

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: Deerwood Elementary School | District Name: Orange |
| Principal: W. John McHale | Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins |
| SAC Chair: Mary Ellen West | Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 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](#)

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.

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

| 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 | W. John McHale | Education Specialist – Educational Leadership Masters – Social Studies Education Bachelors of Science – Advertising Certifications - Secondary Social Studies and Educational Leadership | Less than 1 year | 10 | SY 2009-2010 Timber Creek HS School Grade :A AYP: 100 % | SY 2010-2011 Timber Creek HS School Grade :B AYP: 82% | SY 2011-2012 Timber Creek HS School Grade: A AYP: |
| | | | | | High Standards : Reading : 62% 64% 67% Math: 88% 90% 71 % Writing: 91% 90% 89% Science: 54% 56% n/a | | |
| | | | | | Learning Gains: Reading: 61% 56% 69% Math: 79% 78% 62% | | |
| | | | | | Lowest 25%: Reading: 52% 43% 67% Math: 67% 68% 62% | | |
| Assistant Principal | Kenisha Holmes | Educational Specialist- Exceptional Student Education- Grades (K-6) Social Work (K-6) | Less than 1 year | 3 | SY 2009-2010 Citrus Elementary School Grade: A AYP: 97% | SY 2010-2011 Citrus Elementary School Grade: B AYP: 74% | SY 2011-2012 Citrus Elementary School Grade: B AYP: |
| | | | | | High Standards : Reading : 78% 73% 62% Math: 83% 79% 60% Writing: 85% 82% 73% Science: 46% 41% 54% | | |
| | | | | | Learning Gains: Reading: 71% 63% 71% Math: 70% 56% 66% | | |
| | | | | | Lowest 25%: Reading: 59% 69% 69% Math: 73% 56% 61% | | |

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) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|--------------|--------------|-------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------|----------|----------|------------------|--|--|---------------|-----|-----|-----------|-----|-----|--------------|-----|-----|--------------|-----|-----|-----------------|--|--|--------------|-----|-----|-----------|-----|-----|-------------|--|--|--------------|-----|-----|-----------|-----|-----|
| CRT | Mary Ellen West | Bachelor of Arts in Education Elementary Education 1-6 | 27 | 4 | <table border="0"> <tr> <td>SY 2011-2012</td> <td>SY 2010-2011</td> <td>SY2009-2010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Deerwood Elementary School Grade A</td> <td>Deerwood Elementary School Grade A</td> <td>Deerwood Elementary Grade A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>AYP:</td> <td>AYP: 74%</td> <td>AYP: 97%</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">High Standards :</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reading: 73 %</td> <td>87%</td> <td>91%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Math: 70%</td> <td>89%</td> <td>91%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Writing: 80%</td> <td>90%</td> <td>89%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Science: 60%</td> <td>75%</td> <td>76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Learning Gains:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reading: 70%</td> <td>66%</td> <td>70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Math: 66%</td> <td>65%</td> <td>72%</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Lowest 25%:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reading: 70%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>63%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Math: 45%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>77%</td> </tr> </table> | SY 2011-2012 | SY 2010-2011 | SY2009-2010 | Deerwood Elementary School Grade A | Deerwood Elementary School Grade A | Deerwood Elementary Grade A | AYP: | AYP: 74% | AYP: 97% | High Standards : | | | Reading: 73 % | 87% | 91% | Math: 70% | 89% | 91% | Writing: 80% | 90% | 89% | Science: 60% | 75% | 76% | Learning Gains: | | | Reading: 70% | 66% | 70% | Math: 66% | 65% | 72% | Lowest 25%: | | | Reading: 70% | 51% | 63% | Math: 45% | 51% | 77% |
| SY 2011-2012 | SY 2010-2011 | SY2009-2010 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Deerwood Elementary School Grade A | Deerwood Elementary School Grade A | Deerwood Elementary Grade A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AYP: | AYP: 74% | AYP: 97% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| High Standards : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reading: 73 % | 87% | 91% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Math: 70% | 89% | 91% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Writing: 80% | 90% | 89% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Science: 60% | 75% | 76% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Learning Gains: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reading: 70% | 66% | 70% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Math: 66% | 65% | 72% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lowest 25%: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reading: 70% | 51% | 63% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Math: 45% | 51% | 77% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reading Coach | Mary Miller | Bachelor of Art in Communication Disorders Master of Education in Specific Learning Disabilities | 16 | Less than 1 year | <table border="0"> <tr> <td>SY 2011-2012</td> <td>SY 2010-2011</td> <td>SY2009-2010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Deerwood Elementary School Grade A</td> <td>Deerwood Elementary School Grade A</td> <td>Deerwood Elementary Grade A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>AYP:</td> <td>AYP: 74%</td> <td>AYP: 97%</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">High Standards :</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reading: 73 %</td> <td>87%</td> <td>91%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Math: 70%</td> <td>89%</td> <td>91%</td> </tr> </table> | SY 2011-2012 | SY 2010-2011 | SY2009-2010 | Deerwood Elementary School Grade A | Deerwood Elementary School Grade A | Deerwood Elementary Grade A | AYP: | AYP: 74% | AYP: 97% | High Standards : | | | Reading: 73 % | 87% | 91% | Math: 70% | 89% | 91% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SY 2011-2012 | SY 2010-2011 | SY2009-2010 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Deerwood Elementary School Grade A | Deerwood Elementary School Grade A | Deerwood Elementary Grade A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AYP: | AYP: 74% | AYP: 97% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| High Standards : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reading: 73 % | 87% | 91% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Math: 70% | 89% | 91% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | |
|------------|--------------|--|---|------------------|---|
| | | | | | Writing: 80% 90% 89% Science : 60% 75% 76% Learning Gains: Reading: 70% 66% 70% Math: 66% 65% 72% Lowest 25%: Reading:70% 51% 63% Math:45% 51% 77% |
| Math Coach | Lee-Ann Fink | Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education 1-6 Master of Education, Educational Leadership Certifications: Elementary Education 1-6 Educational Leadership ESOL K-12 Gifted K-12 (Endorsed) | 8 | Less than 1 year | SY 2011-2012 SY 2010-2011 SY2009-2010 Deerwood Elementary School Grade A Deerwood Elementary School Grade A Deerwood Elementary Grade A AYP: AYP: 74% AYP: 97% High Standards : Reading: 73 % 87% 91% Math 70% 89% 91% Writing: 80% 90% 89% Science: 60% 75% 76% Learning Gains: Reading: 70% 66% 70% Math: 66% 65% 72% Lowest 25%: Reading: 70% 51% 63% Math: 45% 51% 77% |

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. Network with colleagues to recruit highly qualified teachers | Principal/Assistant Principal | Ongoing |
| 2. Provide ongoing professional development. | Principal/Assistant Principal | Ongoing |
| 3. Create a positive and professional climate. | Principal/Assistant Principal | Ongoing |

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|--|---|
| 0 | N/A |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 45 | 0 | 41 % (19) | 37 % (17) | 22% (10) | 28% (13) | 100% (46) | 6% (3) | 2% (1) | 63%(29) |

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

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 |
|--------------|------------------|---|--|
| Mary Pagan | Robin Auls | Mrs. Pagan has demonstrated the ability to increase student achievement through effectively implementing the Response to Intervention process and utilizing her student data to inform instruction. | <p>The mentor and the mentee will meet on a basis as a part of the Professional Learning Community model. During these meetings they will discuss best practices, such as utilizing data to inform instruction, effective instructional strategies and SMART goals.</p> <p>The mentee will have multiple opportunities to observe the mentor, as well as the mentor observing the mentee. The purpose of these observations for both the mentor and mentee is coaching, questioning and feedback.</p> |
| Lynn Rummler | Deborah Anderson | Mrs. Rummler is an experienced teacher and has demonstrated the ability to effectively work collaboratively with her colleagues to increase student achievement | <p>The mentor and the mentee will meet on a weekly basis as a part of the Professional Learning Community model. During these meetings they will discuss best practices, such as utilizing data to inform instruction, effective instructional strategies and SMART goals.</p> <p>The mentee will have multiple opportunities to observe the mentor, as well as the mentor observing the mentee. The purpose of these observations for both the mentor and mentee is coaching, questioning and feedback.</p> |

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 |

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

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 |
|---|
| Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Principal, Assistant Principal, Staffing Specialist, Behavior Specialist, Reading Coach, Reading Intervention Teacher, School Psychologist, Speech Pathologist, Math Coach |
| Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The focus of the MTSS/RtI Leadership team will be on meeting the needs of struggling learners through appropriate and structured interventions. The team will meet monthly to review student performance data on assessments and to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. The RtI team will also review progress monitoring data and the grade and classroom level data. The team will determine students in need of more interventions and make recommendations to the regular education and support teachers that provide instruction to the student. The team will also plan for and deliver appropriate professional development. |
| 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. Members of the RtI leadership team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and the principal to help in the development of the SIP. The team shared data on Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 targets; and helped set clear expectations for rigorous and relevant instruction. |
| MTSS Implementation |
| Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Base line Data: Progress monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Florida Kindergarten Readiness Survey (FLKRS) Progress Monitoring: PMRN, FCAT, FCAT Explorer, Edusoft, Mini-Benchmark assessments, -I-Ready, FAIR |
| Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Professional Development will be provided on Wednesday afternoons after school throughout the school year. The first session will be a refresher course on the RtI process followed by the next steps to RtI. The RtI Coach with support from the East Learning Community will conduct refresher trainings as well as further identified areas of need throughout the year. The RtI team will also evaluate additional staff PD during the monthly RtI team meetings. |
| Describe the plan to support MTSS. The plan to support the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is ongoing professional development and the utilization of multiple data sources to progress monitor student success. |

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). Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Reading Intervention Teacher, Media Specialist, Gifted Teacher, CRT |
| Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). Each member of the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) will be assigned a grade level and meet as a Professional Learning Communities (PLC) weekly to discuss student data, updates, and recent activity reports and numbers. The Reading Coach and Reading Intervention teacher will provide teachers with articles, strategies and ideas that promote reading. The Gifted Resource Teacher will assist all grade levels with the integration of reading in math to supplement our Core Envision Math Program. The LLT will promote reading throughout the year with a school-wide incentive program to encourage students to read AR books and take quizzes online. In addition, students will participate in Read Across America and celebrate literacy week. |
| What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The major initiative of the LLT this year will be to integrate reading throughout the content areas, specifically in math. |

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.

**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*

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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. Students not having the prerequisite skills to achieve grade level mastery | 1A.1. Students who have been identified as needing Tier 2/3 reading intervention will be pulled out for intensive reading intervention at a designated time each day. | 1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Intervention Teacher Reading Coach | 1A.1 Classroom Observations Weekly Mini Assessments | 1A.1. Progress Monitoring data Results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment |
| <u>Reading Goal #1A:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| <i>In 2012, 31% (78) of students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 on the Reading section of the FCAT 2.0</i> | <i>31% (78) of students scored a level 3.</i> | <i>34% of students will score a level 3.</i> | | | | | |
| <i>By June of 2013, 34% of students will score at achievement level 3 in reading.</i> | | | 1A.2. Minimal technology in the school to support instruction | 1A.2. Purchase SMART Boards for 2 nd and 5 th grade classrooms Purchase iPads for 1st and 4 th grade classrooms | 1A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Technology Support Rep. | 1A.2. Informal Observations Classroom Walk-throughs | 1A.2. Lesson Plans Work Samples Increase in the number of students who perform at or above grade level proficiency on the 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 |
| <i>All elementary students will read independently by age 9.</i> | | | | | | | |
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. | | | 1B.1. Limited use of differentiated | 1B.1. Provide staff development | 1B.1. Classroom teachers, | 1B.1. Progress Monitoring/ | 1B.1. Benchmark |

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal #1B: In 2012, 61 % (11) students in grades 3-5 scored at the proficiency level on the FCAT Reading section. | 2012 Current Level of Performance: * | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: * | instruction for all students | and modeling in differentiated instruction and Tier 1 and Tier 2 strategies for all teachers | CRT, Reading Intervention teachers | Collaborative Team Time Meetings Mini Observations Analyze RtI graphs from Tier 1 and Tier 2 strategies | Tests/FAIR/Imagine It Reading Assessments RtI Graphs |
| | 61% (11) students scored at the proficiency level. | 67% of students will score at the proficiency level. | | 1B.2. Lack of specific technology resources for students taking Alternate Assessment | 1B2. Research and acquire cutting edge technology to support Alternate Assessment students | 1B2 Staffing Specialist, Speech/Language Pathologist, ESE teachers/ Tech rep | 1B.2 Observation of students interacting at an independent level |

| 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. Minimal technology in the | 2A.1. Purchase iPads for teachers | 2A.1. | 2A.1. Classroom Observations | 2A.1. Teacher work samples |

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Reading Goal #2A:</p> <p>In 2012, 41% (105) students scored at or above a level 4 on the reading section of the FCAT 2.0 assessment.</p> | <p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>41% (105) scored at a level 4 or above.</p> | <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>45% of students will score at or above a level 4 in reading.</p> | <p>school, lack of upgraded tools to use to support instruction</p> | <p>in grades 1 and 4, SMART Boards for teachers in grades 3 and 5, and continue the use of Mimio Boards in Kindergarten and 2nd grade</p> | <p>Tech representative Principal Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers</p> | | <p>observations, lesson plans</p> |
| | | | <p>2A.2. Limited rigor in the 30 minute daily enrichment period</p> | <p>2A.2. Grade level planning to create instructional focus for 30 minute enrichment period with the result being increased rigor Provide professional development on rigor and relevance</p> | <p>2A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Classroom teachers CRT</p> | <p>2A.2. Informal observations</p> | <p>2A.2. Lesson plans Teacher feedback and reflection Increase in the number of students who perform at or above grade level proficiency on the 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0</p> |
| | | | <p>2A.3. Current technology not motivating high performing students</p> | <p>2A.3. Research/purchase of computer based program geared to higher level students</p> | <p>2A.3. Classroom teachers/gifted teacher</p> | <p>2A.3. Comprehensive review of possible technology software.</p> | <p>2A.3. Student feedback, usage reports</p> |
| <p>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</p> | | | <p>2B.1 Teachers not having in-depth knowledge of access points and how to move students from participatory to the independent level</p> | <p>2B.1. Provide staff development on access points</p> | <p>2B.1. Staffing Specialist CRT</p> | <p>2B.1. Classroom Observations</p> | <p>2B.1. Teacher assessments Increase in the percent of students scoring at or above a level 7 on the 2013 FCAT.</p> |
| <p>Reading Goal #2B:</p> <p>In 2012, 33% (6) students scored at or above Level 7 on the reading section of the FCAT</p> | <p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>33% (6) of students scored at or above level 7.</p> | <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>40% of students will score at or above a level 7.</p> | | | | | |
| | | | <p>2B.2 Lack of specific technology resources for students taking Alternate Assessment</p> | <p>2B.2 Research and acquire cutting-edge technology to support Alternate Assessment students</p> | <p>2B.2 Staffing Specialist, Speech/Language Pathologist, ESE teachers/ Tech rep</p> | <p>2B.2 Observation of students interacting at an independent level.</p> | <p>2B.2 Student usage reports</p> |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. | | | 3A.1. Teachers not having a clear understanding of how to utilize FAIR / BENCHMARK data to drive instruction | 3A.1. Assign a member of the Leadership Team to grade level PLC's to assist teachers with data analysis | 3A.1. Leadership team members Principal Assistant Principal | 3A.1. Formal/Informal Observations Mini-Assessments On-going progress-monitoring. | 3A.1. Weekly PLC meeting notes FAIR/Benchmark Assessment Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment. |
| <u>Reading Goal #3A:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| In 2012, 71% (114) students made learning gains in reading. Increase by 3 to 5% students who read on grade level by age 9. | 71% (114) students made learning gains in reading. | 74% of students in 4th and 5th grade, including retained students in 3rd grade will make learning gains. | | | | | |
| | | | 3A.2. Students not reading independently at home or at opportune times during the school day | 3A.2. Continue to create a culture of independent reading during AM arrival time with emphasis on Florida Reading Association Books and Florida Sunshine State Books Encourage goal setting through Destination College (3 rd -5 th) to include independent reading at home Create a school-wide incentive program for Accelerated Reader | 3A.2. Classroom teachers Media specialist Literacy committee | 3A.2. Media specialist generating reports indicating number of books checked out by classroom Media Specialist generating reports from Accelerated Reader to determine the percent of students who take and pass AR quizzes | 3A.2. AR Reports Media Center Circulation Reports Recognition of classes with highest percentage of students checking out books. |
| | | | 3A.3. Limited use of differentiated instruction for | 3A.3. Provide staff development and modeling in | 3A.3. Principal Assistant | 3A.3. Progress Monitoring PLC Meetings | 3A.3. Benchmark Data |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| | | | all students | differentiated instruction and Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies for all teachers | Classroom teachers CRT Reading Intervention teachers | Informal Observations Analyze RtI graphs from Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies. | FAIR/Imagine It Reading Assessments RtI Graphs |
| 3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. | | | 3B.1. Teachers lack of understanding the RtI process | 3B.1. Provide teachers with professional development on the RtI process and methods of determining whether the interventions which are in place are effective | 3B.1. Principal Assistant Principal RtI Coach Classroom Teachers CRT | 3B.1. Monthly RtI meetings | 3B.1. Use of RtI graphs to monitor student progress |
| <u>Reading Goal #3B:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| In June of 2012, 9% (2) of students made learning gains in reading. | 9% (2) of students made learning gains in reading. | 33% of students will make learning gains in reading. | | | | | |
| | | | 3B.2. Students not reading independently at home or at opportune times during the school day | 3B.2. Continue to create a culture of independent reading during AM arrival time with emphasis on Florida Reading Association Books and Florida Sunshine State Books Create a school-wide incentive program for Accelerated Reader | 3B.2. Classroom teachers Media specialist Literacy committee | 3B.2. Media specialist generating reports indicating number of books checked out by classroom. Media Specialist generating reports from Accelerated Reader to determine the percent of students who take and pass AR quizzes. | 3B2. AR Reports Media Center Circulation Reports Recognition of classes with highest percentage of students checking out books. |

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. Teachers not having a clear understanding of how to utilize FAIR / BENCHMARK data to drive instruction | 4A.1. Assign a member of the Leadership Team to grade level PLC's to assist teachers with data analysis | 4A.1. Leadership team members Principal Assistant Principal | 4A.1. Formal/Informal Observations Mini- Assessments On-going progress-monitoring | 4A.1. Weekly PLC meeting notes FAIR/Benchmark Assessment Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment |
| Reading Goal #4A: In 2012, 70% (112) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 70% (112) | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 73% of | | | | | |
| | of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. | | 4A.2. Monitor student attendance on a monthly basis and notify the school social worker/ guidance counselor of any students who have excessive absences | 4A.2 Classroom Teacher Assistant Principal Registrar | 4A.2 Review monthly attendance reports. | 4A.2 Educational Data Warehouse (EDW) attendance report Increase in the number of students who perform at or above grade level proficiency on the 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0 | 4A.2 Monitor student attendance on a monthly basis and notify the school social worker/ guidance counselor of any students who have excessive absences |
| | | | 4A.3 Teachers limited use of progress monitoring tools such as graphs | 4A.3 Provide professional development on the use of progress monitoring and graphing tools | 4A.3 RtI Coach | 4A.3 PLC team times will be used to discuss and analyze specific RtI graphs | 4A.4 Progress Monitoring Tools (Student RtI Graphs) |
| 4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | | | 4B.1 Lack of specific technology resources for students taking Alternate Assessment | 4B.1 Research and acquire cutting edge technology to support Alternate Assessment students | 4B.1 Staffing Specialist, Speech/Language Pathologist, ESE teachers/ Tech rep | 4B.1 Observation of students interacting at an independent level | 4B.1 Student usage reports |
| Reading Goal #3B: In June of 2012, 9% (2) of students made learning gains in reading. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 9% (2) of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 33% of | | | | | |
| | students made learning gains in reading. | | | | | | |

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 4B.2 Teachers limited use of progress monitoring tools such as graphs | 4B.2 Provide professional development on the use of progress monitoring and graphing tools | 4.B.2 RtI Coach | 4.B.2 PLC team times will be used to discuss and analyze specific RtI graphs | 4.B.2 Progress Monitoring Tools (Student RtI Graphs) |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 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 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|

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

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

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</p> | <p>Baseline data 2010-2011</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Reading Goal #5A: In June of 2012, FCAT data showed that 78% (199) of students in the identified AYP subgroups scored at or above the proficiency level in reading.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:</p> | | | <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> | <p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p> | <p>Evaluation Tool</p> | | | | | | |
| <p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #5B: <i>In 2012, FCAT 2.0 data indicated our percentage of students in our AYP subgroups that did not make satisfactory progress in reading are as follows:</i></p> <p><i>White: 20% (12)</i> <i>Black: 46% (6)</i> <i>Hispanic: 40% (26)</i> <i>Asian: 20%(1)</i></p> | | | <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="387 523 521 699"> <p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> </td> <td data-bbox="521 523 667 699"> <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="387 699 521 986"> <p>Percent making satisfactory progress in reading:</p> <p>White: 80% Black: 54% Hispanic:60% Asian: 80% American Indian:N/A</p> </td> <td data-bbox="521 699 667 986"> <p>Percent making satisfactory progress in reading</p> <p>White: 82% Black: 59% Hispanic: 64% Asian:82% American Indian: N/A</p> </td> </tr> </table> | <p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> | <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> | <p>Percent making satisfactory progress in reading:</p> <p>White: 80% Black: 54% Hispanic:60% Asian: 80% American Indian:N/A</p> | <p>Percent making satisfactory progress in reading</p> <p>White: 82% Black: 59% Hispanic: 64% Asian:82% American Indian: N/A</p> | <p>5B.1. Teachers lack of understanding the RtI process</p> | <p>5B.1. Provide teachers with professional development on the RtI process and how to determine if the interventions which are in place are effective</p> | <p>5B.1. Principal Assistant Principal RtI Coach Classroom Teachers CRT</p> | <p>5B.1. Monthly RtI meetings</p> | <p>5B.1. Use of RtI graphs to monitor student progress</p> | |
| <p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> | <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Percent making satisfactory progress in reading:</p> <p>White: 80% Black: 54% Hispanic:60% Asian: 80% American Indian:N/A</p> | <p>Percent making satisfactory progress in reading</p> <p>White: 82% Black: 59% Hispanic: 64% Asian:82% American Indian: N/A</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | <p>5B.2</p> | <p>Limited use of differentiated instruction for all students</p> | <p>5B.2 Provide staff development and modeling in differentiated instruction and Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies for all teachers</p> | <p>5B.2 Classroom teachers, CRT, Reading Intervention teachers</p> | <p>5B.2 Progress Monitoring/ Collaborative Team Time Meetings Mini Observations Analyze RtI graphs from Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3strategies</p> | <p>5B.2 Benchmark Tests/FAIR/Imagine It Reading Assessments RtI Graphs</p> | | | | | |
| | | | <p>5B.3</p> | <p>Communication gap between home and school</p> | <p>5B.3 Schedule Parent Leadership Council meetings to educate</p> | <p>5B.3 PLC team members/Principal</p> | <p>5B.3 PLC feedback and/or survey</p> | <p>5B.3 Student data reports (Edusoft, FAIR)</p> | | | | | |

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

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | | parents on strategies and technology components to support their children at home | | | |
| 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 | 5C.1. Identified school personnel with translation abilities, classroom teacher | 5C.1. Parent feedback reports | 5C.1. Percentage of parent involvement |
| Reading Goal #5C: In 2012, FCAT 2.0 data indicated that 43 % (15) students who are ELL did not make satisfactory progress in reading. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>57% (20) of students made satisfactory progress in reading.</i> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>67% of students will make satisfactory progress in reading.</i> | | | | |
| | | | 5C.2. Teachers not implementing ESOL strategies within their lessons | 5C.2. Provide teachers with professional development on research based practices when working with ELL students. | 5C.2. Principal Assistant Principal CRT | 5C.2. Classroom walkthroughs Informal/Formal Observations Lesson Plans FCAT 2.0 Reading results |
| | | | 5C.3. Parents not educated on how they can help support students at home | 5C.3. Schedule Parent Leadership Council meetings to educate parents on strategies and technology components to support their children at home | 5C.3. Staffing Specialist Principal Assistant Principal | 5C.3. Sign-In sheets from PLC meetings PLC Feedback survey |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. <i>In June of 2012, 17% (4) students made satisfactory progress in reading.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance: * 17% (4) students made satisfactory progress in reading. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 20% of students will make satisfactory progress in reading. | 5D.1. Scheduling of ESE students support to maximize instructional time | 5D.1. Adjust ESE program model to include co-teaching and continue inclusion of self-contained students into regular education classrooms | 5D.1. ESE teachers Resource teachers | 5D.1. Review student performance through on-going progress monitoring | 5D.1. Benchmark Tests/FAIR/Imagine It Reading Assessments RtI Graphs |
| | | | 5D.2 Limited use of differentiated instruction for all students | 5D.2 Provide staff development and modeling in differentiated instruction and Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies for all teachers | 5D..2 Classroom teachers, CRT, Reading Intervention teachers | 5D.2 Progress Monitoring/ Collaborative Team Time Meetings Mini Observations Analyze RtI graphs from Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies | 5D.2. Benchmark Tests/FAIR/Imagine It Reading Assessments RtI Graphs |

| 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. | 5E.1. Teachers are unaware of | 5E.1. Identifying Economically | 5E.1. Registrar, Classroom | 5E1. PLCs will monitor student | 5E.1. Progress monitoring data |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Reading Goal #5E: In 2012, FCAT 2.0 data indicated that 25% (35) of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading. | 2012 Current Level of Performance: * 75% (35) of students made satisfactory progress in reading. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 78% of students will make satisfactory progress in reading. | specific students requiring additional support due to socio-economic status | Disadvantaged students and monitoring their progress through Collaborative team PLCs | teachers | progress during collaborative team time. Create an informational data board using a color coded system to identify specific student groups. | 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 results |
| | | | 5E.2. Students not having the prerequisite skills to achieve grade level mastery | 5E.2. Students who have been identified as needing Tier 3 reading intervention will go to reading intervention class at a designated time during the school day | 5E.2. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Intervention Teacher Reading Coach | 5E.2. Weekly Mini Assessments Classroom Observations | 5E.2. Progress Monitoring data 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 results |
| | | | 5E.3. Student attendance rate | 5E.3. Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis. | 5E.3. Registrar Assistant Principal | 5E.3. Bi-Weekly Child Study Team meetings. | 5E.3. Monthly attendance reports generated from the student management system (SMS) |

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 |

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

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

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------|--|------------------------|------------|--|--|
| Data Analysis | K-5 | Grade Level Leadership Team representative | School-wide | Bi -Weekly | Data meetings scheduled in advance | Principal Assistant Principal CRT |
| PLC using data to inform instruction | K-5 | Grade Level Leadership Representative | School-wide | Weekly | Scheduled in Advance Member of leadership team assigned to each grade level | Principal Assistant Principal |
| RtI Training Update | K-5 | Assistant Principal Behavior Specialist Guidance Counselor | All classroom teachers | TBA | PLC Meetings | Principal Assistant Principal Behavior Specialist Intervention Teachers |
| Access Points | ESE K-5 | Staffing Specialist | ESE Teachers | TBA | PLC Meetings | Staffing Specialist Principal Assistant Principal |

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|---|---|----------------|---------------------------|
| Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Ticket to Read Intervention Program | Internet based computer program used at school and home for Intervention students | General Fund | 3000.00 |
| Accelerated Reader | Progress monitoring software assessment designed to monitor the practice of reading. Assess students' reading with four types of quizzes: Reading Practice, Vocabulary Practice, Literacy Skills, and Textbook Quizzes. | General Fund | 2218.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: 5218.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Smart Boards | | | 11,421.00 |
| iPads | | | 4871.00 |
| | | | Subtotal:16,292.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal:21,510 |
| | | | Total:21,510 |

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: <i>In 2012, 63 % (58) of the students scored at the proficiency level on the listening/speaking portion of the CELLA.</i> | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 63% (58) scored at the proficiency level. | 1.1 Lack of instructional activities which allow students to practice and demonstrate English abilities | 1.1. Provide activities on a weekly basis which provide opportunities for students to participate in structured peer to peer activities which require students to practice listening and speaking skills | 1.1 Classroom Teacher | 1.1 Lesson Plans Classroom Observations | 1.1 Increased percent of students scoring at the proficiency level on the 2013 listening/speaking portion of CELLA. |
| | | 1.2 Communication gap between home and school | 1.2 Schedule Parent Leadership Council meetings to educate parents on strategies and technology components to support their children at home | 1.2 PLC team members/Principal | 1.2 PLC feedback and/or survey | 1.2 Student data reports |
| | | 1.3 Students having difficulty with pronouncing and understanding English vocabulary | 1.3 Provide teachers with training on specific ELL strategies which targets teaching ELL students how to speak English more comprehensibly | 1.3 CCT PLC Team Principal Assistant Principal | 1.3 Lesson Plans | 1.3 Increased percent of students scoring at the proficiency level on the 2013 listening/speaking portion of CELLA. |
| 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 |

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

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading. | | 2.1 Teachers not fully trained in how to use the RtI process to prescribe appropriate interventions in the areas of oral reading fluency and word meaning | 2.1. Train grade level representatives in grades K-5 on how to effectively utilize the RtI process | 2.1. Principal Assistant Principal RtI Coach | 2.1. Weekly Professional learning communities meetings | 2.1. Teachers' effective use of the OCPS RtI Decision Making Form, RtI graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly mini-assessments. |
| CELLA Goal #2: <i>In 2012, 55 % (42) of the students scored at the proficiency level on the reading portion of the CELLA.</i> | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 55 % (42) scored at the proficiency level on reading. | 2.2 Teachers' not implementing ESOL strategies within their lessons | 2.2 Provide teachers with professional development on research based practices when working with ELL students | 2.2 Principal Assistant Principal CRT | 2.2 Classroom walkthroughs Informal/Formal Observations | 2.2 Lesson Plans 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading results 2013 CELLA Results |
| | | 2.3. Student attendance rate | 2.3. Monitor student attendance rates on a bi -weekly basis | 2.3. Registrar Assistant Principal | 2.3. Child Study Team meetings | 2.3. Monthly attendance reports generated from the student management system (SMS) |

| 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. | | 2.1. Limited Vocabulary | 2.1. Introduce a new vocabulary word of the week | 2.1. Principal Assistant Principal | 2.1. Classroom Walk-throughs Teacher Lesson Plans | 2.1. Students' scores on monthly writing prompts |
| CELLA Goal #3: <i>In 2012, 61 % (19) of the students scored at the proficiency level on the writing portion of the CELLA.</i> | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 61 % (19) of the students scored at the proficiency level. | 2.2 Expanded expectations for FCAT Writes/more stringent scoring criteria | 2.2. Reevaluate and adjust writing teaching strategies | 2.2 Classroom Teachers | 2.2 Four school-wide writing prompts administered and reviewed by the principal | 2.2 Teacher writing prompt scores |

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.

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

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | Subtotal:0 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | Subtotal:0 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Provide teachers with professional development on implementing research based ESOL strategies within their lessons. | CCT will provide training and follow-up with teachers on ESOL strategies. | N/A | N/A |
| Understanding the RtI process and how to meet the needs of ELL students. | RtI Coach and CCT will provide training and follow-up on the RtI process. | | |
| | | | Subtotal:0 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | Subtotal: 0 |
| | | | Total: 0 |

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 |
| 1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. | | | 1.2. Automaticity of math facts | 1.2. Continue using V Math Live with 2-5 th students during lab time and at home | 1.2. Classroom teachers Parents | 1.2. Generate V Math Live Reports to monitor progress | 1.2. Mini Benchmarks / Envision Math Assessments/teacher created assessments |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| In June 2012, 22% (56) of students scored at level 3 in mathematics. | 22% (56) of students scored at level 3 in mathematics | 25% of students will score at a level 3 in mathematics | | | | | |
| | | | 1A.2. Students not having the prerequisite skills to achieve grade level mastery | 1A.2. Students who have been identified as needing Tier 2 math intervention will be pulled out for small group instruction with the Math Coach | 1A.2. Math Coach | 1A.2. Classroom Observations Weekly Mini Assessments | 1A.2. 2013FCAT 2.0 Math results |
| | | | 1A.3 Implementation of a new math program (I-READY) | 1A.3 Train our Teachers in grades 3-5 on how to utilize I-READY | 1A.3 Math Coach Principal Assistant Principal | 1A.3 Weekly Mini-Assessments Weekly Classroom Observations | 1A.3 I-READY reports 2013FCAT 2.0 Math results Mini Benchmarks/Envision Math Assessments/teacher created assessments |
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. | | | 1B.1 Automaticity of math facts | 1B.1 Continue using V Math Live | 1B.1 Classroom teachers | 1B.1 Generate V Math Live | 1B.1 Mini Benchmarks / |

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

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

| Mathematics Goal #1B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | with 2-5 th students during lab time and at home. | Parents | Reports to monitor progress | Envision Math Assessments/teacher created assessments |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| In June of 2012, 57% (8) students scored at a level 4, 5 or 6 in mathematics. | 57% (8) students scored at a level 4, 5 or 6 in mathematics | 60% of students will score at a level 4, 5 or 6 in mathematics | | | | | |
| | | | 1B.2. Student attendance rate | 1B.2. Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis | 1B.2. Registrar Assistant Principal | 1B.2. Child study team meetings | 1B.2. Monthly attendance reports generated from the student management system (SMS) |
| | | | 1B.3 Implementation of a new math program (I-READY) | 1B.3 Train our Teachers in grades 3-5 on how to utilize I-READY | 1B.3 Math Coach Principal Assistant Principal | 1B.3 Weekly Mini-Assessments Weekly Classroom Observations | 1B.3 I-READY reports 2013 FCAT Math results Teacher created assessments |

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 Lack of resources to engage high performing students | 2A.1 Train teachers on how to use the Instructional Management System to access resources which are engaging and appealing to high performing students | 2A.1 Math Coach IMS Champion/Co-Champion | 2A.1. Lesson Plans Classroom Observations | 2A.1. Mini Benchmarks Envision Math Assessment Teacher created assessment Results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math assessment |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| In June of 2012, 48% (123) students scored at or above achievement levels 4 and 4 mathematics. | 48% (123) students scored at or above achievement levels 4 and 4 mathematics. | 51% of students will score at or above achievement levels 4 and 5 mathematics. | | | | | |
| | | | 2A.2. Automaticity of math facts | 2A.2. Continue using V Math Live with 2-5 th students during lab time and at home | 2A.2. Classroom teachers, parents | 2A.2. Generate V Math Live Reports to monitor progress | 2A.2. Mini Benchmarks Envision Math Assessments Teacher created assessments |
| | | | 2A.3. Limited differentiated instruction for high performing students in math | 2A.3. Provide extension activities to accelerate math skills already mastered (I-READY) | 2A.3. Classroom teachers Math Coach Gifted Teacher | 2A.3. Informal observations and the use of I-READY and Moby Math | 2A.3. Mini-assessments Benchmark assessments I-READY AND Moby Math reports |
| 2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. | | | 2B.3. Limited differentiated instruction for high performing students in math | 2B.3. Provide extension activities to accelerate math skills already mastered (I-READY) | 2B.3. Classroom teachers Math Coach Gifted Teacher | 2B.3. Informal observations and the use of I-READY and Moby Math. | 2B.3. Mini-assessments I-READY AND Moby Math reports. |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| In June of 2012, 21% (3) of students scored at or above Level 7 in mathematics. | 21% (3) of students scored at or above Level 7 in mathematics. | 24% of students scored at or above Level 7 in mathematics | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| | | 2B.2 Student attendance rate | 2B.2 Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis | 2B.2 Registrar Assistant Principal | 2B.2 Child study team meetings | 2B.2 Monthly attendance reports generated from the student management system (SMS) |
|--|--|---------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|

| 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. Automaticity of math facts | 3A.1. Continue using V Math Live with 2-5 th students during lab time and at home | 3A.1. Classroom teachers, parents | 3A.1. Generate V Math Live Reports to monitor progress | 3A.1. Mini Benchmarks/Envision Math Assessments/teacher created assessments |
| <u>Mathematics Goal</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| #3A: In June 2012, 66% (168) of students made learning gains in mathematics. Increase by 3 to 5% students who become Fluent in Math Operations. | 66% (168) of students made learning gains in mathematics. | 69% of students will make learning gains in mathematics. | | | | | |
| | | | 3A.2 Teachers not fully trained in the RtI process | 3A.2 Train grade level representatives in grades K-5 on how to effectively utilize the RtI process | 3A.2 Principal Assistant Principal RtI Coach | 3A.2 RtI meetings Weekly Professional learning communities meetings | 3A.2 Teachers effective use of the OCPS RtI Decision Making Form, RtI graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly mini-assessments |
| | | | 3A.3. Implementation of a new math intervention program | 3A.3 Train our Teachers in grades 3-5 on how to utilize I-READY | 3A.3 Math Coach Principal Assistant Principal | 3A.3 Weekly Mini-Assessments Weekly Classroom Observations | 3A.3 I-READY reports 2013FCAT 2.0 Math results Mini Benchmark Assessments |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | Envision Math Assessments Teacher created assessments | |
| 3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3B: <i>In June of 2012 50% (4) students made learning gains in mathematics.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | 3B.1. Automaticity of math facts | 3B.1. Continue using V Math Live with 2-5 th students during lab time and at home | 3B.1. Classroom teachers, parents | 3B.1. Generate V Math Live Reports to monitor progress | 3B.1. Mini Benchmarks Assessments Teacher created assessments |
| | 50% (4) students made learning gains in mathematics | 75% of students will make learning gains in mathematics | 3B.2. Teachers not fully trained in the RtI process | 3B.2. Train grade level representatives in grades K-5 on how to effectively utilize the RtI process | 3B.2. Principal Assistant Principal RtI Coach | 3B.2. RtI meetings Weekly Professional learning communities meetings | 3B.2. Teachers effective use of the OCPS RtI Decision Making Form, RtI graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly mini-assessments |
| | | | 3B.3. Implementation of a new math intervention program | 3B.3. Train our Teachers in grades 3-5 on how to utilize I-READY | 3B.3. Math Coach Principal Assistant Principal | 3B.3. Weekly Mini-Assessments Weekly Classroom Observations | 3B.3. I-READY reports 2013 FAA 2Math results Mini Benchmark Assessments Teacher created assessments |

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. Automaticity of math facts | 4A.1. Continue using V Math Live with 2-5 th students during lab time and at home | 4A.1. Classroom teachers Parents | 4A.1. Generate V Math Live Reports to monitor progress | 4A.1. Mini Benchmarks/Envision Math Assessments/teacher created assessments |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| In June 2012, 45% (114) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. | 45% (114) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. | 51% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in math. | | | | | |
| | | | 4A.2. Implementation of a new math intervention program (I-READY and STAMS) | 4A.32 Train our Teachers in grades 3-5) on how to utilize I-READY and STAMS | 4A.2 Math Coach Principal Assistant Principal | 4A.2 Weekly Mini-Assessments Weekly Classroom Observations | 4A.2 I-READY reports 2013FCAT 2.0 Math results Mini Benchmark Assessments Envision Math Assessments Teacher created assessments |
| | | | 4A.3 Lack of prerequisite skills to master grade level benchmarks | 4A.3 Provide morning tutoring 5 times per week coordinated by Math Coach | 4A.3 Math Coach Principal Assistant Principal | 4A.3 Classroom Observations Weekly Mini-Assessments. | 4A.3 2013FCAT 2.0 Math results Benchmark Assessments |
| 4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. | | | 4B.1. Automaticity of math facts | 4B.1. Continue using V Math Live with 2-5 th students during | 4B.1. Classroom teachers Parents | 4B.1. Generate V Math Live Reports to monitor | 4B.1. Mini Benchmarks Math Assessments |

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

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

| <u>Mathematics Goal</u> #4B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | lab time and at home | | progress | Teacher created assessments |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| In June of 2012 , 50% (4) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics. | 50% (4) students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics. | 75% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics. | | | | | |
| | | | 4B2. Implementation of a new math intervention program (I-READY) | 4B.2 Train our Teachers in grades 3-5) on how to utilize I-READY | 4B.2 Math Coach Principal Assistant Principal | 4B.2 Weekly Mini- Assessments Weekly Classroom Observations | 4B.2 I-READY reports 2013FCAT Math results Mini Benchmark Assessments Teacher created assessments |
| | | | 4B.3 Teachers not fully trained in the RtI process | 4B.3 Train grade level representatives in grades K- 5 on how to effectively utilize the RtI process | 4B.3 Principal Assistant Principal RtI Coach | 4B.3 RtI meetings Weekly Professional learning communities meetings | 4B.3 Teachers effective use of the OCPS RtI Decision Making Form, RtI graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly mini- assessments |

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%. Mathematics Goal #5A: In June of 2012, FCAT data showed that 81% (191) of students in the identified AYP subgroups scored at or above the proficiency level in math. | Baseline data 2010-2011 | | | | | | | |
| | 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. Mathematics Goal #5B: In 2012, FCAT 2.0 data indicated our percentage of students in our AYP subgroups that did not make satisfactory progress in math are as follows: White: 13% (14) Black : 15% (2) Hispanic: 23% (25) Asian: 20% (2)) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* Percent making satisfactory progress in math: White:87% Black:85% Hispanic:77% Asian:80% American Indian: N/A | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Percent making satisfactory progress in math: White: 89% Black: 86% Hispanic:79% Asian:82% American Indian: N/A | 5B.1. Teachers lack of understanding the RtI process | 5B.1. Provide teachers with professional development on the RtI process and how to determine if the interventions which are in place are effective | 5B.1. Principal Assistant Principal RtI Coach Math Coach Classroom Teachers CRT | 5B.1. Monthly RtI meetings | 5B.1. Use of RtI graphs to monitor students' progress | |
| | | | 5B.2 Limited use of differentiated instruction for all students | 5B.2 Provide staff development and modeling in differentiated instruction and Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 strategies for all teachers | 5B.2 Classroom teachers, CRT Math Coach | 5B.2 Progress Monitoring/ Collaborative Team Time Meetings Mini Observations Analyze RtI graphs from Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 strategies | 5B.2 Benchmark Assessments RtI Graphs Envision Assessments Weekly Mini-Assessments | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| | | 5B.3 Teachers not using the Envision Re-Teach kit to provide supplemental instruction for struggling learners | 5B.3 Provide staff development for teachers on how to best utilize the Envision Re-Teach kit for struggling learners | 5B.3 Math Coach Principal Assistant Principal | 5B.3 Mini-Assessments Classroom Observations | 5B.3 Benchmark Assessments Envision Assessments 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math results |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|

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. Mathematics Goal #5C: In June 2012, 43% (15) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | 5C.1. Automaticity of math facts | 5C.1. Continue using V Math Live with 2-5 th students during lab time and at home. | 5C.1. Classroom teachers Parents Math Coach | 5C.1. Generate V Math Live Reports to monitor progress | 5C.1. Mini Benchmarks Envision Math Assessments Teacher created assessments 2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |
| | 43 % of ELL students did make satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 53 % of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 5C.2 Teachers' not implementing ESOL strategies within their lessons | 5C.2 Provide teachers with professional development on research based practices when working with ELL students | 5C.2 Principal Assistant Principal Math Coach CRT | 5C.2 Classroom walk-throughs Informal/Formal Observations | 5C.2 Lesson Plans 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math results |
| | | | 5C.3 Limited use of differentiated instruction for all students | 5C.3 Provide staff development and modeling in differentiated instruction and Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies for all teachers | 5C.3 Classroom teachers CRT Math Coach RtI Coach | 5C.3 Progress Monitoring/ Collaborative Team Time Meetings Mini Observations Analyze RtI graphs from Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies | 5C.3 Benchmark Assessments RtI Graphs Envision Assessments Weekly Mini-Assessments |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | | | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| <u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| In June of 2012, (16) 70% of SWD did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 70% of SWD did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 73% of SWD will make satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 5D.1. Automaticity of math facts | 5D.1. Continue using V Math Live with 2-5 th students during lab time and at home | 5D.1. Classroom teachers Parents Math Coach | 5D.1. Generate V Math Live Reports to monitor progress | 5D.1. Mini Benchmarks Envision Math Assessments Teacher created assessments 2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |
| | | | 5D.2. Scheduling of ESE students support to maximize instructional time | 5D.2. Adjust ESE program model to include co-teaching and continue inclusion of self-contained students into regular ed. classroom | 5D.2. ESE teachers Resource teachers Math Coach | 5D.2. Review student performance through on-going progress monitoring | 5D.2. Results of Benchmark testing |
| | | | 5D.3 Teachers not fully trained in the RtI process Bi-Weekly RtI meetings | 5D.3 Train grade level representatives in grades K-5 on how to effectively utilize the RtI process | 5D.3 Principal Assistant Principal RtI Coach Math Coach | 5D.3. Weekly Professional learning communities meetings | 5D.3 Teachers' effective use of the OCPS RtI Decision Making Form, RtI graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly mini-assessments |

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. Mathematics Goal #5E: In June 2012, 25% (35) ED students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | 5E.1 Teachers not fully trained in the RtI process | 5E.1 Train grade level representatives in grades K-5 on how to effectively utilize the RtI process | 5E.1 Principal Assistant Principal RtI Coach Math Coach | 5E.1. Weekly Professional learning communities meetings | 5E.1 Teachers' effective use of the OCPS RtI Decision Making Form, RtI graphing template and progress monitoring through weekly mini-assessments. |
| | 75 % of students made satisfactory progress in mathematics | 78 % of students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 5E.2. Teachers are unaware of specific students requiring additional support due to socio-economic status | 5E.2. Identifying Economically Disadvantaged students and monitoring their progress through Collaborative team PLCs | 5E.2. Registrar, Classroom teachers | 5E. 2 PLCs will monitor student progress during collaborative team time Create an informational data board using a color coded system to identify specific student groups | 5E.2 Teacher progress monitoring data |
| | | | 5E3. Automaticity of math facts | 5E.3. Continue using V Math Live with 2-5 th students during lab time and at home | 5E.3. Classroom teachers Parents Math Coach | 5E.3. Generate V Math Live Reports to monitor progress | 5E. 3. Mini Benchmarks Envision Math Assessments Teacher created assessments 2013 FCAT 2.0 Results |

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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <u>Mathematics Goal</u> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| #1A: | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <u>Mathematics Goal</u> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| #1B: | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | 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 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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| <u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | N/A | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | N/A | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Mathematics Goal #3A: | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Mathematics Goal #3B: | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| N/A | | N/A | | | | | |
| N/A | | N/A | | | | | |
| 4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #4B:</u> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| N/A | | N/A | | | | | |
| N/A | | N/A | | | | | |

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> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this N/A box.</i> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | 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 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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <u>Mathematics Goal</u> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <u>#5E:</u> | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Mathematics Goal #1: | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.2. |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Mathematics Goal #2: | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Mathematics Goal #3: | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | 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 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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Mathematics Goal #4: | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A |
| | | | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. 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 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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. N/A | 2.2. N/A | 2.2. N/A | 2.2. N/A | 2.2. N/A |
| | | | 2.3. N/A | 2.3. N/A | 2.3. N/A | 2.3. N/A | 2.3. N/A |

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%. | Baseline data 2010-2011 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Algebra 1 Goal #3A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> 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. | | 3B.1. N/A | 3B.1. N/A | 3B.1. N/A | 3B.1. N/A | 3B.1. N/A | |
| Algebra 1 Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | | | | | |
| | | | 3B.2. N/A | 3B.2. N/A | 3B.2. N/A | 3B.2. N/A | |
| | | | 3B.3. N/A | 3B.3. N/A | 3B.3. N/A | 3B.3. N/A | |

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: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| N/A | | | 3C.2. N/A | 3C.2. N/A | 3C.2. N/A | 3C.2. N/A | 3C.2. N/A |
| | | | 3C.3. N/A | 3C.3. N/A | 3C.3. N/A | 3C.3. N/A | 3C.3. 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 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: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| N/A | | | 3D.2. N/A | 3D.2. N/A | 3D.2. N/A | 3D.2. N/A | 3D.2. N/A |
| | | | 3D.3. N/A | 3D.3. N/A | 3D.3. N/A | 3D.3. N/A | 3D.3. N/A |

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: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| N/A | | | 3E.2. N/A | 3E.2. N/A | 3E.2. N/A | 3E.2. N/A | 3E.2. N/A |
| | | | 3E.3. N/A | 3E.3. N/A | 3E.3. N/A | 3E.3. N/A | 3E.3. N/A |

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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| N/A | | | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A |
| | | | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. 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 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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| N/A | | | 2.2. N/A | 2.2. N/A | 2.2. N/A | 2.2. N/A | 2.2. N/A |
| | | | 2.3. N/A | 2.3. N/A | 2.3. N/A | 2.3. N/A | 2.3. N/A |

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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> 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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box</i> N/A x. | | | 3B.1. N/A | 3B.1. N/A | 3B.1. N/A | 3B.1. N/A | 3B.1. N/A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></td> <td><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>White:</td> <td>White:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black:</td> <td>Black:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic:</td> <td>Hispanic:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian:</td> <td>Asian:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>American Indian:</td> <td>American Indian:</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | White: | White: | Black: | Black: | Hispanic: | Hispanic: | Asian: | Asian: | American Indian: | American Indian: | 3B.2. N/A | 3B.2. N/A | 3B.2. N/A | 3B.2. N/A | 3B.2. N/A |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White: | White: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black: | Black: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic: | Hispanic: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian: | Asian: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| American Indian: | American Indian: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 3B.3. N/A | 3B.3. N/A | 3B.3. N/A | 3B.3. N/A | 3B.3. N/A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Geometry Goal #3C: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 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 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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Geometry Goal #3D: | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| N/A | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| N/A | | | 3E.2. N/A | 3E.2. N/A | 3E.2. N/A | 3E.2. N/A | 3E.2. N/A |
| | | | 3E.3. N/A | 3E.3. N/A | 3E.3. N/A | 3E.3. N/A | 3E.3. N/A |
| | | | | | | | |

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 |
| I-READY | 3-5 | Lee-Ann Fink | 3 rd -5 th teachers | October, 2012 | Attendance Sheets I-READY reports | Principal, Assistant Principal, and Math Coach |
| Envision Math Reteach/Extension training | K-5 | Lee-Ann Fink | All classroom teachers, SLD resource teacher | August, 2012-ongoing | Attendance records and meeting minutes | Team Leaders and Math Coach |
| RtI Follow-Up | K-5 | RtI Coach | K-5 teachers | October, 2012-ongoing | Attendance records and meeting minutes | RtI Coach, Principal, and Assistant Principal |

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

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 |
| STAMS | Diagnose and provide differentiated instruction in mathematics, improve students' mathematics competency by focusing on key foundational math skills | General Budget | 1260.41 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal:1260.41 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| V Math Live | Internet based intervention program | General Budget | 3000.00 |
| I-READY | Internet based enrichment and intervention program | General Budget | 4830.00 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal:7830.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal:9090.41 |
| | | | Total:9090.41 |

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. Science Goal #1A: In June 2012, 43% (34) students scored at achievement level 3 in science. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | 1A.1. Continued implementation of new 5 th grade NGSSS, STEM and Essential Labs | 1A.1. Provide teachers with follow-up training on NGSSS in Science, STEM and Essential Labs | 1A.1. Classroom Teachers Science Resource teacher | 1A.1. Lesson Plans Classroom Observations | 1A. Data from the Science Edusoft Benchmark assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science results |
| | 43% (34) of students scored a level 3. | 46% of students will score at a level 3. | 1A.2. Implementation of new science resource (Science Fusion) | 1A.2. Provide ongoing professional development on the NGSSS and Science Fusion | 1A.2. Science Resource teacher | 1A.2. Lesson Plans Classroom Observations | 1A.2. Data from the Science Edusoft Benchmark assessment 2013 FC AT 2.0 Science results |
| | | | 1A.3. Teachers not having time to plan with the science resource teacher | 1A.3. Provide Fifth Grade teachers and Science teacher resource with a common planning time in order to develop a plan to increase student knowledge of science vocabulary | 1A.3. Principal Assistant Principal Fifth grade team Science Resource teacher | 1A.3. Provide Fifth grade teachers and Science resource teacher multiple opportunities to meet to discuss student data and the effectiveness of the plan developed Science teacher will host a weekly multi-grade level PLC | 1A.3. Data from the Science Edusoft Benchmark assessment Classroom assessments FCAT 2.0 Science results |

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

| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. | | | 1B.1. Continued implementation of new 5 th grade ACCESS points, STEM and Essential Labs | 1B.1. Provide teachers with follow-up training on ACCESS points in Science, STEM and the Essential Labs | 1B.1. Classroom Teachers Science Resource teacher | 1B.1. Lesson Plans Classroom Observations | 1B.1. Classroom assessments 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science results |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Science Goal #1B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| <i>In June 2012, 22% (9) students scored at levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</i> | 22% (2) students scored at a level 4, 5 and 6. | 26% of students will score at a level 4, 5 and 6. | | | | | |
| | | | 1B.2 Teachers not having time to plan with the science resource teacher | 1B.2 Provide Fifth grade teachers and Science Resource teacher with a common planning time in order to develop a plan to increase student knowledge of science vocabulary | 1B.2 Principal Assistant Principal Fifth grade Team Science resource Teacher | 1B.2 Provide Fifth grade teachers and Science teacher multiple opportunities to meet to discuss student data and the effectiveness of the plan developed. Science teacher will host a weekly multi-grade level PLC | 1B.2 Classroom assessments FCAT 2.0 Science results |
| | | | 1B.3. Student attendance rate | 1B.3. Monitor student attendance rates on a bi -weekly basis | 1B.3. Registrar Assistant Principal | 1B.3. Child Study Team meetings. | 1B.3. Monthly attendance reports generated from the student management system (SMS) |

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. Science Goal #2A: In June of 2012, 17% (13) students scored at or above achievement levels 4 and 5 in science. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>17% (13) students achieved at or above a level 4 and 5.</i> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>21% of students will achieve at or above level 4 and 5.</i> | 2A.1. Implementation of new science resource (Science Fusion) | 2A.1. Provide ongoing professional development on the NGSSS and Science Fusion | 2A.1. Science Resource teacher | 2A.1. Lesson Plans Classroom Observations | 2A.1. Data from the Science Edusoft Benchmark assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science results |
| | | | 2A.2. Students not having enrichment opportunities in science | 2A.2. Science resource teacher and classroom teacher will work collaboratively to provide enrichment opportunities in the science lab | 2A.2. Classroom teacher Science Resource teacher | 2A.2. Lesson Plans Classroom Observations | 2A.2. Data from the Science Edusoft Benchmark assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science results |
| | | | 2A.3. Teachers not comfortable doing inquiry based science lessons | 2A.3. Schedule 3 rd -5 th grade classroom in Science lab each week to co-teach inquiry based science activities | 2A.3. Classroom Teachers, Science Resource Teacher | 2A.3. Review lesson plans for specific inquiry-based strategies, on-going teacher observations | 2A.3. Data from the Science Edusoft Benchmark assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science results. Review lesson plans, on-going teacher observation data |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| 2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. | | | 2B.1. Implementation of new science resource (Science Fusion) | 2B.1. Provide ongoing professional development on the ACCESS POINTS and Science Fusion | 2B.1. Science Resource teacher | 2B.1. Lesson Plans Classroom Observations | 2B.1. Classroom Assessments 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science results. |
| Science Goal #2B: In June of 2012, 33% (3) students scored at or above achievement level 7 in science. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 33% (3) students scored at or above achievement level 7 in science. | 35% of students will score at or above achievement level 7 in science. | 2B.2 Teachers not comfortable doing inquiry based science lessons | 2B.2 Schedule 3 rd -5 th grade classroom in Science lab each week to co-teach inquiry based science activities | 2B.2 Classroom Teachers, Science Resource Teacher | 2B.2 Review lesson plans for specific inquiry-based strategies, on-going teacher observations | 2B.2 Classroom Assessments 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science results Review lesson plans, on-going teacher observation data |
| | | | 2B.3. Students not having enrichment opportunities in science | 2B.3 Science resource teacher and classroom teacher will work collaboratively to provide enrichment opportunities in the science lab | 2B.3 Classroom teacher Science Resource teacher | 2B.3 Lesson Plans Classroom Observations | 2B.3 Classroom Assessments 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science results |

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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A |
| | | | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. 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 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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. N/A | 2.2. N/A | 2.2. N/A | 2.2. N/A | 2.2. N/A |
| | | | 2.3. N/A | 2.3. N/A | 2.3. N/A | 2.3. N/A | 2.3. N/A |

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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]).

| 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: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A | 1.2. N/A |
| | | | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. N/A | 1.3. N/A | 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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Biology 1 Goal #2: | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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 |
| Science Fusion | K-5 | Patricia Hotaling | School-Wide | August, 2012 | Classroom Observations | Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Resource teacher |
| Science PLC | K-5 | Patricia Hotaling | School-wide | Once a week | Weekly PLC Meeting notes Scheduled in advance | Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Resource teacher |
| | | | | | | |

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 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Brain Pop | BrainPop is a web-based animated, curriculum with content that supports educators. Content is aligned to NGSSS. The site displays quizzes, games, experiments and other related content that students can use interactively to reinforce the lessons. | General Fund | \$1465.00 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: 1465.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |

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

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

| | | | Subtotal: |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal 1465.00: |
| | | | Total: 1465.00 |

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 Student attendance rate | 1A.1 Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis | 1A.1 Registrar Assistant Principal | 1A.1 Child Study Team meetings. | 1A.1. Monthly attendance reports generated from the student management system (SMS) |
| Writing Goal #1A: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| In June of 2012, 81% (65) students scored at achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing. | 81% (65) of students scored at achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing. | 84% of students will score at achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing. | | | | | |
| | | | 1A.2. Inconsistency between scoring techniques | 1A.2. Purchase Write Score to ensure consistency amongst the grade level | 1A.2. Principal Assistant Principal CRT | 1A.2. Disaggregate the data received from Write Score | 1A.2. Results from the 2013 FCAT Writing assessment. |
| | | | 1A.3 Rigorous expectations for FCAT Writes/more stringent scoring criteria | 1A.3 Reevaluate and adjust writing teaching strategies | 1A.3 Classroom Teachers | 1A.3 Four school-wide writing prompts administered and reviewed by the principal. | 1A.3 Teacher writing prompt scores |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. | | | 1B.1 Student attendance rate | 1B.1 Monitor student attendance rates on a bi -weekly basis | 1B.1 Registrar Assistant Principal | 1B.1 Child Study Team meetings. | 1B.1 Monthly attendance reports generated from the student management system (SMS) |
| Writing Goal #1B: In June of 2012, 63% (5) students scored at 4 or higher in writing. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 63% (5) students scored at 4 or higher in writing. | 67% of students will score at 4 or higher in writing. | | | | | |
| | | | 1B.2. Inconsistency between scoring techniques | 1B.2. Purchase write score to ensure consistency amongst the grade level | 1B.2. Principal Assistant Principal CRT | 1B.2. Disaggregate the data received from Write Score | 1B.2. Results from the 2013 FCAT Writing assessment. |
| | | 1B.3 Rigorous expectations for FCAT more stringent scoring criteria | 1B.3 Reevaluate and adjust writing teaching strategies. | 1B.3 Classroom Teachers | 1B.3 Four school-wide writing prompts administered and reviewed by the principal. | 1B.3 Teacher writing prompt scores | |

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 | K-5 | Grade level representative | School-wide | Monthly | PLC meeting notes | Grade level representative |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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 | A scoring company that provides formative data to increase quality of student writing. | General Fund | 1130.00 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: 1130.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total:1130.00 |

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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Civics Goal #1: | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.2. |
| | N/A | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Civics Goal #2: | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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

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

| | |
|--|------------------|
| | Subtotal: |
| | Total: |

End of Civics Goals

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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| U.S. History Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 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 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. | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| U.S. History Goal #2: | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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

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

| | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | 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 sending students to school on time | 1.1 Send connect orange messages informing parents of school hours Including school hours on the parent newsletter | 1.1 Principal Assistant Principal Registrar | 1.1 Generate monthly attendance reports utilizing SMS | 1.1. At least a 3% decrease in the amount of absences and tardiness at the end of the 2012-2013 school year in comparison to the previous year |
| Attendance Goal #1: | <u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u> | | | | | |
| In June of 2012, the average attendance rate for the school year was 96 % (506) | <i>97% of students school on a daily basis</i> | <i>99% of students will attend school on a daily basis</i> | | | | | |
| | <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> | | | | | |
| | <i>21% (115) of students</i> | <i>18 % of students</i> | | | | | |
| | <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> | | | | | |
| | <i>10% (55) of students</i> | <i>7% of students</i> | | | | | |

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 |
| N/A | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

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 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Suspension Goal #1: In June of 2012, the total number of suspensions for the school year was 3% (18) | | | 1.1 Lack of differentiated support for high needs students with disruptive behaviors. | 1.1 Collaborative team meetings with the behavior specialist and teachers to develop individualized student behavior plans. | 1.1 Behavior Specialist Principal Assistant Principal | 1.1 Classroom Walkthroughs | 1.1 Number of discipline referrals that result in out of school suspension. Student Success rate with Individualized Behavior plans. |
| 2012 Total Number of In – School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions | | | | | | |
| 1% (1) | 0 | | | | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School | | | | | | |
| 1 | 0 | | | | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | | | | |
| 3% (20) | 1% | | | | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | | | | | | |
| 3% (18) | 1% | | | | | | |

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 |
| CHAMPS | K-5 | Principal Selected teachers who have already been trained on CHAMPS procedures. | Teachers in grade levels K-5 and special area | On-going | Classroom Walkthroughs | Principal Assistant Principal Behavior Specialist |
| Individualized Behavior Plans | Select teachers in K-5 | Behavior Specialist | Select teachers in K-5 | On-going | Classroom Walkthroughs Student success rate with behavior plan | Behavior Specialist |
| | | | | | | |

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

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

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

| Other | | | |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

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 Student attendance rate | 1.1 Monitor student attendance rates on a bi-weekly basis | 1.1 Registrar Assistant Principal | 1.1 Bi-Weekly Child Study Team meetings. | 1.1 Monthly attendance reports generated from the student management system (SMS) |
| <u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> | <u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 5% (5) of students in were retained | 3% of students will be retained | | | | | |
| Increase by 3 to 5% students who read on grade level by age 9. | <u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u> | | | | | |
| In June 2012, 5% (5) students were retained in 3 rd grade. | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. Limited use of differentiated instruction for all students | 1.2. Provide staff development and modeling in differentiated instruction and Tier 1 and Tier 2 strategies for all teachers | 1.2 Classroom teachers, CRT, Reading Intervention teachers | 1.2 Progress Monitoring/ Collaborative Team Time Meetings Mini Observations Analyze RtI graphs from Tier 1 and Tier 2 strategies | 1.2 Benchmark Tests/FAIR/Imagine It Reading Assessments RtI Graphs |
| | | | 1.3 Students not having the prerequisite skills to achieve grade level mastery | 1.3 Students who have been identified as needing Tier 3 reading intervention will receive targeted small group instruction | 1.3 Principal Assistant Principal Reading Intervention Teacher Reading Coach | 1.3 Weekly Mini Assessments Classroom Observations | 1.3 Progress Monitoring data 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0 results |

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 | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|--|---|--|---|
| <small>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</small> | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| PLC using data to inform instruction. | K-5 | Identified grade level leadership team member | School-wide | Weekly | Scheduled in advance Member of the leadership team assigned to each grade | Principal Assistant Principal |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

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. Communication gap between home and school | 1.1. Principal will continue monthly Connect Orange phone calls, and distribute school wide newsletters to all families | 1.1. Principal Assistant Principal | 1.1. Connect Orange Messages and Monthly Newsletters | 1.1. Connect Orange Messages and Monthly Newsletters |
| Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>During the 2011-2012 school year, Deerwood logged a total of 3,380.53 (153 volunteers) hours.</i> | 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* | | | | | |
| | 3,380.53 (153) volunteer hours | 4,394.70 volunteer hours | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2 Parents limited time to attend events | 1.2 Weekend events Combine events Provide dinner Provide structured child care activities | 1.2 Principal Assistant Principal | 1.2 Parent Survey Review sign in sheets at the end of events to monitor progress | 1.2 Sign-In sheets |

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 |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

| STEM Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| <p><u>STEM Goal #1:</u></p> <p>To increase the percent of teachers using problem based learning.</p> | <p>1.1. Teachers limited knowledge of STEM and how to utilize problem based learning when instructing students</p> | <p>1.1. Provide on-going professional development on STEM and its impact on classroom instruction</p> | <p>1.1. Principal Assistant Principal Science Resource Teacher Math Coach</p> | <p>1.1. Classroom observations</p> | <p>1.1. Lesson Plans</p> |

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 |
| STEM | K-5 | Patricia Hotaling Lee Ann Fink | School-Wide | TBD | Classroom observations | Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Resource Teacher and Math Coach |
| FCR-STEM | Selected teachers | Patricia Hotaling | K-5 | December | Sharing of ideas through PLC Classroom observations Staff Development | Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Resource Teacher and Math Coach |
| | | | | | | |

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 | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| FCR-STEM Conference | A conference which is focused on assisting teachers with increasing their teaching skills and knowledge in the "STEM" fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics. | General Budget | TBD |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal:TBD |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | Subtotal:TBD |
| | | | Total:TBD |

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 | | | | |
|---|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
| CTE Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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

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 | | | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Additional Goal #1: | <u>2012 Current Level :*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> | Limited control of the number of ESE students due to Deerwood being an ESE center site | Continued Staff Development supporting RtI Process and Procedure Utilization of RtI processes and procedures | Staffing Specialist, ESE teachers, and Regular Ed Teachers | PLC and Staffing meetings | RtI Tools and evaluation forms |
| Decrease disproportionate classification in Special Education During the 2011-2012 , 41 % (70) of Hispanic students were classified in Special Education. | 41% (70) Hispanic students were classified in Special Education | 37 % of Hispanic students will be classified in Special Education. | | | | | |

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

*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 |
| 2. Additional Goal | | | See SIP GOAL #3A (MATH) | See SIP GOAL #3A (MATH) | See SIP GOAL #3A (MATH) | See SIP GOAL #3A (MATH) | See SIP GOAL #3A (MATH) |
| <u>Additional Goal #2:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level :*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> | | | | | |
| Increase by 3-5 %- Students who become Fluent in Math Operations | See SIP GOAL #3A (MATH) | See SIP GOAL #3A (MATH) | | | | | |
| See SIP GOAL #3A (MATH) | | | See SIP GOAL #3A (MATH) | See SIP GOAL #3A (MATH) | See SIP GOAL #3A (MATH) | See SIP GOAL #3A (MATH) | See SIP GOAL #3A (MATH) |

| 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 | | | See SIP GOAL #5B | See SIP GOAL #5B | See SIP GOAL #5B | See SIP GOAL #5B | See SIP GOAL #5B |
| <u>Additional Goal #3:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level :*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> | | | | | |
| Decrease the Achievement Gap for each identified Subgroup by June 30, 2016 | See SIP GOAL #5B | See SIP GOAL #5B | | | | | |
| See SIP GOAL #5B | | | See SIP GOAL #5B | See SIP GOAL #5B | See SIP GOAL #5B | See SIP GOAL #5B | See SIP GOAL #5B |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|--|--|

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

| Additional Goal(s) | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| 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 | | | 1.1 Students having difficulties understanding the importance of setting goals and being organized | 1.1 Teachers will explicitly teach 3-5 grade students how to set short and long term goals Teachers will show students how to organize binders and explain how organizational skills are essential to future success | 1.1 Classroom Teachers | 1.1 Classroom Observations | 1.1 Standardized Binder system across grade levels. |
| Additional Goal #4: | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |
| Increase College and Career readiness | <i>During the 2011-2012 school year, 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teachers implemented Year Two of Destination College.</i> | <i>Continue teaching students goal setting and binder organization</i> | | | | | |

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 | | | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Additional Goal #5: Increase by 3-5% -The percent of VPK students who will enter elementary school ready based on FLKRS data We do not have VPK at Deerwood Elementary School. | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| | N/A | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| 6. Additional Goal | | | See SIP Goal #1A | See SIP Goal #1A | See SIP Goal #1A | See SIP Goal #1A | See SIP Goal #1A |
| Additional Goal #6 All elementary students will read independently on grade level by age nine. See SIP Goal #1A | See SIP Goal #1A | See SIP Goal #1A | See SIP Goal #1A | See SIP Goal #1A | See SIP Goal #1A | See SIP Goal #1A | See SIP Goal #1A |
| | See SIP Goal #1A | See SIP Goal #1A | | | | | |
| | See SIP Goal #1A | | | | | | |

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 | | | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.1 |
| Additional Goal #7 | | | Lack of opportunities for minority students who are identified as performing above grade level to participate in enrichment activities | Gifted teacher will work collaborative with teachers to disaggregate data to determine students who would benefit from gifted services | Gifted Teacher Classroom Teacher School Psychologist | Classroom observations Lesson Plans | Percent of minority students who are recommended for gifted testing. |
| Increase the enrollment and performance in gifted program. In June of 2012, 25% (10) of students enrolled in the gifted program were minorities. | | | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | |
| | | | <i>25% of students in the gifted program are minority.</i> | <i>28% of students in the gifted program will be represented by minority students.</i> | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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 |
| RtI | PreK-5 Teachers | RtI Team | PreK-5 Teachers | TBD | PLC and Staffing meetings, progress monitoring | RtI Tools and Evaluation Forms |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

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: \$21,510 |
| CELLA Budget | Total: 0 |
| Mathematics Budget | Total: \$9090.41 |
| Science Budget | Total: \$1465.00 |
| Writing Budget | Total: \$1130.00 |
| 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: 0 |
| | Grand Total:\$33,195.41 |

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. |
|---|
| TBD |

| Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year. |
|--|
| TBD |

| Describe the projected use of SAC funds. | Amount |
|--|--------|
| TBD | |
| | |
| | |