Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

Name of School:

North

Audubon Elementary

Area:

Principal:

Dr. Ron Bobay

Area Superintendent:

Lisa Paniale

SAC Chairperson:

Kathy Herbst

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

Audubon Elementary is a partnership of students, parents, staff, and community. Our student-centered environment ensures that each learner will have the opportunity to soar to higher levels.

Vision Statement:

Our mission is to create a community of empowered life-long learners in an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust.

Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

Audubon continues to be a high achieving school as indicated by FCAT reading (70% proficient), FCAT math (73% proficient), and FCAT writing (83% proficient) on FCAT. Proficiency on FCAT is defined as scoring Level 3 or above. In order to meet Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) under Race to the Top (Increase Student Performance in Reading and Math), Audubon will increase the proportion of students scoring at levels 3 and above and reduce the proportion of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 by 50% over 6 years. For the 2013 school year, Audubon will increase the percent of students scoring at levels 3 and above in reading by 10% (from 70% to 77%). For the 2013 school, Audubon will increase the percent of students scoring at levels 3 and above in math by 10% (from 73% to 80%). For the 2013 school year, Audubon will reduce the percent of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 in reading by 10% (from 30% to 27%). For the 2013 school year, Audubon will reduce the percent of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 in math by 10% (from 27% to 24%).

Through analysis of a five year trend of Reading, Math, Writing, and Science FCAT scores, Audubon continues to be a high performing school; however, there is an overall downward trend of scores in Reading, Math, and Science(with a slight upward trend for 2008 - 2009 and 2009 - 2010 in Reading and 2007 - 2008 and 2008 - 2009 in Math). The Writing trend for the past five years has steadily increased (with the exception of 2009 – 2010). Science scores have decreased steadily since 2007 – 2008. The trend for the past five years is as follows. The percent of students meeting high standards is in parentheses following the year. The * next to current year indicates new cut scores.

Reading
2007 – 2008 (90)
2008 – 2009 (93)
2009 – 2010 (93)
2010 – 2011 (90)
2011 – 2012 (70)*

Math
2007 – 2008 (91)
2008 – 2009 (93)
2009 – 2010 (92)
2010 – 2011 (90)
2011 – 2012 (73)*

Writing
2007 – 2008 (90)
2008 – 2009 (94)
2009 – 2010 (92)
2010 – 2011 (94)
2011 – 2012 (83)*

Science
2007 – 2008 (83)

2008 – 2009 (79)
2009 – 2010 (78)
2010 – 2011 (71)
2011 – 2012 (60)*

During 4 separate classroom walkthroughs during September 2012, 3 out thirty-nine teachers had an Essential Question on the board. Through a recent survey of what teachers were concentrating on for their PGPs, it was discovered that 7 out of the 20 who responded were focusing on informational text. Additionally, 72% of questions were answered correctly for the informational text section of FCAT Reading (3rd grade – 75%, 4th grade – 88%, 5th grade – 65%, 6th grade – 67%)

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

Each school day, students in grades K – 5 participate in Walk to Intervention. Students are placed in groups according to their achievement on specific skills. The groups are flexible and change in accordance with the current skills being taught. Generally there is one more group as there are number of teachers in that grade level. For example, there are currently 4 First Grade classes at Audubon. During the Walk to Intervention timeframe (8:00 a.m. – 8:40 a.m. daily), a fifth instructor is assigned to that grade level. Students are divided into 5 groups according to their skill needs. Normally, the groups range from intense individual instruction (Tier III), practice (on grade level), and enrichment (students who excel). Teachers differentiate their instruction in accordance with the achievement level of their group.

Each classroom teacher teaches Reading during a 90-minute uninterrupted reading block daily. MacMillan/McGraw-Hill *Triumphs* is used for Tier 3 instruction for below grade level students in reading for grades 1, 4 – 6 and the Voyager program and *Triumphs* is used for grades 2 and 3. All below grade level students have a Progress Monitoring Plan in place to address deficient areas. Diagnostic testing and a PASI/PSI are administered to the lowest 25% of students in reading, including third-grade students working below grade level in reading.

The Scott Foresman *enVision* (K-5 grade) and the Macmillan/McGraw-Hill Glencoe (6th grade) Math programs are currently implemented for mathematics instruction at Audubon. Third through sixth grade classes conduct timed skill tests in multiplication and division to improve student achievement in math. Grades K - 5 receive Math instruction by their homeroom teacher. Students in Grade 6, receive instruction from the Sixth Grade Math teacher with the exception of those students in the self-contained VE classes who are not mainstreamed. Math Night will coincide with the annual Book Fair and is held during an evening event. A carnival-like atmosphere where parents and students visit classrooms in each grade level where they participate in various Math-themed games and activities. Each family who attends will receive a game with materials and directions to take home with them.

National Geographic Science program is currently in place for grades K - 5. Discovery Learning is the Science program currently in place for sixth grade. Science instruction at Audubon is aligned with the Florida Sunshine State Standards. Science literacy is developed through Science labs that teach the content area as well as the essential process skills with real-world connections. Science concepts are reinforced through the use of Thinking Maps, and other various graphic organizers. All students in grades K - 3 receive instruction in Science from their homeroom teacher. Students in Grade 4 receive Science instruction from all 3 Fourth grade teachers as they rotate through all three classrooms learning a different concept in each room. Students in grade 6 receive Science instruction from the Sixth Grade Science teacher, with the exception of those students in the Varying Exceptionalities classes who are not mainstreamed. Students in grades K – 2 learn about the Science Experiment process by participating in a class Science Project and display. All students in grades 3 – 6 participate in the school Science Fair and top winners go on to compete in the North Area's Science Fair.

The writing programs currently used for writing in Kindergarten through sixth grades, consists of the *Piece By Piece p*acing guide, *Developing Artistic Writing*, and *Extreme Makeover*. District writing assessments are analyzed to drive instruction in writing for each grade level. Audubon's Young Author's program is designed to showcase students' published books. The program encourages students to write like an author and produce a finished product that can be shared with others. Books are selected for recognition at each quarterly awards ceremony where students receive Blue Ribbons for their writing abilities. Several student-authored books are selected for competition at the District Discovering Literature Day.

Teachers in grades K – 2 are implementing the Common Core Standards in English/Language Arts and Math. Teachers in grades 3 – 6 are familiarizing themselves with the standards and increasing their awareness and use of text complexity and problem-solving in Math.

Students in grades 3 – 6 have the opportunity to participate in the Academic Support Program (ASP). Audubon's Academic Support Program will focus students who scored in the lowest 25% in Reading and Math. This focus will include students who scored a Level 1, Level 2, or low Level 3 in Reading and/or Math on the 2012 FCAT. Students demonstrating deficiencies in reading or mathematics who do not have FCAT scores will participate based on scores from district required assessments, FAIR testing, running records, Scholastic Reading Inventories, and teacher observation.

ASP Reading in grades 3 through 6 will be provided from approximately October 2012 through February 2013. Classes will meet two days a week (Mondays and Wednesdays) for one hour after school for a total of approximately 28 sessions. ASP Math in grades 3 through 6 will be provided from approximately October 2012 through February 2013. Classes will meet two days a week (Tuesdays and Thursdays) for one hour after school for a total of approximately 28 sessions.

Instruction will be provided by classroom teachers utilizing whole group, small group, one-on-one instruction, and centers. MacMillan/McGraw-Hill Treasures and Triumphs programs are used for the core instruction in Reading and Scott Foresman *enVision* Math is used for the core instruction in Math. SRA Laboratory Kits and trade books with Accelerated Reader quizzes supplement the core program. Ancillary materials from off-adoption MacMillan/McGraw-Hill math programs are used with the core curriculum materials in math. ASP teachers focus on teaching skills not yet introduced in classrooms so that students in ASP have a head start on the skill.

Science ASP focuses on sixth grade students who scored 300 or below on Science FCAT 2012 and fifth grade students indicating below grade level performance based on district required science assessments and teacher observation. Science ASP classes are held one day a week for one hour after school from approximately October 2012 through February 2013. Instruction is provided by a classroom teacher and Science Court materials are utilized.

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

According to Louis and Marks (1998), when a school is structured into a professional learning community, teachers set higher expectations for student achievement, and achievement levels are significantly higher. Professional learning communities that are school-based provide support and motivate teachers as they work through obstacles frequently encountered (Kruse, Seashore Louis, & Bryk, 1994 from All Things PLC). In schools where a PLC is strong, teachers effectively work together and are more likely to maintain opportunities for student achievement.

The term “Essential Questions” was first introduced by Grant Wiggins in the 1980’s (McKenzie, 2005). Wiggins and Jay McTighe define essential questions as “questions that are not answerable with the finality in a brief sentence…Their aim is to stimulate thought, to provoke inquiry, and to spark more questions – including thoughtful student questions – not just pat answers” (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005, p. 106). Essential questions keep us focused on inquiry and not on just answers. Essential questions are at the top of Bloom’s Taxonomy and require students to evaluate, synthesize, or analyze. They peak our curiosity. Students must create their own answers from the information they have gathered. According to an excerpt from an article in *Technology Connection (1995)*, essential questions provide teachers with the relevance of a unit or a course by using them as a guide of the importance of knowledge for each unit or course. They help answer the “Why do we have to learn this?” for students. Additionally, essential questions are thought-provoking to students and can be used to stimulate debate and discussions (Technology Connections, 1995).

“Informational text” and “nonfiction” are often terms that are interchanged. According to the article *What’s the Difference Between Informational Text and Nonfiction?* they are not the same. Informational text is a type of nonfiction. (Reading & Writing…n.d.) Informational text differs from other types of nonfiction in purpose, features, and format. The purpose of informational text is to communicate information about the world from someone presumed to know the information to someone who does not with features such as headings and technical vocabulary to help convey the information. Informational text differs from a biography (which is nonfiction) in that a biography focuses on a single individual during a specific point in time. Informational text has characteristics addressing whole classes of things in a timeless manner.

Informational text comes in many different formats including books, magazines, handouts, brochures, CD-ROMS, and the Internet (Reading & Writing…). Features of informational text include descriptions of events, technical vocabulary, illustrations and photographs, labels, captions, indexes, headings, page numbers, diagrams, tables, charts, and other graphical devices. According to the article *What's the Difference Between Informational Text and Nonfiction?,* learning to read informational text is the key to success in learning once children learn to read. If we introduce informational text at an early age, students are more likely to deal with the reading and writing demands of later learning. Additionally, informational text is everywhere in everyday lives outside of school. More than 96% of the text on the Internet is expository. If children are going to succeed in this world, they need to be prepared to read and write informational text.

References

McKenzie, J. (2005). Learning to question to wonder to learn. Linworth Publishing Company. Retrieved on September 24, 2012 from http://questioning.org/mar05/essential.html

Reading and Writing Informational Text in the Primary Grades. (n.d.). *What's the difference between information text and nonfiction?* Retrieved on September 25, 2012 from http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/scholasticprofessional/authors/pdfs/duke_sample_pages.pdf

Wiggins, G. and McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design.* Expanded 2nd Edition. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. Retrieved on September 26, 2012 from http://www.huffenglish.com/?p=363

http://www.allthingsplc.info/pdf/articles/advocates.pdf

CONTENT AREA:

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

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

Through Professional Learning Communities, Audubon Elementary will increase knowledge and use in instruction of Essential Questions and Informational text with evidence-based written responses as demonstrated by an increase in student achievement in all subject areas.

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

Barrier	*Action Steps*	*Person Responsible*	*Timetable*	*Budget*	*In-Process Measure*
1. Teachers have not had training on the use of Essential Questions.	1. a. Training on Essential Questions will be held. b. Database of Essential Questions used by teachers and posted on SharePoint.	Administration; Teacher Leader and former Literacy Coach –Jennifer Tonhauser	October 11 & 12, 2012	$0	1.Faculty meeting agenda 2.sample printout of database 3.At least one Essential Question will be listed on the board each day in every classroom and in plan book as monitored by Classroom Walkthroughs

2. Teachers have not had training on Informational Text	2. Training on Informational Text with evidence-based written responses will be held.	Administration ; Common Core Team (Peggy White and Sandie Weinbrenner)	November 8, 2012	$0	1.Faculty meeting agenda 2.Teachers will document in lesson plans what type of text is used for instruction 3. Documentation through a monthly collection (twice – January and March) showing what informational text and evidence-based written responses are being used
3. Time provided for PLCs is only once per week.	3. a. Thursday afternoons for 1 hour15 minutes have been set aside for training, data talks and professional learning community meetings. 3. b. Tuesday meetings during planning times are scheduled for data talks and small-group training.	Administration; teachers	Every Thursday from 2:45 – 4:00 throughout the school year.	$0	Professional Learning Calendar showing meeting dates and topics
4.	4.				
5.	5.				
6.	6.				
7.	7.				
8.	8.				

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

At the end of school year 2012 – 2013, teachers will be posting daily Essential Questions on the board as recorded in their plan books. Teachers will be using at least 50% Informational text as part of instruction and students will be providing evidence-based written responses to the text.

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

High performance (level 3 or above) on FCAT reading, math, writing, and science will increase by 10%. Students scoring level 1 and 2 on FCAT reading, math, writing, and science will decrease by 10%.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal **Total Tested Reading: 292** **Bottom Quartile: 73**	**2012 Current Level of Performance** **(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance**	**2014 Expected Level of Performance**	**2015 Expected Level of Performance**
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. **Collaborative Mutual Accountability groups are designed to focus on lowest quartile students when the number of students scoring in levels 4s and 5s has dropped.**				
Strategy(s): **1.** **While maintaining strategies and focus on bottom quartile students, focus on maintaining annual learning gains for students scoring level 4 or level 5.**				

FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	27% = 79 students	30% = 88 students +9	33% = 96 students +8	36% = 105 students +9
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.				
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading **Barrier(s): There is a built-in focus on lowest quartile students** **Strategy(s):** 1.Focus on levels 4 and 5 by developing students' problem-solving skills through essential questions.	43% = 126 students	47% = 137 students +11	52% = 152 students +15	57% = 166 students +14
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**				
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**				

FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.** **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**				
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline data 2010-11:**				
Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading : 292 Total tested	Enter numerical data for current level of performance	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance	Enter numerical data for current level of performance	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance
White: (228)	29% = 66 students	26% = 59 students -7	23% = 52 students -7	21% = 48 students -4
Black: (12)	50% = 6 students	45% = 5 students -1	40% = 5 students -0	36% = 4 students -1
Hispanic: (32)	24% = 8 students	22% = 6 students -2	20% = 6 students -0	18% = 6 students -0
Asian: (8)	0% = 0 students	0% = 0 students	0% = 0 students	0% = 0 students
American Indian: (2)	50% = 1 student	45% = 1 student	40% = 1 student	35% = 1 student
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading (7 Total ELL tested) **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	43% = 3 students	39% = 3 students -0	35% = 2 students -1	29% = 2 students -0

Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading (69 Total SWD) **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1. Academics in the Intermediate need to be the focus	61% =42 students	55% = 38 students -4	49% = 34 students -4	44% = 30 students -4
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading (113 Total ECD) **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	50% = 57 students	45% = 51 students -6	40% = 45 student-6	36% = 41 students -4

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Essential Questions	October 11 & 12, 2012	1. Classroom Walkthroughs by Administration 2. Database posted on SharePoint of Essential Questions teachers are using
Informational Text	November 8, 2012	1. Month-long documentation of all informational text materials used in classrooms for month of January and again in March.

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:** 50%			Dan Carter, Assistant Principal/ESOL Contact
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:** 60%			Dan Carter, Assistant Principal/ESOL Contact
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**: 70%	Out of the 10 ELL students at Audubon, 3 scored HI (High Intermediate) in writing. All 3 of these students are primary age students.	Primary teachers will focus on the mechanics and vocabulary choice in students' writing as evidenced by the District required Writing Assessments.	Dan Carter, Assistant Principal/ESOL Contact

Mathematics Goal(s): **Total Tested Reading: 292** **Bottom Quartile: 73**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance**	**2014 Expected Level of Performance**	**2015 Expected Level of Performance**
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1.				
Strategy(s): **1.**				
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	29% = 85 students	32% = 93 students +8	35% = 102 students +9	39% = 114 students +12
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**				

FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	44% = 128 students	48% = 140 students +12	53% = 155 students +15	58% = 169 students +14
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**				
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**				
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**				
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**				
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline Data 2010-11:**				

Student subgroups by ethnicity : 292 total tested White: (228) Black: (12) Hispanic: (32) Asian: (8) American Indian: (2)	27% = 62 students 42% = 5 students 24% = 8 students 13% = 1 student 50% = 1 student	24% = 55 students -7 38% = 5 students -0 22% = 7 students -1 12% = 1 student 45% = 1 student	22% = 50 students -5 34% = 4 students -1 20% = 6 students -1 11% = 1 student 40% = 1 student	20% = 46 students -4 29% = 3 students -1 18% = 6 students -0 10% = 1 student 35% =1 student
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics (10 Total ELL)	14% = 1 student	13% = 1 student	12% = 1 student	11% = 1 student
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics (69 Total SWD)	50% =35 students	45% = 31 students -4	40% = 28 students -3	36% = 25 students -3
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics (113 Total ECD)	36% = 41 students	32% = 36 students -5	29% = 33 students -3	26% = 29 students -4

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Subitizing	First semester	Collect various methods for subitizing numbers 10 and share with K-2 teachers.
Introduction to Common Core	First semester	Share the Eight Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice and encourage teachers to start exposing their students to them.

Writing **Total Tested: 70** **Bottom Quartile: 18 students**	**2012 Current Level of Performance**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance**	**2014 Expected Level of Performance**	**2015 Expected Level of Performance**
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**				
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	37% = 26 students	41% = 29 students	45% = 32 students	49% = 34 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing				

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) **Total Tested: 71** **Bottom Quartile: 18**	**2012 Current Level of Performance**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance**	**2014 Expected Level of Performance**	**2015 Expected Level of Performance**
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**				
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science**:**	32% = 23 students	35% = 25 students	39% = 28 students	43% = 31 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science				
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	27% = 19 students	30% = 21 students	33% = 23 students	36% = 26 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading				

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

APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		

Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:**		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

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

Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:**		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		

Biology EOC Goal	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage**

	and the number of students that percentage reflects)	information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Biology**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology:		

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

U.S. History EOC	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in U. S. History**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History:		

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

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

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

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1.		
2.		
3.		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are not highly effective. *When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly effective	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective

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

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and it role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS) no issues
PARENT INVOLVEMENT: **Great parent involvement. No issues to address.**
ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies) 95+% attendance on average. NO issues to address.
SUSPENSION: No issues to address
DROP-OUT (High Schools only):
POSTSECONDARY READINESS: (How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful? Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.)