

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Camelot Elementary	District Name: Orange
Principal: Curry Aldridge	Superintendent: Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Luis Sosa	Date of School Board Approval: January 29 th , 2013

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](#)

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

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	Principal	BA, General Studies with Teacher Certification; MA, Educational Leadership/School Principal, Educational Leadership, Elem. 1-6, English 5-9, Media Specialist, ESOL K-12, Reading Endorsement.	1	5	Two years at district office in administrative non-school based role. Two years at Timber Creek High School as assistant principal. School year 2009-10 : school grade of A, 100% AYP, reading proficiency 62%, math proficiency 88%, science proficiency 54%, writing proficiency 91%, learning gains in reading 61%, learning gains in math 79%, lowest 25% in reading 52%, lowest 25% in math 67%. School year 2010-11 : school grade of B, 82% AYP, reading proficiency 64%, math proficiency 90%, science proficiency 56%, writing proficiency 90%, learning gains in reading 56%, learning gains in math 78%, lowest 25% in reading 43%, lowest 25% in math 68%. 2011-12 school grade of A, reading proficiency 67%, math proficiency 66%, science proficiency 47%, writing proficiency 90%, learning gains in reading 78%, learning gains in math 66%, lowest 25% in reading 81%, lowest 61% in math
Assistant Principal	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	Jennifer Vaccaro	BS Elem. Ed, 1993 Auburn University MS Reading, 2006 Walden University Elementary Ed 1-6, Primary Ed K-3, ESOL, Certification	11	6	<p>2006-2007 Grade A, Reading Mastery: 82%, Math Mastery: 81%, Writing Mastery: 90%, Science Mastery: 45%, Learning Gains Reading 73%, Learning Gains Math 67%, Lowest 25% Reading 76%, Lowest 25% Math 67%, AYP 92%, Hispanic and ELL students did not make AYP in Reading and Hispanic students did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2007-2008 Grade A, Reading Mastery: 82%, Math Mastery: 78%, Writing Mastery: 84% Science Mastery: 52%, Learning Gains Reading 72%, Learning Gains Math 75%, Lowest 25% Reading 63%, Lowest 25% Math 65%, AYP 90%, ELL students did not make AYP in Reading and Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and ELL students did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2008-2009 Grade A, Reading Mastery: 83%, Math Mastery: 76%, Writing Mastery: 90%, Science Mastery: 56%, Learning Gains Reading 70%, Learning Gains Math 62%, Lowest 25% Reading 66%, Lowest 25% Math 76%, AYP 100%.</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade B, Reading Mastery: 77%, Math Mastery: 73%, Writing Mastery: 85%, Science Mastery: 36%, Learning Gains Reading 66%, Learning Gains Math 61%, Lowest 25% Reading 49%, Lowest 25% Math 67%, AYP 82%, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL and Hispanic students did not make AYP in Math or Reading and the Total Group did not meet AYP in Math.</p> <p>2010-2011 Grade A, Reading Mastery: 83%, Math Mastery: 85%, Writing Mastery: 92%, Science Mastery: 64%, Learning Gains Reading 65%, Learning Gains Math 78%, Lowest 25% Reading 58%, Lowest 25% Math 83%, AYP 95%, Black students did not meet AYP in Reading or Math.</p> <p>2011-12 school grade of A, reading proficiency 67%, math proficiency 66%, science proficiency 47%, writing proficiency 90%, learning gains in reading 78%, learning</p>

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

					gains in math 66%, lowest 25% in reading 81%, lowest 61% in math
Dean	Regina Hagans	BA Psychology, 2001 University of Central Florida MA Elementary Ed., 2004 University of Central Florida Elementary Ed K-6 certification ESOL Endorsed	6	3	2009-2010 Grade B, Reading Mastery: 77%, Math Mastery: 73%, Writing Mastery: 85%, Science Mastery: 36%, Learning Gains Reading 66%, Learning Gains Math 61%, Lowest 25% Reading 49%, Lowest 25% Math 67%, AYP 82%, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL and Hispanic students did not make AYP in Math or Reading and the Total Group did not meet AYP in Math. 2010-2011 Grade A, Reading Mastery: 83%, Math Mastery: 85%, Writing Mastery: 92%, Science Mastery: 64%, Learning Gains Reading 65%, Learning Gains Math 78%, Lowest 25% Reading 58%, Lowest 25% Math 83%, AYP 95%, Black students did not meet AYP in Reading or Math. 2011-12 school grade of A, reading proficiency 67%, math proficiency 66%, science proficiency 47%, writing proficiency 90%, learning gains in reading 78%, learning gains in math 66%, lowest 25% in reading 81%, lowest 61% in math

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. Mentoring	Jennifer Vaccaro	ongoing
2. Work with district's certification department to ensure that candidates are highly qualified before hiring as well as retain our current teachers who are highly effective.	Curry Aldridge	ongoing
3. Continue to network with UCF to promote placement of interns at Camelot.	Jennifer Vaccaro/Curry Aldridge	ongoing
4.		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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 either Effective or Highly Effective	All Teachers are either Effective or Highly Effective
All Paraprofessionals are Effective or Highly Effective	All Paraprofessionals are Effective or 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
42	2% (1)	36% (15)	43% (18)	19% (8)	48% (20)	100% (42)	4% (2)	0% (0)	79% (33)

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
Joan Green	Megan Dickinson	First Year Teacher	Weekly meetings with mentor and observation/meetings as necessary from instructional coach
Kathy Martini	Danielle Rossetti	Second Year Teacher	Weekly meetings with mentor and observation/meetings as necessary from instructional coach

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 N/A
Title I, Part C- Migrant N/A
Title I, Part D N/A
Title II N/A
Title III N/A
Title X- Homeless N/A
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) N/A
Violence Prevention Programs N/A
Nutrition Programs N/A
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start N/A
Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education N/A
Job Training N/A
Other N/A

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
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Curry Aldridge, Principal, provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making and ensures that the school based team is implementing RtI. Jennifer Vaccaro, CRT, designs and implements training on the implementation of progress monitoring, data collection and data analysis and assists with early interventions for students. Regina Hagans, Compliance Teacher/Reading Resource, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with teachers to identify appropriate intervention strategies, provides services and expertise on interventions for individual students. Leigh Ann Thomes, School Psychologist, participates in collection, interpretation and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation. Erin Martin, ESE teacher, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with teachers to identify appropriate intervention strategies. Heather Bielski, Behavior Specialist, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with teachers to identify appropriate intervention strategies, provides training and support to teachers. Valerie Fluhr, Speech and Language Pathologist, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with teachers to identify appropriate intervention strategies. Beth Marincov, staffing specialist, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with teachers to identify appropriate intervention strategies, provides training and support to teachers.</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? Teachers identify at risk students based on classroom performance and assessment data. RtI team (includes teachers who work with the students) meets to discuss appropriate interventions and strategies to address identified needs. The team decides who will provide the intervention, and progress monitoring duties. The RtI team meets at least once a month to discuss at risk students and their progress towards individual goals.</p>
<p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? RtI Leadership Team meets to discuss strategies for meeting AYP and improving student performance across all categories. Some RtI team members are also members of the SAC committee and give input for the SIP.</p>
MTSS Implementation
<p>Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Tier 1 data is collected by the classroom teacher and recorded on a grade level specific data sheet. Tier 2 and 3 problem solving data is collected and recorded on the school's RtI checklist and the OCPS Response to Intervention Progress Monitoring Plan instrument. Individual student progress monitoring in Tier 2 and 3 is charted on assessment data graph by either the classroom teacher, intervention teacher, or ESE teacher depending on who is providing the intervention</p>
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Camelot began training teachers in RtI six years ago. We have provided ongoing training each year to our seasoned staff, and intense training and mentoring for our new staff members. This year the RtI Leadership Team created an RtI Procedure Binders for each grade level. The binder has all of the grade level data and checklist for how to follow all RtI procedures. Grade levels were trained on how to use the data and binder during individual data meetings.</p>
<p>Describe the plan to support MTSS. Continue to monitor MTSS and provide PD, as needed, to ensure high quality implementation.</p>

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Curry Aldridge, Principal; Jennifer Vaccaro, CRT; Regina Hagans, Dean/Compliance Teacher; Erin Martin, ESE Teacher; Heather Bielski, Behavior Specialist, Beth Marincov, Staffing Specialist
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The team will meet every-other month to focus on all six areas of the reading process. After reviewing data the team will provide support, ideas and motivation for reading throughout the school. Based on school reading trends in the data, the team will make recommendations for interventions or new programs to put in place.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The major initiatives this year will be to assist with the implementation of the newest Reading Curriculum for all Level 1 and 2 students using FCAT scores from the previous year. We will also support the creation and implementation of Family Reading Night and FCAT Night.

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

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

****Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition***

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

N/A

****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?

N/A

****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?

N/A

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?

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#).

N/A

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. Inconsistent progress monitoring	1A.1. Grade levels will analyze data on a regular basis to drive instruction. Provide Walk to Intervention for all Tier 2 and 3 students and meet with RtI Team monthly to analyze student data. Provide Professional Development on monitoring student progress and graphing accordingly.	1A.1. Principal, Leadership Team, PLC, RtI Team, Classroom teachers	1A.1. Analyze progress monitoring forms and graphs by RtI team twice a month.	1A.1. FAIR, Benchmark Assessment Curriculum Assessment, FCAT, STAR, Florida Ready, Florida Achieves
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students in reading decreased by 16%. However, with the retrofitted score, we increased by 1%. 2010-2011 (83%) 2011-2012 (67%) The strands that still need improvement for proficiency are: Grade 3: Vocabulary/Informational text/Research process Grade 4: Vocabulary/Informational text/Research process Grade 5: Vocabulary/Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction	26% (70 students) scored a level 3 in reading in grades 3-5	We expect to increase to 29% in grades 3-5	1A.2. Inconsistent implementation of the core curriculum and need for differentiated instruction.	1A.2. Focus on fidelity of core curriculum which includes differentiated instruction with small groups and centers. Teachers new to Camelot will attend Houghton Mifflin Training. Foresight Assessment will be given in October and February to grades 3-5. Professional Development will be provided to the staff following results in order to drive instruction.	1A.2. Principal, Leadership Team, Classroom teachers	1A.2. Classroom walkthroughs, observations, analyzing reading assessment data	1A.2. FAIR, Benchmark Assessment, Classroom Assessments, FCAT, STAR

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1. Inconsistent progress monitoring	1B.1. VE teacher will work with ESE team and RtI team to record and track student growth. Provide Professional Development on monitoring student progress and graphing accordingly.	1B.1. Principal, Leadership Team, ESE Team, RtI Team	1B.1. Analyze student data to monitor growth in monthly data meetings using display boards.	1B.1. Access Points
Reading Goal #1B: 100% (1) of students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment scored a Level 5.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Level 5	Level 6					
			1B.2. Lack of support staff within classroom to provide accommodations.	1B.2. Behavior Specialist and Program Assistant will work in VE classroom to provide needed support and accommodations.	1B.2. Principal, Leadership Team, Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant	1B.2. Analyze student data to monitor growth in monthly data meetings	1B.2. Access Points
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Differentiated instruction geared to motivate students who understand benchmarks in lessons taught.	2A.1. Provide enrichment activities to students within the classroom	2A.1. Principal, Leadership Team, classroom teachers	2A.1. Analyzing reading assessment data, Classroom walkthroughs, and observations	2A.1. FAIR, Benchmark Assessment, STAR, FCAT Explorer, Florida Achieves
<u>Reading Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of students proficient in reading increased by 2%. In 2010-2011 38% scored a level 4 or 5. In 2011-2012 40% scored a level 4 or 5. The strands that still need improvement for proficiency are: Grade 3: Vocabulary/ Informational text/Research process Grade 4: Vocabulary/Informational text/Research process Grade 5: Vocabulary/Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction	40% (107 students) scored a level 4 or 5 in grades 3-5.	We expect to increase to 43% in grades 3-5					
			2A.2. Lack of higher order thinking questions in lessons	2A.2. Incorporate use of Houghton Mifflin Challenge Handbook and Marzano's cooperative learning strategies in classrooms. Form enrichment group of level 4 and 5 students during intervention/enrichment time.	2A.2. Principal, Leadership Team, classroom teachers, PLC	2A.2. Classroom walkthroughs, observations, lesson plan evaluations, monthly data meetings	2A.2. FAIR, Benchmark Assessment, Classroom Assessments, FCAT, STAR, FCAT Explorer, Lesson Plans
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A
<u>Reading Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Insufficient time for independent reading	3A.1. Teachers will schedule sustained silent reading during the day with guided structure provided by the teacher to monitor the use of reading skills.	3A.1. Principal, Classroom Teachers	3A.1. Monitor usage of Accelerated Reader Data to ensure an increase in independent reading. Classroom walkthroughs	3A.1. AR data Classroom Schedules
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
78% of all students taking the FCAT Reading test made annual learning gains. Students will make further gains by 3%.	78% (208 students)	81% (216 students)					
Additional Goal #2 Progress monitor students in K-5 for proficiency in reading by age 9 -increase proficiency level by 3%.			3A.2. Students lack motivation to read independently.	3A.2. Teacher read aloud will be done daily in all classes. Family Curriculum night will be held to encourage reading support at home. Genre of the month will be highlighted to introduce new books to students.	3A.2. Media Specialist, Classroom Teachers, CRT, CT	3A.2. Monitor usage of Accelerated Reader data to ensure an increase in independent reading. Monitor/track attendance at family reading night.	3A.2. AR data, sign in sheet from event.
			3A.3 High number of students below grade level in reading. Students are not on grade level by age 9.	3A.3 Provide extra support during Intervention time	3A.3 Principal, classroom teachers	3A.3 Data meeting discussions	3A.3 Mini Benchmark assessments
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A
<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			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

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
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Differentiated instruction is not being aligned to specific needs of students.	4A.1. Assess students using grade level and below grade level assessments. Match instructional material used during small group and intervention block time to specific needs as identified in assessments. Implement Florida Ready for intervention. Foresight Assessment will be given in October and February to grades 3-5. Professional Development will be provided to the staff following results in order to drive instruction.	4A.1. Principal, Leadership Team, Classroom Teachers	4A.1. Analyze Reading Assessment Data	4A.1. FAIR Benchmark Assessment Curriculum Assessments FCAT STAR FCAT explorer, Florida Achieves
<u>Reading Goal #4A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
81% of the students who make up our lowest 25% made annual learning gains on the FCAT. Students will make further gains by 3%	81% (42 students)	84%					
			4A.2. Students that are not making progress, based on Tier 2 instruction, are not being identified and provided Tier 3 instruction consistently.	4A.2. At PLC/RtI meetings teachers will learn further assessments and instructional tools to use in order to determine additional skills needed in further instruction (Tier 3)	4A.2. Leadership Team, Classroom Teachers	4A.2 Progress Monitoring Data Reviewed regularly at PLC/RtI meetings Analyze reading assessment data	4A.2. FAIR, EDUSOFT, Classroom Assessments, FCAT, STAR, Success Maker Enterprise, FCAT Explorer, selected progress monitoring tools
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A
<u>Reading Goal #4B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 65% of students scored satisfactory in reading		67%	71%	74%	77%	80%	83%
	Reading Goal #5A: In 2012, 67% of students scored satisfactory in Reading. In 2013, we hope to increase to 71% in order to reduce the achievement gap in reading.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	Reading Goal #5B:		5B.1. White: Families misconceptions about school processes and ways to support their children at home. Black: Families misconceptions about school processes and ways to support their children at home. Hispanic: Families misconceptions about school processes and ways to support their children at home. Asian: Families misconceptions about school processes and ways to support their children at home.	5B.1. Schedule Parent Leadership Council meetings to educate parents on strategies and technology components to support their children at home. Provide curriculum based nights along to build capacity and family involvement as well as provide them with resources to use at home.	5B.1 Gina Hagans, CT Curry Aldridge, Principal	5B.1. PLC Feedback Curriculum Night Feedback	5B.1. Sign In Sheets	
	In 2012, 23% of White students were considered not proficient in reading. We hope to decrease this percent by 4%	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> In 2012 the following percentage of students were proficient in their respective subgroups: White: 23% (26 Students) Black: 43% (30 Students) Hispanic: 42% (41 Students) Asian: 8% (2 Students) American Indian: N/A						
In 2012, 43% of Black students were considered not proficient in reading. We hope to decrease this percent by 12% in order to reduce the achievement gap.								
In 2012, 42% of Hispanic students were considered not proficient in reading.								

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

<p>We hope to decrease this percent by 8% in order to reduce the achievement gap.</p> <p>In 2012, 8% of Asian students were considered not proficient in reading. We hope maintain this percentage.</p>			<p>5B.2. Differentiated instruction is not being aligned to specific needs of students.</p>	<p>5B.2. Assess students using grade level and below grade level assessments. Match instructional material used during small group and intervention block time to specific needs as identified in assessments. Implement Florida Ready for intervention. Foresight Assessment will be given in October and February to grades 3-5. Professional Development will be provided to the staff following results in order to drive instruction.</p>	<p>5B.2. Principal, Leadership Team, Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>5B.2. Analyze Reading Assessment Data</p>	<p>5B.2. FAIR Benchmark Assessment Curriculum Assessments FCAT STAR FCAT explorer, Florida Achieves</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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Communication gap between home and school.	5C.1. Provide translations of school/classroom communication to those who need another language: Monthly newsletter, Connect Orange phone messages	5C.1. Identified school personnel with translation abilities, classroom teacher.	5C.1. Parent feedback reports	5C.1. Percentage of parent involvement
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In 2012, 53% of ELL students were considered to be not proficient in reading. In 2013, we hope to decrease this goal by 6%. In order to reduce the achievement gap.	53% (32 students)	47%					
			5C.2. Students that enter our school are not proficient in the areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.	5C.2. Provide vocabulary instruction on a daily basis. Imagine Learning Program will be utilized during RtI time for non- English Speakers.	5C.2. Classroom Teachers, CT, Principal, CRT	5C.2. Iobservation	5C.2. FAIR, CELLA, classroom assessments, RtI graphs
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. Inconsistent progress monitoring	5D.1. VE teacher will work with ESE team and RtI team to record and track student growth. Provide Professional Development on monitoring student progress and graphing accordingly.	5D.1. Principal, Leadership Team, ESE Team, RtI Team	5D.1. Analyze student data to monitor growth in monthly data meetings using display boards.	5D.1. Access Points
<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In 2012, 91% of SWD students were considered to be not proficient in reading. In 2013, we hope to decrease this goal by 19% in order to reduce the achievement gap.	91% (22 students)	72%					
			5D.2. Lack of support staff within classroom to provide accommodations.	5D.2. Behavior Specialist and Program Assistant will work in VE classroom to provide needed support and accommodations.	5D.2. Principal, Leadership Team, Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant	5D.2. Analyze student data to monitor growth in monthly data meetings	5D.2. Access Points
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: In 2012, 49.2% of ED students were considered to be not proficient in reading. In 2013, we hope to decrease this goal by 3%.			5E.1. Limited literacy resources	5E.1. Offer extended hours for the Media Center after school one day a month.	5E.1. Administration Media Specialist	5E.1. Participation in use of AR	5E.1. Circulation Report for Media Center	
			2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
			49.2% (57 students)	46.2%				
			5E.2. Limited use of technology at home	5E.2 Provide use of computers before school.	5E.2. Classroom Teachers	5E.2. Participation in FCAT explorer, Pearson Success Net, Destination Reading, AR	5E.2. AR, FCAT Explorer reports, classroom assessments	
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Houghton Mifflin Training	K-5	District	All New Teachers	Prior to School beginning	Classroom Walk throughs	Leadership Team
Progress Monitoring of Students receiving Tier II & Tier III Interventions	K-5	RtI and Leadership Team	All Instructional Staff	Meetings as necessary	Progress Monitoring Data and Graphing. Progress Monitoring Data and Graphing. PLC Notes and completion of RtI checklists	RtI Resource Team and Administrator
Foresight Assessment Data Review	3-5	3 rd -5 th Teachers, Leadership Team	Grades 3-5	Fall 2012, Winter 2013	To analyze Foresight Data to drive instruction	CRT

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
Family Reading Night	Books, Reading Resources for Parents, certificates	PIE	\$0
AR recognition (each nine weeks)	Books and book marks	Scholastic/PIE	\$0
Foresight Testing	Data Review	SAI Funds	\$ 2133
			Subtotal:\$2133
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Accelerated Reader	Books and Tests	-	
Parent Email Directory	Email Accounts	-	-
			Subtotal:\$0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Review of Common Core Standards/CORE instruction during PLC/RtI Meetings	IMS, Common Core Websites		Review of Common Core Standards/CORE instruction during PLC/RtI Meetings
			Subtotal: \$0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:\$0
			Total: \$2133

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]).

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
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
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: For the 2012-2013 school year, our goal is to have 50.5% of our ELL's score proficient on the listening/speaking section of CELLA	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 47.5% (58 students)	1.1. Students that enter our school from other countries are not proficient in the areas of listening speaking.	1.1. Consistent use of ESOL strategies in classroom.	1.1. Classroom Teachers, CT, Principal, CRT	1.1. Iobservation	1.1. FAIR, CELLA, classroom assessments
		1.2 Students have limited opportunities to practice English	1.2 Imagine Learning Computer Program- Proprietary speech-recognition to help students improve their pronunciation Immersion-based methodology that replicates the strengths of a real-world learning Speech-recognition technology to help students adjust speaking to match native-speaker pronunciation	1.2. Classroom Teachers and Regina Hagans; CT	1.2. Quarterly PLC's	1.2. Standardized and classroom assessments

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

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
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
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1. Students enter our school from other countries and are not proficient in English.	2.1. Imagine Learning Online Program- Carefully sequenced content to introduce new vocabulary and grammar by building upon previous content	2.1. Classroom Teachers, CT, Principal, CRT	2.1. Iobservation	2.1. FAIR, CELLA, classroom assessments
CELLA Goal #2: For the 2012-2013 school year, our goal is to have 28% of our ELL's score proficient on the listening/speaking section of CELLA	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 25% (32 students)					
		2.2 Limited vocabulary Development	2.2 Implement focused strategic vocabulary development plan. (Houghton Mifflin LA Lessons, word wall usage, word of the week, vocabulary notebooks etc.)	2.2 Classroom Teachers, Leadership Team	2.2 Iobservation	2.2 CELLA, classroom assessments
		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
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		3.1. Understanding of English grammar structure	3.1. Explicitly focus on LA/Grammar in scheduled ESOL time.	3.1. Classroom teachers	3.1. Collecting and scoring school wide writing prompts.	3.1. CELLA
<u>CELLA Goal #3:</u>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					
For the 2012-2013 school year, our goal is to have 28% of our ELL's score proficient on the listening/speaking section of CELLA	25% (32 students)	3.2 Limited vocabulary Development	3.2 Implement focused strategic vocabulary development plan. (Houghton Mifflin LA Lessons, word wall usage, word of the week, vocabulary notebooks etc.)	3.2 Classroom Teachers, Leadership Team	3.2 Iobservation	3.2 CELLA, classroom assessments
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

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
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Rosetta Stone Software	Online Program	SAI Funds	\$5500
			Subtotal:\$5500
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:\$0
			Total:\$5500

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]).

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #1A:</p> <p>Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring at a level 3 in mathematics.</p> <p>The percentage of students in math decreased by 19%. 2010-2011 (85%) 2011-2012 (66%)</p> <p>The following clusters/strands were the area of need based on the 2012 FCAT data:</p> <p>3rd: Number Operations -overall 76% score in this cluster out of 100%</p> <p>4th: Geometry and Measurement-overall 75% score in this cluster out of 100%</p>			<p>1A.1. Acclimating to the new core curriculum</p>	<p>1A.1. Implementation of Envision math base Curriculum/training on different components of the core program</p>	<p>1A.1 Principal/Leadership Team</p>	<p>1A.1 Compare FCAT/Benchmark Assessment</p>	<p>1A.1 FCAT Benchmark Assessment</p>
	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>29% (76) of the students scored at a level 3 on the 2012FCAT Math</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>By July 2013, 32% of all students taking the FCAT Math test will score at Level 3.</p>					
			<p>1A.2. Lack of time for mastery</p>	<p>1A.2. Intense Math Small Group Intervention during the school day</p>	<p>1A.2. Leadership Team</p>	<p>1A.2. Progress Monitoring using Envision Assessments and Benchmark Assessment mini Benchmark Assessments</p>	<p>1A.2. Envision Unit Test Benchmark Assessment Benchmark Assessment</p>
			<p>1A.3. Students not fluent in math operations</p>	<p>1A.3. Continue using Kids College and introduce Moby Math to all students K-3 and 4-5.</p>	<p>1A.3. Administration</p>	<p>1A.1. Usage and Performance Reports Progress monitoring of K-5 students using both programs</p>	<p>1A.3. Benchmark Mini Assessments</p>

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

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

<p>5th –Numbers -overall 59% score in this cluster out of 100%</p> <p>Additional Goal #3 Progress monitor struggling students in K-5 for proficiency in math operations- increase proficiency by 3%.</p>							
<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</p>			1B.1 Lack of time for mastery	1B.1 Intense Math Small Group Intervention during the school day	1B.1. Leadership Team	1B.1. Progress Monitoring using Envision Assessments and Benchmark Assessment mini Benchmark Assessments	1B.1. Envision Unit Test Benchmark Assessment Benchmark Assessment
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u></p> <p>In 2013, we hope that our alternate assessment students will increase by one level.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>One third grade student scored a level 4</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>In 2013, we hope that this student will score a level 5.</p>					
			1B.2. Lack of support staff within classroom to provide accommodations.	1B.2. Behavior Specialist and Program Assistant will work in VE classroom to provide needed support and accommodations.	1B.2. Principal, Leadership Team, Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant	1B.2. Analyze student data to monitor growth in monthly data meetings	1B.2. Envision Unit Test Benchmark Assessment Benchmark Assessment
			1B.3	1B.3.	1B.3.	1.B.3	1.B.3

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. There are a number of students performing below grade level.	2A.1. Implement small group and differentiated instruction for math during math block	2A.1. Leadership Team	2A.1. Analyzing growth from Mini-Assessments, PLC's	2A.1. Benchmark Assessment Mini-Assessments Reports
Mathematics Goal #2A: 37% (99/266) of the students scored above grade level on FCAT Math. Our goal is to increase the number of students who are performing above grade level.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 37% (99) of students scored above grade level in math.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013 40% of the students will score above grade level in math.					
			2A2. Lack of time and resources to effectively implement the enrichment components of Envision Math	2A2. School Wide Amazing Race event to expose students to all components of the math benchmarks	2A2. Math Specialist/Teachers	2A2. Analyzing growth from Mini-Assessments, PLC's	2A2. Benchmark Assessment Mini-Assessments Reports
			2 A.3 Lack of time	2 A.3 Implement a Math Club for 4 th and 5 th graders with a focus on problem solving.	2 A.3 Math Specialist/Teachers	2 A.3 Analyzing growth from Mini-Assessments, PLC's	2 A.3 Benchmark Assessment Mini-Assessments Reports
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1. <i>N/A</i>	2B.1. <i>N/A</i>	2B.1. <i>N/A</i>	2B.1. <i>N/A</i>	2B.1. <i>N/A</i>
Mathematics Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			2B.2. <i>N/A</i>	2B.2. <i>N/A</i>	2B.2. <i>N/A</i>	2B.2. <i>N/A</i>	2B.2. <i>N/A</i>
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1 Students will enter at various levels of proficiency many who lack basic math skills	3A.1 Train staff on differentiating instruction so all levels of students needs are being met	3A.1 Curriculum Resource Teacher/Principal/Math Specialist	3A.1. Progress Monitoring using Envision Assessments and Benchmark Assessment mini Benchmark Assessments, PLC's	3A1. Envision Unit Test Benchmark Assessment Benchmark Assessment
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Our goal is to increase the percentage of students who made learning gains.	On the 2012 FCAT there was a 10% decrease in the number of students making leaning gains in math.	By July 2013, 69% of all students taking the FCAT Math test will make learning gains.					
On the 2011 FCAT, there was a 17% increase of the number of students making learning gains in math. On the 2012 FCAT there was a 10% decrease in the number of students making leaning gains in math.	2011-76% learning gains 2012-66% (136 students) learning gains						
			3A.2 Lack of time	3A.2 Implement a Math Club for 4 th and 5 th graders with a focus on problem solving.	3A.2 Math Specialist/Teachers	3A.2 Analyzing growth from Mini-Assessments	3A.2 Benchmark Assessment Mini-Assessments Reports
			3A.3 Lack of strong foundation in basic math skills	3A.3 Additional usage of computer - based math programs Fast Math ,ST Math and Moby Math(2-5)	3A.3 Tech Support	3A.3 Analyzing reports from Fast Math ,ST Math and Moby Math	3A.3 Program Reports.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A

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

Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			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

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
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1 Lack of time for mastery	4A.1 Implement before/after school tutoring for targeted ESOL students using FL Ready Curriculum and Envision Targeted students who are not ESOL will receive small group math instruction in the classroom during school hours	4A.1 Principal and Gina Hagans- CT Principal/Math Specialist	4A.1 Analyzing growth from Mini-Assessments	4A.1 Benchmark Assessment Mini-Assessments Reports
<u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Our goal is to increase the percent of the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. On the 2011 FCAT, 83% (66) of Camelot Elementary's 4th and 5th graders in the lowest quartile showed learning gains. On the 2012 FCAT, 61% (41) of Camelot Elementary's 4th, and 5th graders in the lowest quartile showed learning gains.	2012 FCAT results showed that 61% of the lowest 25% (41) of students taking the FCAT Math test made learning gains, a decrease of 21% from 2011.	By July 2013, 64% of the lowest 25% of students taking the FCAT Math test will make learning gains.					
			4A.2 Lack of strong foundation in basic math skills	4A.2 Additional usage of computer - based math programs Fast Math , Moby Math & ST Math (2-5)	4A.2 Tech Support	4A.2 Analyzing reports from Fast Math, Moby Math and ST Math	4A.2 Program Reports
			4A.3 Lack of Mathematical Vocabulary and basic math skills	4A.3 3 rd , 4 th and 5 th grade will identify and support the lowest 25% in a small group outside of the math block.	4A.3 Classroom Teachers	4A.3 Analyzing reports from Fast Math, Moby Math and ST Math Analyzing growth from Mini-Assessments	4A.3 Program Reports Benchmark Assessment Mini-Assessments Reports
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A

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

Mathematics Goal #4B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 63%	66%	69%	72%	75%	78%	82%
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> In 2012, we had 66% of students who scored proficient in Math. In 2013, we hope to increase to 69% in order to reduce the achievement gap.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5B.1. White: Families misconceptions about school processes and ways to support their children at home. Black: Families misconceptions about school processes and ways to support their children at home. Hispanic: Families misconceptions about school processes and ways to support their children at home. Asian: Families misconceptions about school processes and ways to support their children at home.	5B.1. Schedule Parent Leadership Council meetings to educate parents on strategies and technology components to support their children at home. Provide curriculum based nights along to build capacity and family involvement as well as provide them with resources to use at home.	5B.1 Gina Hagans, CT Curry Aldridge, Principal	5B.1. PLC Feedback Curriculum Night Feedback	5B.1. Sign In Sheets	
<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> In 2012, 21.7% of White students were considered not proficient in math. We hope to decrease this percent by 3% In 2012, 50% of Black students were considered not proficient in math. We hope to decrease this percent by 13% in order to reduce the achievements gap. In 2012, 43.6% of Hispanic students	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> White: 21.7% (23 students) Black: 50% (24 students) Hispanic: 43.6% (41 students) Asian: 21.4% (3 students) American Indian: N/A	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> White: 18.7% Black: 37% Hispanic: 40.6% Asian: 18.4% American Indian: N/A					

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

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

were considered not proficient in math. We hope to decrease this percent by 3% In 2012, 21.4% of Asian students were considered not proficient in math. We hope to decrease this percent by 3%						
		5B.2 Lack of strong foundation in basic math skills	5B.2 Additional usage of computer - based math programs Fast Math ,ST Math and Moby Math(2-5)	5B.2 Tech Support	5B.2 Analyzing reports from Fast Math ,ST Math and Moby Math	5B.2 Program Reports.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Communication gap between home and school.	5C.1. Provide translations of school/classroom communication to those who need another language.	5C.1. Identified school personnel with translation abilities, classroom teacher.	5C.1. Parent feedback reports	5C.1. Percentage of parent involvement
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In 2012, 57% of ELL students were considered to be not proficient in reading. In 2013, we hope to decrease this goal by 12%.	57% (32 students)	45%					
			5C.2. Language proficiency of ELL students	5C.2. Provide opportunities for students to use oral language skills during math problem solving activities.	5C.2. Classroom teachers	5C.2. Progress monitoring	5C.2. Observation
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. Lack of time for mastery	5D.1. Intense Math Small Group Intervention during the school day	5D.1. Leadership Team	5D.1. Progress Monitoring using Envision Assessments and Benchmark Assessment mini Benchmark Assessments	5D.1. Envision Unit Test Benchmark Assessment Benchmark Assessment
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In 2012, 65.4% of SWD students were considered to be not proficient in reading. In 2013, we hope to decrease this goal by 12% in order to reduce the achievement gap.	65% (17 students)	53%					
			5D.2. Lack of support staff within classroom to provide accommodations.	5D.2. Behavior Specialist and Program Assistant will work in VE classroom to provide needed support and accommodations.	5D.2. Principal, Leadership Team, Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant	5D.2. Analyze student data to monitor growth in monthly data meetings	5D.2. Envision Unit Test Benchmark Assessment Benchmark Assessment
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			4A.2 Limited use of technology at home	4A.2 Additional usage of computer - based math programs Fast Math , Moby Math & ST Math offered before school	4A.2 Classroom Teachers	4A.2 Analyzing reports from Fast Math, Moby Math and ST Math	4A.2 Program Reports
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#5E: In 2012, 48.3% of ED students were considered to be not proficient in reading. In 2013, we hope to decrease this goal by 3%.	48.3% (55 students)	45.3%					
			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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. N/A	1A.1. N/A	1A.1. N/A	1A.1. N/A	1A.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #1A: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1A.2. N/A	1A.2. N/A	1A.2. N/A	1A.2. N/A	1A.2. N/A
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #1B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. N/A	2A.1. N/A	2A.1. N/A	2A.1. N/A	2A.1. N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2A: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	N/A	N/A					
			2A.2. N/A	2A.2. N/A	2A.2. N/A	2A.2. N/A	2A.2. N/A
			2A.3. N/A	2A.3. N/A	2A.3. N/A	2A.3. N/A	2A.3. N/A
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2B: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	N/A	N/A					
			2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. N/A	3A.1. N/A	3A.1. N/A	3A.1. N/A	3A.1. N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A.	N/A	N/A					
			3A.2. N/A	3A.2. N/A	3A.2. N/A	3A.2. N/A	3A.2. N/A
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. N/A	4A.1. N/A	4A.1. N/A	4A.1. N/A	4A.1. N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			4A.2. N/A	4A.2. N/A	4A.2. N/A	4A.2. N/A	4A.2. N/A
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A	4B.1. N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal #4B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			4B.2. N/A	4B.2. N/A	4B.2. N/A	4B.2. N/A	4B.2. N/A
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. <u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> N/A	Baseline data 2010-2011		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. <u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1. N/A	5B.1. N/A	5B.1. N/A	5B.1. N/A	
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. N/A	5E.1. N/A	5E.1. N/A	5E.1. N/A	5E.1. N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#5E:	N/A	N/A					
N/A							
			5E.2. N/A	5E.2. N/A	5E.2. N/A	5E.2. N/A	5E.2. N/A
			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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #2: N/A.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			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

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
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #3: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
							3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1. N/A	4.1. N/A	4.1. N/A	4.1. N/A	4.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #4: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
							4.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Algebra 1 Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Algebra Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			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

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
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. <u>Algebra 1 Goal #3A:</u> N/A	Baseline data 2010-2011		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
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	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. <u>Algebra 1 Goal #3B:</u> N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
			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

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
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1. N/A	3C.1. N/A	3C.1. N/A	3C.1. N/A	3C.1. N/A
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.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
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1. N/A	3D.1. N/A	3D.1. N/A	3D.1. N/A	3D.1. N/A
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: N/A.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1. N/A	3E.1. N/A	3E.1. N/A	3E.1. N/A	3E.1. N/A
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Geometry Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Geometry Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Geometry Goal #3A: N/A.	Baseline data 2011-2012		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	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
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box N/A.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A	3B.1. N/A White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A
			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

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
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1. N/A	3C.1. N/A	3C.1. N/A	3C.1. N/A	3C.1. N/A
Geometry Goal #3C: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
							3C.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
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1. N/A	3D.1. N/A	3D.1. N/A	3D.1. N/A	3D.1. N/A
Geometry Goal #3D: N/A.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
							3D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1. N/A	3E.1. N/A	3E.1. N/A	3E.1. N/A	3E.1. N/A
Geometry Goal #3E: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Standards Training	All	Black Belt Team Members	School-wide	Faculty Meetings.	Classroom Observation	Principal
Foresight Assessment Data Review	3 rd , 4 th , 5 th	3 rd , 4 th , 5 th grade teachers, Leadership Team	Grades 3, 4, 5	Fall 2012/Winter 2013	Analyze Foresight Data to drive instruction	Principal or CRT

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
Amazing Race	Teacher Made Materials	N/A	N/A
Curriculum Night	District Materials	N/A	N/A
			Subtotal: \$0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: \$0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: \$0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: \$0
			Total: \$0

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]).

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Science Goal #1A: Proficiency in science decreased by 17% from 2011 to 2012. Approximately 45% (45 students) of our fifth grade students scored a level 3 or above, on the 2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test. The principal and staff will disaggregate science data from FCAT and Write Scores in order to continue to strengthen instruction in science. Our goal is to have 70% of our students score a level 3 or higher in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance: *	2013 Expected Level of Performance: *	Level of competency in science pedagogy.	Grant project - P-Sell Science 5th Grade NYU Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development* Department of Teaching and Learning: Funded by the National Science Foundation. Teachers will receive ongoing professional development through this grant. Teachers will use Write Score data to drive instruction.	Principal, Leadership team, Science Teachers	FCAT scores from 2012 will be compared to scores from 2011 Science Assessment; Fifth Grade Write Score Results for science will also provide a base line for instruction, Monthly meetings with Grade level teams	FCAT, Write Science Score, Student assessment –multiple choice and essay questions – graded by curriculum developers
	In 2012, 30% (29) of our fifth grade students scored a level 3 on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment test.	By 2013, 50% of our fifth grade students will score a level 3 or higher on the 2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test.					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			Loss of our Science Lab & Limited resources in our science resource room.	Grant project - P-SELL Science 5 th Grade NYU Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development * Department of Teaching and Learning: Funded by the National Science Foundation.	Classroom science contracts, and CRT	Teacher Observations, Science Write Score evaluations (3 times a year), lesson rubrics, P-SELL Assessment	FCAT Science, Science Write Score, P-SELL

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

			Teachers will receive ongoing professional development through this grant. Teachers will use Write Score data to drive instruction.			
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.		1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A
<u>Science Goal #1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
N/A	N/A	N/A				
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2a.1 Using NGSSS in conjunction with a text book and incorporating an inquiry approach to science.	2a.1 Provide Professional Development to 5 th grade science teachers on utilizing the science textbook in conjunction with an inquiry approach.	2a.1 Leadership Team and Classroom Teachers	2a.1 Teacher observations.	2a.1 Science directed and guided inquiry labs, Write Score Assessment, P-SELL Assessment
Science Goal #2A: Approximately 15% of our Fifth grade students scored a Level 4 or higher on the 2012 FCAT. We hope to increase this percentage by 3%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In July 2012, 15% (15 students) of our Fifth Grade students scored at a 4 or higher on the 2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test.	2013Expected Level of Performance:* In July of 2013, 20% of our fifth grade students will score a level 4 or higher on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test					
			2a.2. Limited real world scientific experiences	2a.2. Daily use of the Scientific Method with the Scientific Process. Provide after school clubs: Science Olympiad Club and Garden Club after school	2a.2. Selected classroom teachers	2a.2. Attend monthly team member (PLC) meetings to ensure proper usage	2a.2. Sign in sheets and student artifacts
			2A.3	2A.3	2A.3	2A.3	2A.3
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A
Science Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			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

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Science Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Science Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)*

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

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Biology 1 Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Biology 1 Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
P-SELL Grant	5 th Grade	Schesser/Tardugno	5 th Grade students	2012-13	PLC Meetings/Leadership Meetings	Curry Aldridge
Write Score/Benchmark Assessment Data Review	5	5 th grade teachers, CRT	Grade 5	Fall 2012/Winter 2013	Analyze Write Score & Benchmark Science Data to drive instruction	Principal or CRT

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
To implement the NGSSS into daily science lessons	Scotts Foresman Science 2-5, District CIA Science lessons	None needed	\$0.00
Write Score Science	Assessment on test taking strategies with instant and in-depth feedback	School funds (purchased out of 2011-2012 budget)	\$0.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Assist teachers with on line lesson planning and generating on line assessments	Pearson Success Net	A part of adopted science program	Assist teachers with on line lesson planning and generating on line assessments
			Subtotal:

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

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$0

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]).

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Change in DOE scoring procedures with an increased attention to conventions. Rubric will be more challenging.	1A.1. Train staff of the changes for this year. Use Houghton Mifflin grammar skill lessons and OCPS writing/grammar lessons.	1A.1.Principal/ Leadership Team	1A.1. Compare monthly writing prompt scores.	1A.1. School-wide monthly writing prompts.
Writing Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In 2012, 90% (78) of the students attained a level 3.5 or higher on FCAT Writes Exam. Our goal is to increase this by 3%	90% (78)	93% (70)					
			1A.2. No school-wide writing program	1A.2. Develop a school-wide writing program	1A.2. Principal, team leaders	1A.2. Compare monthly writing prompt scores, classroom visits	1A.2. School-wide monthly writing prompts, FCAT writing test 2.0
			1A.3. The difficulty of ELL students to translate Spanish to English with proper English grammar rules applied.	1A.3. Use Houghton Mifflin grammar skill lessons and OCPS writing/grammar lessons in all grade levels.	1A.3. Principal/ Leadership Team	1A.3. Compare monthly writing prompt scores	1A.3. School-wide monthly writing prompts
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A
Writing Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Process	K-5	Tara Zawacki	School Wide	As Needed	Iobservation	Principal, Dean, CRT
Write Traits	K-5	Tara Zawacki	School Wide	As Needed	Iobservation	Principal, Dean, CRT
Write Score Assessment Data Review	4	4 th grade teachers, CRT	Grade 4	After Write Score Assessment is implemented	Analyze Write Score Data to drive instruction	Principal, CRT

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
Write Score	Assessment on test taking strategies with instant and in-depth feedback	General Funds	\$602.23
			Subtotal: \$602.23
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal: \$0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal: \$0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			

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

	Subtotal:
	Total: \$602.23

End of Writing Goals

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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2014-2015)*

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

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Civics Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Civics Goal #2: N/A.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			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

Civics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Civics 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
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Civics Goals

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

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

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

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

U.S. History EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
U.S. History Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
U.S. History Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			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

U.S. History Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

U.S. History 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
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of U.S. History Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Parents not familiar with OCPS truancy policy.	1.1. Add CPS truancy policy to Open House at the beginning of the year. Send letters home to address attendance concerns and or tardiness. -5 day tardy attendance letter -5 day attendance letter tied to truancy -5 day attendance letter -10 day attendance letter	1.1. Registrar, Classroom Teachers	1.1. Reduced number of students tardy or absent.	1.1. Attendance Record Report from OCPS (SMS)
Attendance Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
Camelot would like to decrease the absence and tardy rate by 3% respectively	96 %	99%					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	24% (161)	21%					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	47% (32)	44%					
			1.2. Parents not conforming to attendance policy	1.2. Meetings involving the social worker and state detective.	1.2. Parents not conforming to attendance policy	1.2. Reduced number of students not attending school.	1.2. Attendance Record Report from OCPS (SMS)
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance	K-5	Principal/Social Worker	Parent, Principal, School Social Worker	1 or 2 month depending on the need.	Attendance Meeting Log	Curry Aldridge
Tardiness	K-5	Principal Social Worker	Parent, Principal, School Social Work	1 or 2 month depending on the need.	Attendance Meeting Log	Curry Aldridge

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
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:

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

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

Total: \$0

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension					
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Suspension			1.1. Consistent enforcement of Code of Conduct.	1.1. Review expectations with teachers at the beginning of the year and as needed. Develop school wide discipline plan Each teacher will create and submit their classroom discipline plan. *Quarterly review of the code of conduct with all students*	1.1. Principal, Resource Teachers, Special Area Teachers, Classroom Teachers	1.1. Reduction in number of offenses.	1.1. Number of referrals.	
Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions						
	1% (4)	0%						
Camelot would like to decrease the number of out of school suspensions by 2%.	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School						
		1% (4)						0%
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions						
		3% (17)						1% (6)
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School						
		2% (15)	0-1% (0-6)					
			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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal: \$0
			Total: \$0

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)).

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1. Retention	1.1. Implement year two of Destination College	1.1.Melanie Simmons, Leadership Team	1.1. Decrease Student retention rates in grades 3-5	1.1. Retention
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: Because overage students are more likely to drop out of school, Camelot is committed to preventing retention, whenever possible. In 2011-12, there were a total of 9 students retained in grades K-5. In 2012-2013, there will be 10% fewer students retained.	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*	2011-2012 9 retentions in Grades 3-5.				
	0%	0%					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*	1.2. Students are struggling to read on grade level by age 9	1.2. Provide immediate intensive interventions during RtI time and offer free tutoring before and after school for our ESOL students.	1.2. classroom teachers, RtI Team, Leadership Team	1.2.Increase the amount of students reading on grade level by age 9	1.2. Houghton Mifflin, FAIR, STAR
	N/A	N/A					
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Destination College	Grades 3-5	Melanie Simmons, Tara Zawacki	Grades 3-5 classroom teachers, CRT, CT, principal	Year two, ongoing	Online postings, destination college end of the year binder submitted to Melanie Simmons (OCPS)	Melanie Simmons

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
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$0

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)).

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. Availability of parents to participate in school functions	1.1. Offer opportunities for parental participation on various days of the week and at various times of the day	1.1. Leadership Team	1.1. Number of parents in attendance	1.1. Sign-in Sheet and/or ADDitions online data
Parent Involvement Goal #1: Camelot would like to increase parent participation for all activities.	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					
	60%	65%					
			1.2. Lack of knowledge about school functions	1.2. Utilize Connect-Orange Phone System, use marquee, publish dates and information on Camelot website, Send emails as needed	1.2. Leadership Team	1.2. SAC End of Year Survey; Participation Data collected at Events	1.2. Sign-in Sheet and/or ADDitions online data/SAC Survey
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
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
Reading Strategies (curriculum night)	K-5	Reading Resource	School-wide	September 2011	Teacher/student/Parent feedback	Leadership Team
Writing Strategies (Curriculum Night)	K-5	Teachers	School-wide	September 2011	Teacher/student/Parent feedback	Leadership Team
Math Strategies (Curriculum Night)	K-5	Teachers	School-wide	September 2011	Teacher/student/Parent feedback	Leadership Team

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
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$0

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: All teachers will conduct a quarterly STEM design challenge in math and science.	1.1. Lack of familiarity	1.1. Provide Professional Development on staff development days and have teachers discuss during PLC's/ongoing www.stem.ocps.net	1.1. Leadership Team	1.1. classroom walkthrough and FCAT Math and Science Scores	1.1. Teacher Rubric
	1.2. Lack of time	1.3. Incorporate with Core Benchmarks 1.4. www.stem.ocps.net	1.2. Leadership Team	1.2. FCAT Math and Science Scores	1.2. Teacher Rubric
	1.5.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
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 during staff development and PLC's	K-5	Math Specialist/5 th grade science teachers	All grade levels	monthly	PLC notes	Curry Aldridge

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
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal: \$0
			Total: \$0

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE 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
CTE Goal #1: N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A						
N/A						
N/A						

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
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$0

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)).

Additional 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
1. Additional Goal- Maintain High Fine Arts Enrollment Percentage			1.1 Lack of experience in a Fine Arts Program	1.1. After School Chorus Club (grades 4-5) and Guitar Club (grades 3-5)	1.1. Samuel Ramos-Music Teacher	1.1. The amount of students who join a fine arts club.	1.1. Programs and Shows
Additional Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
In 2012, we did not have a Music Program. In 2013, we were able to bring Music back and we would like to increase student participation in a Fine Arts Program in the upcoming years.	N/A.	25% (64 students in grades 3-5)					
			1.1.	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 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				
2. Additional Goal Increase by 3-5%- Students Who read on grade level by nine.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.				
Additional Goal # 2 See SIP Goal – Reading 3A			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2012 Current Level :*</td> <td>2013 Expected Level :*</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </table>	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*						
2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*										
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.				
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.				

Additional 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				
3. Additional Goal Increase by 3-5%-Students who become fluent in math operations.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.				
Additional Goal #3: See SIP Goal- Math 1A			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2012 Current Level :*</td> <td>2013 Expected Level :*</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </table>	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*						
2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*										
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.				

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

Additional 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
4. Additional Goal Decrease the Achievement Gap for Each Identified Subgroup by 10% by June 30, 2016			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Additional Goal #4: See SIP Goal- Reading/Math 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
			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 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	
5. Additional Goal-Increase by 3-5%- The percent of students who will enter Elementary School Ready Based on FLKRS Data (score 70% and above)			1.1 Students enter the VPK program with a variety of exposure to the basic foundational skills.	1.1. Professional Development will be provided by the VPK Program via regularly scheduled meetings for VPK teachers	1.1. VPK Teacher, Kindergarten Teachers, and principal	1.1. Students who attended our VPK program will enter into Kindergarten, “school ready”	1.1. FLKRS	
								Additional Goal #5:
VPK- In 2012, 85% (11 out of 13 students) of our VPK entered Camelot “School Ready”. We hope to increase to 90% for 2013.								
				N/A.	90%			
						1.2Lack of Transportation	1.2. Provide information on bus services available	1.2. Registrar, Principal
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Additional 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>6. Additional Goal Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education</p>			<p>6.1. Inconsistent progress monitoring</p>	<p>6.1. Closely monitor their progress in order to prevent over classifying students in Reading and Math</p>	<p>6.1. Classroom Teachers, RtI team</p>	<p>6.1. Progress Monitoring</p>	<p>6.1. FCAT, Benchmark Assessment</p>
<p><u>Additional Goal #6:</u></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level :*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level :*</u></p>					
<p>During the 2011-2012 school year, 37 students were classified as special education students (ESE). During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students classified as special education students (ESE) will be reduced by 3%.</p>	<p>During the 2011-2012 school year, 37 students were classified as special education students (ESE).</p>	<p>During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students classified as special education students (ESE) will be reduced by 3%</p>					
			6.2.	6.2.	6.2.	6.2.	6.2.
			6.3.	6.3.	6.3.	6.3.	6.3.

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

Additional 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
7. Additional Goal Increase College and Career Awareness (i.e. Destination College, AVID, school wide activities)			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Additional Goal #4: See SIP Goal- See Dropout Prevention Professional Development Section	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

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

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core	K-5	Leadership Team, Black Belt Members	Teachers	Staff development days	lobervation	Leadership Team
STEM	K-5	Leadership Team	Teachers	Staff development days	FCAT Science and Math Scores	Leadership Team
Marzano	K-5	Leadership Team	Teachers	Staff Development days	lobervation	Leadership Team

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
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase 2 nd Grade Rigor	SAT-10 Assessment, STARS, Test Ready workbooks	Textbook fund	\$2937.35
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$2937.35

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.	
Reading Budget	Total:\$2133
CELLA Budget	Total:\$2320
Mathematics Budget	Total:\$0
Science Budget	Total:\$0
Writing Budget	Total:\$602.23
Civics Budget	Total:\$0
U.S. History Budget	Total:\$0
Attendance Budget	Total:\$0
Suspension Budget	Total:\$0
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:\$0
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:\$0
STEM Budget	Total:\$0
CTE Budget	Total:\$0
Additional Goals	Total:\$2937.35
Grand Total: 7992.58	

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

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input 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.

N/A

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

FCAT Score Analysis
Discuss the school budget
Conduct a Parent Survey of the school
Make recommendations for the School Improvement Plan

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

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Will be discussed and determined in upcoming meetings.	\$6,000