with essential questions in mind 2. extending vocabulary opportunities 3. Success Maker lab experiences</p>	32%=110 students	36%=123 students
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading (for the 2012-2012 school year data we are including 340 students within grades 3-6)</p> <p>Barrier(s):lack of critical thinking skills</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.use of data notebooks 2. present tasks which include critical thinking skills and tasks that include analysis and synthesis; application</p>	36%=125 students	40%=136 students
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading (we are looking at 64 students in grades 3-6 within this category)</p> <p>Barrier(s): deficits in foundation level skills</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.Walk to Intervention model to supplement specific student skills 2.build background knowledge 3.vocabulary development 4. inferencing 5. 12 Powerful Words & RUNRAAVEL 6. Ability to retell 7. Invitation to small group instructional setting such as ASP 8. Mentoring</p>	61%=39 students	65%=42 students
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>Our FAA students are not in the lowest 25% category</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>Our FAA students will not be in the lowest 25% category</p>

Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading	100%=2 students	100%=1 student
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading 2 students participated in FAA during the 2011-2012 school year: (1) in 4 th grade and (1) in 6 th grade	100% = 2 students	100%=1 student
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline data 2010-11:		
Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading : 258 students within this category White: 17 students within this category Black: 36 students within this category Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	Enter numerical data for current level of performance (# of stdts performing at Level 1 & 2 according to FCAT) 30%=77 students 59%=10 students 47%=17 students 0%=0 students 0%=0 students	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance 76%= 197 students 50%=8 students 65%= 24 students NA NA
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading 3 students are within the ELL category in total	0%=0 students	NA
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading 79 students are within the SWD category in total Barrier(s):not understanding the question and vocabulary terms Strategy(s): 1.vocabulary development 2. inferencing 3. 12 Powerful Words & RUNRAAVEL 4. Ability to retell	37%=29 students	44%= 35 students

<p>Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading 179 students are within the ED category in total</p> <p>Barrier(s): not understanding the question and vocabulary terms</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.build background knowledge 2.vocabulary development 3. inferencing 4. 12 Powerful Words & RUNRAAVEL 5. Ability to retell</p>	44%=78 students	67%= 120 students
--	-----------------	-------------------

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Higher Order Thinking Questions	1 st semester	Professional Development training in PLC
Essential Questioning	Throughout the 2012-2013 school year	Professional Development training in PLC
Graphic Organizers & Lesson Plan templates	Fall 2012	Professional Development training in PLC
Writing Across the Content Areas, Holistic Writing, Notebooking	1 st semester & 2 nd semester	Professional Development training in PLC
Reading Across the Content Areas, Text Complexity, Extending Vocabulary	1 st semester	Professional Development training in PLC
Common Core Standards	Throughout the 2012-2013 school year	Professional Development training in PLC

6 students participated in CELLA during the 2011-2012 school year

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
------------	---------------------	----------	---------------------------

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 4/6=67%	Exposure in learning second language	Vocabulary building; Spotlight software resource	Classroom Teacher, Guidance Counselor, & Data Team
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 1/6=17%	Exposure in learning second language	Small group reading instruction	Classroom Teacher, Guidance Counselor, & Data Team
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing: 0/6=0%	Exposure in learning second language	Vocabulary building; Spotlight software resource	Classroom Teacher, Guidance Counselor, & Data Team

Mathematics Goal: 1. Fidelity within Tier 1 instruction of the math block	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. Improvement within lesson planning and implementation		
Strategy(s): 1. Teachers will plan and implement quality lessons to yield learning gains.		

<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 (for the 2012-2012 school year data we are including 340 students within grades 3-6)</p> <p>Barrier(s): high quality tier 1 instruction</p> <p>Strategy(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. hands on experiences 2. Success Maker lab experiences 3. identify key vocabulary </p>	<p>32%=111 students</p>	<p>36%= 123 students</p>
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics (for the 2012-2012 school year data we are including 340 students within grades 3-6)</p> <p>Barrier(s):effective enhanced skill opportunities to include higher order thinking questions</p> <p>Strategy(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Increased opportunities for student-centered activities 2. Focus on multi-step math tasks </p>	<p>32%=110 students</p>	<p>36%=123 students</p>
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics (we are looking at 66 students in grades 3-6 within this category)</p> <p>Barrier(s):basic fact recall and determining which operation to utilize</p> <p>Strategy(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.identifying key words 2. math strategies 3. number sense and basic review of math facts 4. Number Talk strategies 5. Invitation to small group instructional setting such as ASP </p>	<p>63%=42 students</p>	<p>67%= 45 students</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics</p>	<p>0%=0 students</p>	<p>0%=0 students</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics</p>	<p>100%=2 students</p>	<p>100%=1 student</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics</p> <p>2 students participated in FAA during the 2011-2012 school year: (1) in 4th grade and (1) in 6th grade</p>	<p>100%=2 students</p>	<p>100%=1 student</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics</p>	<p>NA Our FAA students are not in the lowest 25% category</p>	<p>Our FAA students will not be in the lowest 25% category</p>

Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11:		
Student subgroups by ethnicity : 258 students within this category White: 17 students within this category Black: 36 students within this category Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	(# of stdts performing at Level 1 & 2 according to FCAT) 36%=93 students 71%= 12 students 39%=14 students 0%=0 students 0%=0 students	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance 76%= 197 students 33%= 6 students 61%= 22 students NA NA
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics 3 students are within the ELL category in total	0%=0 students	NA
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics 79 students are within the SWD category in total Barrier(s):basic fact recall and determining which operation to utilize Strategy(s): 1.identifying key words 2. math strategies 3. number sense and basic review of math facts 4. Number Talk strategies	37%=29 students	60%=48 students
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics 179 students are within the ED category in total Barrier(s):basic fact recall and determining which operation to utilize Strategy(s): 1.identifying key words 2. math strategies 3. number sense and basic review of math facts 4. Number Talk strategies	44%=78 students	64%=115 students

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Higher Order Thinking Questions	1 st semester	Professional Development training in PLC
Essential Questioning	Throughout the 2012-2013 school year	Professional Development training in PLC

Emphasis on Math Word Problem Strategies	Throughout the 2012-2013 school year	Professional Development training in PLC
Graphic Organizers & Lesson Plan templates	Fall 2012	Professional Development training in PLC
Common Core Standards & Math Process Standards	Throughout the 2012-2013 school year	Professional Development training in PLC

Writing Goal 1. Fidelity within Tier 1 instruction of the writing block	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
<p>78 students in 4th grade account within this writing category in total For the 2011-2012 school year</p> <p>Barrier(s): Improvement within lesson planning and implementation</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1. Teachers will plan and implement quality lessons to yield learning gains.</p>	<p>According to FCAT data: 63% of our 4th grade students scored at a level 3 or higher on the 2011-2012 FCAT Writing Assessment.</p>	<p>70% at level 3 or above</p>
<p>FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing</p>	<p>63%=49 students</p>	<p>70%=54 students</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing</p>	<p>100%=1 student</p>	<p>NA; we do not have any 4th grade students expected to participate in FAA 2012-2013</p>

Science Goal 1. Fidelity within Tier 1 instruction of the science block	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
<p>92 students in 5th grade account within this science category in total For the 2011-2012 school year</p> <p>Barrier(s): -Improvement within lesson planning and implementation - Not able to examine, extrapolate and synthesize info</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will plan and implement quality lessons to yield learning gains. Use of Notebooking 	<p>According to FCAT data: 54% of our 5th grade students scored at a level 3 or higher on the 2011-2012 FCAT Science Assessment.</p>	<p>70% performing at a level 3 or above</p>
<p>FCAT Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:</p>	<p>40%=37 students</p>	<p>55%=51 students</p>
<p>FCAT Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:</p>	<p>13%=12 students</p>	<p>18%=17 students</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science</p>	<p>NA; we did not have any 5th grade students participate in FAA during the 2011-2012 school year</p>	<p>0%=0 students</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science</p>	<p>NA; we did not have any 5th grade students participate in FAA during the 2011-2012 school year</p>	<p>100%=1 student</p>

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

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and its role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

MTSS is a multi-tiered system of support at Atlantis Elementary School that uses data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention. The integrated instruction and intervention is provided to students at varying levels of intensity based on student need. The goal is to prevent problems and intervene early to ensure student success.

The Leadership Team Consists Of:

- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- School Counselor
- Staffing Specialist
- School Psychologist
- Resource Persons
- Teachers
- Behavior Analyst
- Speech Pathologists
- Parents

During the 2011-2012 school year 31 meetings were requested by parents and teachers to discuss academic or behavioral concerns. Those meetings progressed with interventions being put in place and monitored based on analysis of presented data. Twenty four (24) formal referrals were made to Psychological Services based on the outcome of those meetings.

Referral Results:

- Gifted 9 students staffed into the program with 2 students determined that they did not qualify
- Autism 2 students staffed into the program
- SLD 7 students staffed into the program with 1 student determined that they did not qualify
- Withdrew 3 students withdrew from our school
- In Process 2 students are currently in progress of assessments

Training for The Multi-Tiered System of Support has been provided this year for our School Counselor and Staffing Specialist at the Exceptional Education Contact Meeting on August 22, 2012. Additional training was received by the School Counselor at Counselor's Training on September 12, 2012. MTSS Resource teachers have been invited to our school on October 8, 2012 to discuss current procedures and discuss possible changes with the leadership team. MTSS Resource teachers will again return on October 22, 2012 to present to our faculty.

In addition, our school has PLCs that meet weekly on Tuesdays. Teachers identify students whose data reveal that they are not as successful as their peers. Interventions are identified and implemented through teacher collaboration. Teachers in primary grades share students and create Walk to Intervention plans. If the response to the interventions is not successful as compared to the rest of the class (with at least 80% of the rest of the class proving success), the student's data is then brought before the RtI team to further diagnose and provide more intensive interventions, moving the child into receiving Tier II interventions or beyond. In addition, our school has a separate Tier I and Tier II behavior intervention team and addresses students in need of Tier III behavior interventions within our Individualized Problem Solving Team (IPST).

PARENT INVOLVEMENT: Maintain effective school/community communication and partnerships.

We ensure parent opportunities to be involved in students' education both during the day and in the evenings. It is the staff's intent to create inviting collaborative successful connections between the home and the school.

Involvement opportunities that were planned and successfully implemented include (but were not limited to) the following: Hosting volunteer activities (orientation, appreciation and recognition), hosting academic nights (writing, reading, math and science nights), and the hosting of parent leadership venues such as School Advisory Committee, PTO, Health/Safety/Security Meetings and Principal Forums quarterly. All planned opportunities occurred.

Communication to parents was deemed critical to parent involvement. The following forms of communication were used regularly: school-wide newsletter, shuttle mail, marquee, email, Edline, progress reports, planner usage, synervoice, conferences and of course phone calls.

Another measure of success was met when Atlantis met our volunteer hours goal. Our goal was to show at least 13 volunteer hours per students. There were 7,819.05 hours recorded and the base number of students was 593.

On a daily basis, we have volunteers on campus to assist our students in the media center, cafeteria, and in our Mind & Body lab.

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

	For the 180 day period beginning 8/10/11, Ending 5/25/12							
						Percentage by School		
		Percent		Percent	Total Days	Total Days	Attendance %	
School	Excused	Excused	Unexcused	Unexcused	Present	Membership		
ATLANTIS ELEM	1,885	1.66%	3,216	2.82%	108,748	113,849	95.52%	

Another way to look at our attendance data from the 2011-2012 school year is depicted below. As the table shows, Atlantis Elementary School meets our county's goal of 95% consistent attendance to school. We aim to meet or exceed this goal within the current school year as well.

Month	August	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	Totals
School Wide Attendance	97.35	96.1	95.57	94.75	95.82	95.89	94.66	94.53	96.02	94.64	95.54

SUSPENSION:

At Atlantis Elementary School, we focus on celebrating students' success linked to positive character traits such as Respect, Responsibility, Trustworthiness, Fairness, Citizenship and Caring.

Positive Referrals are earned when students go above and beyond consistently by displaying Kid for Character qualities.

At times, students do not display these traits and when poor choices are made, they may result in suspension out of school. The data we have gathered from the 2011-2012 school year is listed below.

# of Positive Referrals	Month	# of Discipline Referrals	Average Discipline Referrals per day	# School Days
1	August	9	0.56	16
3	Sept	24	1.2	20
34	Oct	30	1.5	20
10	Nov	25	1.39	18
6	Dec	13	0.93	14
6	Jan	17	1.06	16
22	Feb	31	1.55	20
10	March	17	1	17
10	April	15	0.7	20
16	May	10	0.53	19
118	TOTALS	191	1.042	180
		Total Referrals per 100 students		32.7
		Total Student Enrollment		639 in October ... 634 in February

