# Brevard County Public Schools
# School Improvement Plan
# 2012-2013

**Name of School:**                                                    **Area:**

South

Columbia Elementary

**Principal:**                                          **Area Superintendent:**

Dr.  Mark Mullins

Linda Jennings

**SAC Chairperson:**

Sherry Paleta

## Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

**Mission Statement:**

To nurture and facilitate the emotional, academic,

and social potential of all our students through

encouragement, high expectations, and positive

example.  We will develop creative and critical thinkers

who take from our instruction a life long love of learning

and who exemplify model citizens.

**Vision Statement:**

Columbia's vision is to provide a safe and stable environment that will enable all students to thrive intellectually, physically, and emotionally.  We strive to provide an atmosphere that will help mold our students to become well rounded citizens who encompass pride and respect for themselves and for their community.

## RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

One place to start – three year trend history (optional):

Columbia Elementary in the past 11 years has earned an A. For the 2011-2012 our school grade was a B.  Our school grade points have decreased from 2010 to 2012 from 613 to 495. 2011 we saw a slight drop from 613 – 603 and AYP status was earned last year. However, in 2012 we saw our largest drop in points from 603 to 495 in points therefore earning a school grade of a B.

The main factor contributing to our decreased performance was the change in the FCAT 2.0 cut scores.  Another factor could be the change in the school population due to boundary changes and the closing of Palm Bay Community Charter School.  Our School Demographics have changed steadily over the past 3 years.  The free and reduced rate has increased.  In 2009 – 2010 it was 71%, 2010 – 2011 – 77%, and for the 2011- 2012 we are estimated at 78%.

In June 2012 our Leadership team attended a charge session with Dr. Max Thompson, author of <u>Moving Schools: Lessons From Exemplary Leaders.</u> We came to the realization that we need to collaborate with Columbia's faculty to revisit our instructional strategies.  His research shows that "the more Free/ Reduced lunch students in a school, the fewer options each

teacher has in their classrooms" due to the fact that Reading Blocks in each class throughout the school are consistent. Because of this, teachers have less flexibility to change what happens in their blocks. There were 15 common patterns of Exemplary Leadership that moved Former Struggling Schools to Exemplary. Some examples were, but not limited to: class and homework assignments are aligned to state standards, assessments incorporated higher order questions; schools chose 2 – 3 high yield instructional practices to implement while carrying over the previous year's; all school –wide professional development activities were consistently implemented with a focus on quality and learning expectations.

After analyzing Columbia's assessments for the past 3 years (i.e.; FCAT, FAIR, District Assessments, etc), we came to the conclusion we must modify our instructional strategies as a school, to those that are proven to be most effective through research. In past years we have implemented BEST Strategies through professional development, Thinking Maps, Singapore Math, Book Studies, Marzano, and PLC's. Now with the adoption of Common Core State Standards, grades K-2 needs to fully implement the standards this school year with grades 3 – 6, having a blended curriculum until 2014 -2015 school year, when the CCSS will be fully implemented in those grade levels. Last year, we have established a K-2 launch team in ELA and math CCSS. This past summer, Columbia's Leadership team attended the CCSS summer institute in Orlando by the FDOE.

This school year, we need to "unpack the standards" as a faculty for greater understanding in order to implement them with fidelity.

Our weekly faculty meetings will be restructured on a rotational basis that will include professional development in CCSS, PLC's, collaborative groups/vertical teaming, and school-based meetings. Our belief is that the use of modified research based instructional strategies will raise our student achievement levels as we move toward a better understanding of the Common Core State Standards.

## READING:

Proficient (Level 3 or higher) School Wide:

2010-86%, 2011-84%, 2012-55%

Learning Gains School Wide:

2010-70%, 2011-72%, 2012-63%

Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% School Wide:

2010- 66 %, 2011-70%, 2012-68%

## MATH:

Proficient (Level 3 or higher) School Wide:

2010-79%, 2011-81%, 2012-47%

Learning Gains School Wide:

2010-78%, 2011-70%, 2012-59%

Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% School Wide:

2010-80%, 2011-71%, 2012-59%

## SCIENCE:

Proficient (Level 3 or higher) School Wide:

2010-61%, 2011-57%, 2012-42%

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

Columbia Elementary currently has a Walk to Intervention model in place where all students are serviced as identified by their individual needs (evidence based intervention practices and enrichment) for 30 minutes a day.  We will continue to utilize Success Maker where students work at their own level for 30 minutes a day in Reading and Math. Success Maker results will be monitored frequently and the schedules will be adjusted as needed.  We also utilize the district core curriculum, and individualized instruction through flexible small group strategy based instruction.  We started RTI a few years ago having bimonthly meetings where teachers analyze and compare student data on staff developed monitoring sheets, implement appropriate strategies, and progress monitor at appropriate intervals.

Over the past two years, Columbia has completed B.E.S.T Modules 1 – 6 training and classroom teachers have been incorporating strategies learned into daily instruction across all content areas.

Teachers also meet collaboratively to work on their PLC's by focusing on their lowest 25 – 30 % in both reading and math.  By scheduling regular PLC meetings, teachers are provided an opportunity to work together to create common assessments, curriculum pacing data analysis, and eventually effective vertical team planning across grade levels.

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

Research by Max Thompson states "65 – 80% of classroom assessments and school/district benchmark assessments were higher order questions, thus matching or exceeding state assessments.  Schools established a baseline for higher order questions and tracked percentage changes each month continuously during the year."  Therefore, as a matter of Best Practices, Columbia has chosen to infuse higher order questioning into the daily instruction. We will incorporate 50% of non fictional text in the reading block in all grade levels. This will require student written response to text.

In addition as Marzano states, "Research also shows that questions are an important aspect of higher order thinking and questioning.  By providing students with questions it requires them to elaborate on information they have experienced."  Marzano also states that, "advance organizers are well-researched types of preview techniques that help students think about content they encounter in a critical-input experience."  Columbia is a
Thinking Map school and as part of BEST Practice, teachers will incorporate Thinking Maps and various other advanced organizers in their daily instruction.

## CONTENT AREA:

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

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

> Columbia's faculty and staff will incorporate informational text with written response bi-weekly to challenge student higher order of questioning in order to increase student achievement.

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

| Barrier | Action Steps | Person Responsible | Timetable | Budget | In-Process Measure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Teacher Buy In | 1. Build team relationships by continuing grade level PLCs to promote collaboration among teachers. | Principal, Asst. Principal | August 2012 – May 2013 | | PLC sign ins |
| 2. Time Constraints Scheduling | 2. Develop schedules that assure bell-to-bell instruction | Principal Asst. Principal | August 2012 – May 2013 | | Classroom walk thrus, Teacher observations. |
| 3. Lack of Knowledge and practice with asking higher order questions. | 3. Implement w/ fidelity appropriate instruction to promote higher order questioning skills at all levels of instruction across all content areas. | Principal Asst. Principal, Leadership Team, Launch Teams (CCSS), Reading Coach District Personal | August 2012 – May 2013 | | Classroom Walk thrus, Peer teacher observations, Peer modeling. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.<br>Quality Resources available for CCSS instruction | 4. Increase the usage of CPALMS for lesson plans and resources. Beyond leveled reader, National Geographic Readers, Time for Kids FCAT Edition. Incorporate Science/ Social Studies text and leveled readers into the 90 minute block. | Reading Coach, Classroom teachers, Asst. Principal Media Specialist | August 2012 – May 2013 | | Classroom walk thrus, Formative Assessments |
| 5.<br>Lack of Materials | 5a.<br>Utilize Media dollars for purchasing nonfiction books.<br><br>Teachers can check them out in the media center. | Classroom teachers Media Specialist | October 2012 – May 2013 | $4,500 | Formative assessments, Thinking Maps Student projects Student performance tasks. |
| | 5b. Purchase Daily Science books for every teacher, and Sciencesaurus A Student Handbook. | Classroom teachers Leadership team | October 2012 – May 2013 | $1,500 | Formative assessments Student projects Student performance tasks. |

## EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

The successful implementation of Columbia's School

Improvement Plan will show that 85% of classroom teachers

have implemented nonfictional information text including higher

| | **Page** 9 | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

order questioning as documented in lesson plans and classroom walk thrus.

Columbia will survey its teachers with the goal of 100% of the teachers agreeing with the fact that higher order questioning and increased nonfictional text should increase student achievement on district assessments.

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

Qualitative achievement would include student surveys. Student work samples will show students mastery of the standards by generating higher order questions.

Quantitative achievement expectations would include an increase of 25% in student grade level achievement on district level assessments that include DRLA, and math benchmarks. In 2011-2012 50% of Columbia's student score satisfactorily on the reading section of FCAT 2.0.  In 2012 – 2013 Columbia would like to increase the percentage to 67%.

# APPENDIX A

## (ALL SCHOOLS)

| Reading Goal | 2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students) | 2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students) |
|---|---|---|
| **Anticipated Barrier(s):**<br>**1.** | | |
| **Strategy(s):**<br>**1.** | | |
| **FCAT 2.0**<br>Students scoring at Achievement Level 3<br><br>**Barrier(s):**<br>1. **Teacher Knowledge**<br>2. **Time for remediation**<br>3. **Lack of nonfiction resources**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. **Employ Academic Support Teacher**<br>2. **Push-in ESOL teacher, Resource Teacher, Speech/Language Pathologists**<br>3. **Purchase additional nonfictional text at various levels through fund raising efforts**<br>4. **Professional development (Higher Order Questioning)**<br>5. **Thinking Maps**<br>6. **Focus Walls** | 27% = 104 | 35% = 133 |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading<br><br>**Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br><br>**1.** | N/A | N/A |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **FCAT 2.0**<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>1. **Time**<br>2. **Lack of nonfiction resources**<br>3. **Teacher knowledge**<br><br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. **Employ Academic Support Teacher**<br>2. **Push-in ESOL teacher, Resource teacher, Speech/Language Pathologists**<br>3. **Purchase additional nonfictional text at various levels through fund raising efforts**<br>4. **Professional Development (Higher Order Questioning)**<br>5. **Thinking Maps**<br>6. **Focus Walls** | 26% = 100 | 35%= 109 |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading<br><br>**Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. | N/A | N/A |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading<br><br>**Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. | N/A | N/A |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **FCAT 2.0**<br>Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading<br><br>**Barrier(s):**<br>1. **Teacher knowledge**<br>2. **Time for remediation**<br>3. **Lack of nonfictional resources**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. **Employ Academic Support Teacher**<br>2. **Push-in ESOL teacher, Resource teacher, Speech and Language Pathologists**<br>3. **Purchase nonfictional text, in various levels, through fund raising efforts**<br>4. **Professional development (Higher Order Questioning)**<br>5. **Thinking Maps**<br>6. **Focus Walls**<br>7. **Barton (tier 3 students)**<br>8. **Phonics Lesson Library**<br><br>**Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading<br>**Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. | 70% = 66 | 76% = 72 |
| **Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:**<br><br><br>**Baseline data 2010-11:** | 60% | 67% |
| **Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :**<br><br><br>White:<br><br>Black:<br><br>Hispanic:<br><br>Asian:<br><br>American Indian: | Enter numerical data for current level of performance<br><br>58%<br><br>52%<br><br>48%<br>N/A<br>N/A | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance<br><br>70%<br><br>58%<br><br>57%<br>N/A<br>N/A |
| **English Language Learners** (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>1. **Language – Percentage of our parents do not read or write fluently in English.**<br>2. **Large ELL population (not just Spanish)**<br>3. **Parents may not speak English.**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. **To implement The Rourke Reading Web Program for ELL students.**<br>2. **Provide more one-on-one and small group assistance pull-out groups.**<br>3. **All ESOL staff will be providing push-in service aid with mastery and/or comprehension of content vocabulary and concepts during instruction in the classroom.**<br>4. **Columbia purchased "Learning Today" for ELL students only. It can be used at home or school.** | 69% = 22 | 64%= 20 (2) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Students with Disabilities** (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>1. **A percentage of our SWD students are also ESOL students**<br>2. **Difficulty of Curriculum**<br>3. **Need for consistent teaching techniques and strategies**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. **Triumphs for Reading**<br>2. **Small groups for grades K – 6**<br>3. **BEST strategies applied**<br>4. **Comprehension tool kit – grades 3 – 6** | 62% = 73 | 60% = 43 |
| **Economically Disadvantaged** Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>1. **Transfer/moving around**<br>2. **Inconsistent parenting from parents to grandparents**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. **Success Maker**<br>2. **WTI Instruction** | 50% = 149 | 40% = 119 |

# Reading Professional Development

| PD Content/Topic/Focus | Target Dates/<br>Schedule | Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring |
|---|---|---|
| Focus Walls | August 30, 2012 | Classroom walk-through |
| Higher Order Questioning | October 4, 11, 2012 | Observations/Classroom walk-through |
| Success Maker | October 1, 2012 | Success Maker reports |
| Kid's College | September 20, 2012 | Kid's College reports |
| Thinking Maps | October 10, 2012 | Observations/classroom walk through |
| | | |

| CELLA GOAL<br>To increase our percentage of students scoring proficient on Cella by 5%. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person/Process/ Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:**<br><br>72% | 1. A percentage of our ELL parents do not read, write, or speak English fluently. | **1. To implement The Rourke Reading Web Program for ELL students.** | Asst. Principal ESOL Staff |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:**<br><br>31% | 1. A percentage of our ELL parents do not read, write, or speak English fluently. | **1. To implement The Rourke Reading Web Program for ELL students. 2. Columbia purchased Learning Today for ELL students only. It can be used at home or school.** | Asst. Principal ESOL Staff |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**:<br><br>17% | 1. A percentage of our ELL parents do not read, write, or speak English fluently. | **1. To implement The Rourke Reading Web Program for ELL students.** | Asst. Principal ESOL Staff |

| Mathematics Goal(s):<br>1. Columbia Elementary students who are proficient in Math Level 3 will increase from 27% to 32% on the 2013 FCAT. | 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):**<br>**1.Time**<br>**2.Teacher Knowledge** | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Strategy(s):**<br>**1.** **Increase amount of time in Success Maker Lab with Math focus**<br>**2.** **Incorporate Math Class to the Activity Wheel to remediate and enhance instruction along with collaboration with the classroom teachers for pacing and focus purposes**<br>**3. Track student progress to determine if schedules need to be modified through Monthly Ongoing Progress Monitoring**<br>**4. Provide Professional Development on Math Strategies** | | |
| **FCAT 2.0**<br>Students scoring at Achievement Level 3<br>**Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1 | **27% = 100** | **32% = 119** |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics<br>**Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| **FCAT 2.0**<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics<br>**Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. | **19% = 71** | **24% = 90** |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics<br>**Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics<br>**Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| **FCAT 2.0**<br>Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics<br>**Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. | **63% = 66** | **70% = 73** |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics<br>**Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. | N/A | N/A |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs).** In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline Data 2010-11:** | 57% | 64% |
| **Student subgroups by ethnicity :** | | |
| White: | 49% | 70% |
| Black: | 40% | 54% |
| Hispanic: | 49% | 60% |
| Asian: | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian: | N/A | N/A |
| **English Language Learners** (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics | 82% = 23 | 75%=(21) 2 |
| **Students with Disabilities** (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics | 67% = 77 | 57% =(66) 11 |
| **Economically Disadvantaged** Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics | 59% = 173 | 49% =(144) 29 |

## Mathematics Professional Development

| PD Content/Topic/Focus | Target Dates/ Schedule | Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring |
|---|---|---|
| Singapore Math | October 16/17th | 1.Discussion at Grade level meetings<br>2. Walk Throughs |
| Math Jeopardy | September 27th/ every other month during math activity | 1. Math activity teacher<br>2. Open discussion at faculty and grade level meetings |
| Kid's College | September 20th | 1. Done in classroom, math activity, and/or computer lab |
| Rhymes and Times | September – February | 1.  Done in classroom or math activity. |

| Writing | 2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) | 2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) |
|---|---|---|
| **Barrier(s):**<br>**1.** Increased focus on grammar and conventions in scoring procedures.<br>2. Teachers are given a new district created document without training<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>**1.** Use district created document to enhance grammar instruction, purchase consumable grammar workbooks<br>**2.** Train teachers to use the new document, *Developing Sentence Imitation* | | |
| **FCAT:** Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing | 88%(87) | 90%(75) |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing | N/A | N/A |

| Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) 1. To raise our scores from 42% to 54%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) | 2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) |
|---|---|---|
| **Barrier(s):** 1. **Time for collaboration** 2. **Science Vocabulary** **Strategy(s):** 1. **Remediate through an After School Program for Science.** 2. **Apply Daily Science checkups with Thinking Maps linking it with the State Standards.** 3. **Brain Pop** | | |
| **FCAT 2.0** Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science**:** | 42% (42) | 54%(54) |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science | N/A | N/A |
| **FCAT 2.0** Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science: | N/A | N/A |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading | N/A | N/A |

| Science Goal(s)<br>(High School) | 2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) | 2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) |
|---|---|---|
| **Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. | | |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science | | |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science | | |
| Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>**White:**<br><br>**Black:**<br><br>**Hispanic:**<br><br>**Asian:**<br><br>**American Indian**: | | |
| **English Language Learners (ELL)** not making satisfactory progress in Algebra | | |
| **Students with Disabilities (SWD)** not making satisfactory progress in Algebra | | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra | | |
|---|---|---|

# APPENDIX B

## (SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

| Algebra 1 EOC Goal | 2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) | 2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) |
|---|---|---|
| **Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>**1.** | | |
| Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra**:** | | |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra: | | |

| 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 (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>**White:**<br><br>**Black:**<br><br>**Hispanic:** | | |
| **English Language Learners (ELL)** not making satisfactory progress in Algebra | | |
| **Students with Disabilities (SWD)** not making satisfactory progress in Algebra | | |
| **Economically Disadvantaged Students** not making satisfactory progress in Algebra | | |

| **Geometry EOC Goal** | **2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)** | **2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)** |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. | | |
| Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry**:** | | |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry: | | |
| **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 (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>**White:**<br><br>**Black:**<br><br>**Hispanic:** | | |
| **English Language Learners (ELL)** not making satisfactory progress in Geometry | | |
| **Students with Disabilities (SWD)** not making satisfactory progress in Geometry | | |
| **Economically Disadvantaged Students** not making satisfactory progress in Geometry | | |

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

| Civics EOC | 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) |
|---|---|---|
| Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Civics: | | |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics: | | |

| U.S. History EOC | 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) |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in U. S. History**:** | | |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History: | | |

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

| Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s) | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person/Process/Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:<br><br>**Goal 1:**<br><br>**Goal 2:** | | | |

| Additional Goal(s) | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person/Process/Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:<br><br>**Goal 1:**<br><br>**Goal 2**: | | | |

# APPENDIX C

## (TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

### Highly Effective Teachers

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

| Descriptions of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Provide quality staff development opportunities | Principal and Asst. Principal | On-going |
| 2. Schedule biweekly peer to peer time to discuss areas of improvement, and strategies. | Principal | On-going |
| 3. Maintain grade level PLCs that allow teachers to learn from peers and work collaboratively on summative assessments and applying BEST strategies. | Principal and  Asst. Principal | On-going |
| 4. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal/Asst. Principal | Principal and Asst. Principal | On-going |
| 5.  Partner new teachers with CET certified mentor teachers | Principal and Asst. Principal | On-going |

### 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 paraprofessionals 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 |
|---|---|
| NONE | NONE |

*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 it role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

**The MTSS leadership team consists of; Guidance Counselor, Staffing Specialist, Literacy Coach, Principal, School Psychologist, and the Exceptional Education Resource Teacher.**

**The RTI focuses on student success. The goal is to facilitate grouping of students and support the implementation of the Walk to Intervention model with research-based interventions. The key component will be the team's on-going monitoring of the students in tiers 1, 2, and 3.**

**One of the RTI's functions is to look at the identified students who need intervention, provide interventions to resolve the learning deficit, monitor the interventions for progress and to ensure fidelity, evaluate the need for intervention changes and finally connect the results and data for special education referrals and eligibility requirements. Many sources of data are used to accomplish this such as: A3, FAIR, PASI/PSI, running records, and SRI. In addition, the MTSS leadership team is scheduled to meet monthly to assess the "health" of the tier 1 core reading program. During this time data from A3 will be examined.**

**Training for RTI will occur with staff on tier identification and interventions, progress monitoring strategies and tools, and differentiation through grade level and faculty meetings as well as PLC groups. New teachers to the school that were not initially trained last year will be trained and monitored by a teacher mentor.**

| |
|---|
| PARENT INVOLVEMENT: |
| Columbia offered 8 parenting events during the 2011 – 2012 school year, to support and educate parents in areas of school information, reading, math, science, and writing.  Our Title I Annual Meeting/Open House was attended by the most parents at 398.  Our least attended was an information night on Bullying and internet safety with 3 participants. (This had been a parent requested workshop from the District Client Survey).  Columbia uses the Title I parent annual survey, event feedback and SAC member input to choose topics and design parent events. |

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:
Columbia offered 8 parenting events during the 2011 – 2012 school year, to support and educate parents in areas of school information, reading, math, science, and writing.  Our Title I Annual Meeting/Open House was attended by the most parents at 398.  Our least attended was an information night on Bullying and internet safety with 3 participants. (This had been a parent requested workshop from the District Client Survey).  Columbia uses the Title I parent annual survey, event feedback and SAC member input to choose topics and design parent events.

5 parent events are planned for 2012 – 2013.  This includes Parenting Partners that is a 7 class course which is researched based.  It is based on the 40 Assets and is designed to help parents raise successful children.

For Professional Development, a district Title I facilitator will train teachers, grade pre-k through 6 on the ways to effectively communicate with parents.  Teachers will also be encouraged to use the expanded professional library to help strengthen the relationship between parent and teacher.

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

Columbia's attendance rate for 2010/2011 was 94.89%, and 2011/2012 was 94.33%.  Our absences and tardies were high.  Although our tardies have gone up steadily, we are working to provide incentives such as the HOT award (Here On Time) every 9 weeks for the children.   In addition with excessive tardies, letters will be sent by their teachers informing them that their child has numerous tardies. We want to ensure that we keep attendance high, absences, and tardies low, so that all students are receiving essential time in the classroom which enables them to keep up with instruction, peer interaction time, and assignments.
Our goal for attendance is to achieve 95%.

**SUSPENSION:**
Our suspension for the 2011 – 2012 was 34 out of 68 days.

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

N/A

**POSTSECONDARY READINESS**: (How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?  Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.)
**N/A**