

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



## Buck Lake Elementary School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

**PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS**

**School Information**

School Name: Buck Lake Elementary	District Name: Leon
Principal: Eydie Sands Tricquet	Superintendent: Jackie Pons
SAC Chair: Erin Cuzzort	Date of School Board Approval: October 2012

**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.

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	Eydie Tricquet	Bachelor of Science in Special Education. Masters of Science in Special Education Educational Specialist in Educational Leadership, Florida Certification in the areas of SLD/EH/VE K-12, Educational Leadership,	3 year	11 years	Buck Lake Elementary, Principal 09/10 “A”, 10-11 “A”, 11-12 “A” Springwood Elementary, Assistant Principal, 08/09 “A” Cobb Middle School 07/08 “A” and Adequate Yearly Progress Assistant Principal Desoto Trail Elementary 7/03 – 6/04 “A” Assistant Principal Ft. Braden School “A”, “C” 7/01 - 6/03 Assistant Principal

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Assistant Principal	Betty McKay	Bachelor of Science-Early childhood; Masters in Elementary Education; Specialist in Educational Leadership	1 year	8 years	Buck Lake Elementary, Assistant Principal 11/12 "A"; Assistant Principal Woodville Elementary 2004/05 "B", 05/06 "B"; 06/07 "C"; 07/08 "C"; 08/09 "B"; 09/10 "B"; 10/11 "A"
---------------------	-------------	--	--------	---------	---

### Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Teresa Hollis	Masters in Reading Elementary Education K-5 ESOL, Early Childhood	5	8	2008/2009 – Buck Lake Elementary – School Grade “A” AYP/Y 2009/2010 – Buck Lake Elementary- School Grade “A” , AYP/N, 88%/Y 2010/2011 – Buck Lake Elementary – School Grade – “A”, AYP Yes 2011/2012 – Buck Lake Elementary – School Grade – “A”, AYP Yes

### Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Teacher Interview Day	Eydie Tricquet	June 2012
2. PATS Hiring System	Eydie Tricquet	On-Going
3. Soliciting referrals from current Employees	Assistant Principal	On-Going

**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 who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
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	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
57	0%	19% (11)	21% (12)	60% (34)	29% (17)	100%	10% (6)	19% (11)	15% (9)

***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
No Beginning Teachers			

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

## 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..

**Eydie Tricquet, Principal:** Provides vision, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RTI, ensures implementation of intervention support, ensures adequate professional development is provided to support RTI and communicates with outside stakeholders regarding school-based RTI.

**Laura York, SLP; Betty McKay, Assistant Principal:** Provides information about intervention instruction, participates in student data collection, and collaborates with general education teachers.

**Teresa Hollis, Reading Coach:** Participates in student data collection and evaluation of data, collaborates with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies and assists with design and delivery of professional development relative to implementation of effective reading strategies.

**Robert Grandal, School Psychologist:** Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates implementation of intervention plans. Provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities.

**Cathy Shields, Program Specialist:** Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates implementation of intervention plans. Provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities.

**Each Grade Level:** One representative from each grade level provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, and collaborates with other staff to ensure implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction and support.

**Sarah Mullinax, Guidance Counselor and Referral Coordinator:** Assist with the data gathering process and paperwork completion, collaborates with general and RtI teachers

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?

**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 school RTI Leadership team focuses on developing and maintaining a problem-solving system to ensure optimal student achievement for all students. The team meets twice a month. The first meeting is with Grade levels to discuss classroom data collection and to monitor student's progress. The second meeting is to look at school wide data collection and to compare classroom data with other schools, students, etc. Each meeting include reviewing student data (screening, progress monitoring) and implementation plans. The review of data will facilitate identification of students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate or high risk for not achieving benchmarks. Based on evaluation of data and identification of student needs the team will identify professional development and resources needed.

*The school RTI Leadership team focuses on developing and maintaining a problem-solving system to ensure optimal student achievement for all students. The team meets at least once a month, but more often if needed. Examples of activities during weekly meetings include reviewing student data (screening, progress monitoring). The review of data will facilitate identification of students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate or high risk for not achieving benchmarks. Based on evaluation of data and identification of student needs the team will identify professional development and resources needed.*

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?

The RTI Leadership team met to give input in developing the SIP. The team provided data, helped set goals and expectations, and suggested strategies that

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

would ensure attainment of instructional goals. The team will also collaborate with the School Advisory Council to provide data when needed.
<b>MTSS Implementation</b>
<p><b>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 Reading:</b> <i>Baseline data</i> is obtained through the AIMSweb assessment and previous test information. <i>Progress Monitoring</i> is obtained through the administration of AIMSweb, Curriculum Based Measurements, SuccessMaker5 and other FCAT simulation assessments. (FOCUS mini-assessments); and teacher made assessments. <i>Midyear data</i> is obtained through AIMSweb assessments, SuccessMaker, and other FCAT simulation assessments. End of year data is obtained through AIMSweb, FCAT, and SuccessMaker.</p> <p><b>Mathematics:</b> <i>Baseline data</i> is obtained through the GOMath Pre-test baseline measure, and AIMSweb assessments. The data will be collected through an excel spreadsheet or by a Scantron application file. <i>Progress Monitoring</i> is obtained through the administration of AIMSweb math assessment, GOMath Assessment Guide tests, Curriculum Based Measurements, SuccessMaker and other FCAT simulation assessments, (FOCUS mini-assessments); and teacher made assessments. <i>Midyear data</i> is obtained through Riverside District created math assessments, SuccessMaker, and other FCAT simulation assessments. End of year data is obtained through the administration of GOMath Assessment Guide tests, FCAT, SuccessMaker and Riverside District created math assessments.</p> <p><b>Science:</b> <i>Baseline data</i> is obtained through the Riverside 5th grade math assessment and the Houghton Mifflin Science Fusion baseline measure. <i>Progress Monitoring</i> is obtained through the administration of Unit Assessments that accompany the Houghton Mifflin Science Fusion Series, Curriculum Based Measurements, and other FCAT simulation assessments, (FOCUS mini-assessments); and teacher made assessments. <i>Midyear data</i> is obtained through Riverside District created 5<sup>th</sup> grade science assessments, SuccessMaker, and other FCAT simulation assessments. End of year data is obtained through the administration of Houghton Mifflin Science Fusion Series Assessment Guide, FCAT, and Riverside District created science assessments.</p> <p><b>Writing:</b> <i>Baseline data</i> is obtained through the beginning of the year writing samples collected from each student. <i>Progress Monitoring</i> is obtained through the administration of Writes Upon Request (WUR) administered 4 times a year, Curriculum Based Measurements, and other FCAT simulation assessments and teacher made assessments. <i>Midyear data</i> is obtained through writing samples, WUR assessments and other FCAT simulation assessments. End of year data is obtained through FCAT Writing assessment, WUR and teacher created end-of-the year writing assessments.</p>
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the year. Mini-trainings on RTI topics will be addressed at each monthly faculty meeting. The teachers will also participate in Professional Learning Communities based on areas of weakness or interest.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. Principal meets monthly with grade levels to discuss individual student progress. MTSS team meets weekly with teachers, parents, and administrators to follow-up on specific students needing support.

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

***Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)***

***Buck Lake Elementary School has combined the RtI and LLT.***

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). <b>Buck Lake Elementary School has combined the RtI and LLT.</b>
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

***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.

--

***\*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?

--

***\*High Schools Only***

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

--

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?

--



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

### 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.

## 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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>			1.1. Instructional rigor throughout the grade levels is at the basic level	1.1. Students will receive instruction in the core curriculum for at least 90 minutes a day.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Classroom Teacher	1A.1. 1.1. Student Progress is assessed using the weekly and/or unit test .	1A.1. AIMSweb data
<b>Reading Goal #1A:</b>  28% of standard matched curriculum students will score a 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Consistently actively engaging students	1.2. Differentiated Instruction will include the Re-teach, ELL and Enrichment portion of the curriculum		1.2. Review of Imagine It reading materials	Data Director
	22 [78]	28% [103]	Classroom management and time on task	1.3. Professional development on higher order questioning and other reading strategies		Classroom Walk-through focused on weekly strategies	Curriculum progress monitoring Imagine It Weekly/Unit Tests
			1.2. Classroom management and time on task  Materials needed for small groups	1A.2. Students not responding to the core curriculum will receive supplemental instruction in small groups focusing on area of difficulty	1A.2. Classroom Teacher Reading Coach Administrators	.2. Student's progress is determined by success in group and how well he/she performs in core instruction	.2. AIMSweb data Curriculum progress monitoring
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.

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

<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b>			1B.1. Wide range of disabilities	1B.1. Assess ability and differentiate in collaborative groups	1B.1. Principal Asst. Principal	1B.1. Progress Monitoring	1B.1. Florida Alternative Assessment 2013
Reading Goal #1B: 66% of matched students will score a 4,5, or 6 on the 2013 FAA.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	17 [1]	33% [2]					
							1B.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
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b>			2A.1. Instructional rigor throughout the grade levels is at the basic level	2A.1 1.4. Students will receive instruction in the core curriculum for at least 90 minutes a day. Differentiated Instruction will include the Re-teach, ELL and Enrichment portion of the curriculum Professional development on higher order questioning and other reading strategies	2A.1. 1.2. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Classroom Teacher	2A.1. Student Progress is assessed using the weekly and/or unit test . Review of Imagine It reading materials Classroom Walk-through focused on weekly strategies	2A.1. AIMSweb data Curriculum progress monitoring Imagine It Weekly/Unit Tests
Reading Goal #2A: 70% of our Standard matched curriculum students will score a 4 or above on the 2012 FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Consistently actively engaging students				
	60% [213]	70 [259]	Classroom management and time on task				
			2A.2. Available technology	2A.2. Challenging/higher order thinking skills	2A.2. 1.3. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Classroom Teacher Technology Teacher	2A.2. Student Progress is assessed using the weekly and/or unit test . Review of Imagine It reading materials Classroom Walk-through focused on weekly strategies Review of technology used in lessons	2A.2. AIMSweb data Curriculum progress monitoring Imagine It Weekly/Unit Tests SuccessMaker Reading Results
			Teacher education of the use of technology	Teacher training in talented and gifted strategies Students and teachers actively engaged in technology			
			Teacher knowledge of higher order thinking skills				
			Teachers knowledge of talented and gifted teaching strategies				

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

			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>			2B.2 Wide range of disabilities	2B.2 Assess ability and differentiate in collaborative groups	2B.2 Principal Asst. Principal	2B.2 Progress Monitoring	2B.2 Florida Alternative Assessment 2013
Reading Goal #2B: 33% of matched students will score at or above a Level 7 on the 2013 FAA.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% [0]	33% [1]					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.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
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			3A.1. Instructional rigor throughout the grade levels is at the basic level	3A.1. Instructional rigor throughout the grade levels is at the basic level	3A.1. Classroom Teacher Administrators	3A.1 Classroom Walk-through focused on weekly strategies	3A.1 AIMSweb data Curriculum progress monitoring
Reading Goal #3A: 85% of our students will show learning gains on the 2013 Reading FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Consistently actively engaging students	Consistently actively engaging students	Reading Coach	Collaborative data review team meetings	
	84 % [200]	85% [296]	Classroom management and time on task	Classroom management and time on task			
			3A.2	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.

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

		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>		3B.2 Wide range of disabilities	3B.2 Assess ability and differentiate in collaborative groups	3B.2 Principal Asst. Principal	3B.2 Progress Monitoring	3B.2 Florida Alternative Assessment 2013
<b>Reading Goal #3B:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
66% of all students will make learning gains in Reading.	33 [1]	66% [2]				
		3				
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.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
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>			4A.1. Insufficient time to provide interventions	4A.1. Conduct ongoing, in-depth data reviews on individual students	4A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Classroom Teacher	4A.1. Classroom Walk-through focused on weekly strategies	4A.1.1 . AIMSweb data
<b>Reading Goal #4:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Insufficient time to review intervention results	Diagnose individual students needs  Provide professional development on various intervention programs		Collaborative data review team meetings	Curriculum progress monitoring iObservations
85% of our lowest 25% students will make learning gains in Reading	81% [41]	85% [39]					
			4A.2. Lack of time to meet individual needs of struggling readers.	4A.2. Small group instruction during reading workshop. Remedial reading programs implemented with fidelity.	4A.2. Principal Asst. Principal Reading Coach	4A.2. Classroom Observation Review of lesson plans Review of reading remediation schedules	4A.2. i-observation
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017				
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b> Reading Goal #5A:  <i>By 2017 Buck Lake will reduce our achievement gap by 50%.</i>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>		82% are proficient in reading	83% are will be proficient in reading	84% are will be proficient in reading	86% are will be proficient in reading	89% are will be proficient in reading	91% are will be proficient in reading				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool					
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b> Reading Goal #5B: <i>The percentage of students proficient not in reading, within the subgroups, will decrease by at least 2% as evidenced by the performance on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White:18% [42] Black: 26% [8] Hispanic: 11[2] Asian:11 [2] American Indian:</td> <td>White: 16% Black: 24% Hispanic:9% Asian: 9% American Indian:</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	White:18% [42] Black: 26% [8] Hispanic: 11[2] Asian:11 [2] American Indian:	White: 16% Black: 24% Hispanic:9% Asian: 9% American Indian:	5B.1. Need for clear learning goals.	5B.1. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and rubrics, track student progress and celebrate success	5B.1. Principal/Assistant Principal	5B.1. Monitoring of progress toward goals	5B.1. Appropriate benchmark assessment; classroom observation tools; various classroom assessments	
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*										
	White:18% [42] Black: 26% [8] Hispanic: 11[2] Asian:11 [2] American Indian:	White: 16% Black: 24% Hispanic:9% Asian: 9% American Indian:										
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.						
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.						

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<b>Reading Goal #5C:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>BLES does not have a subgroup of ELL students.</b>		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5D.1. Need for clear learning goals.	5D.1. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and rubrics, track student progress and celebrate success	5D.1. Principal/Assistant Principal	5D.1. Monitoring of progress toward goals	5D.1. Appropriate benchmark assessment; classroom observation tools; various classroom assessments
<b>Reading Goal #5D:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>The percentage of SWD not proficient in reading will decrease by at least 2% as evidenced by the performance on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	36 [15]	34%				
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5E.1. Need for clear learning goals.	5E.1. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and rubrics, track student progress and celebrate success	5E.1. Principal/Assistant Principal	5E.1. Monitoring of progress toward goals	5E.1. Appropriate benchmark assessment; classroom observation tools; various classroom assessments
<b>Reading Goal #5E:</b>  <i>BLES does not have any Economically disadvantaged subgroups</i>  <i>The percentage of ED students not proficient in reading will decrease by at least 1% as evidenced by the performance on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> 32 [10]	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> 31%					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

### Reading Professional Development

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b>						
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
Imagine It! Training	K-5	Reading coach	All, as needed		Sign-in sheets	Administration; Peers
Professional Learning Communities	All	Grade Level chair			Sign-in sheets Meeting Agendas	Administrators; Reading Coach
Rtl/Data Planning Days	All	Grade Level Chairs Administrators	All	Sept/Oct 2012 April/May 2013	Sign-in sheets Progress Monitoring Notebooks	Administrators; Reading Coach

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

**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	Strategy
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy			
FETC Conference & Workshops	Subs for teachers, registration, rooms, meals	TEC, TITLE II, EDEP 20%	FETC Conference & Workshops
			<b>Subtotal: \$5000.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Strategy
Learn and Implement Gifted and Talented teaching strategies	Subs, registration	TEC, Title I, EDEP 20%	Learn and Implement Gifted and Talented teaching strategies
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Strategy
Next Network	Online		
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*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
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>		1.1 ELL students do not speak English.	1.1. Differentiated collaborative grouping according to language acquisition level.	1.1. ESOL Teacher	1.1. Fluency Test progress data	1.1. CELLA 2013
<b>CELLA Goal #1:</b>  <i>The percentage of ELL students proficient in listening and speaking English will increase by at least 1% as evidenced by the performance on the CELLA.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	75% [9]					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>		2.1 ELL students do not speak English.	2.1. Differentiated collaborative grouping according to language acquisition level.	2.1. ESOL Teacher	2.1. Fluency Test progress data	2.1. CELLA 2013
<b>CELLA Goal #2:</b>  <i>The percentage of ELL students proficient in reading will increase by at least 1% as evidenced by the performance on the CELLA.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	50 [6].					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>		2.1 ELL students do not speak English.	2.1. Differentiated collaborative grouping according to language acquisition level.	2.1. ESOL Teacher	2.1. Fluency Test progress data	2.1. CELLA 2013
CELLA Goal #3:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
<i>The percentage of ELL students proficient in writing will increase by at least 1% as evidenced by the performance on the CELLA.</i>	67% [8]					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

**CELLA Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of CELLA Goals*

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

**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]).

<b>Elementary Mathematics Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>			1A.1 Time to learn new curriculum	1A.1 Students will receive instruction in the core curriculum for at least 50 minutes a day. Differentiated Instruction will include the Re-teach, ELL and Enrichment portion of the curriculum	1A.1 Math SIP Team Administrators Classroom Teachers RTI Team	1A.1 Grade level teams will review common assessments data monthly to determine progress toward benchmark (75% on common assessment	1A.1 . Benchmark Assessments; AIMSweb GO Math Florida Assessment Guide Weekly Lesson Plans Observations
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u> :*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u> :*	Teacher “buy-in”				
30% of Standard Matched Curriculum Students will Score a 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT.	25 [88]	30 [100]	Lack of teacher training and follow through				
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>			1B.1 Wide range of disabilities	1B.1 Assess ability and differentiate in collaborative groups	1B.1 Principal Asst. Principal	1B.1 Progress Monitoring	1B.1 Florida Alternative Assessment 2013
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u> :*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u> :*					
33% of Matched Students will Score a 4, 5, or 6 on the 2013 FAA.	17% [1]	33% [2]	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *	Time to learn new curriculum	Students will receive instruction in the core curriculum for at least 50 minutes a day.	Math SIP Team Administrators Classroom Teachers RTI Team	. Grade level teams will review common assessments data monthly to determine progress toward benchmark (75% on common assessment	Benchmark Assessments;
#2A:	55 [197]	68 [251]	Lack of Teacher knowledge on extending curriculum	Differentiated Instruction will include the Re-teach, ELL and Enrichment portion of the curriculum			AIMSweb
68% of Standard Match Curriculum students will score a 4 or 5 on 2013 Math FCAT.			Lack of teacher training and follow through				GO Math Florida Assessment Guide  Weekly Lesson Plans  Observations
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>			2B.1	2B.1	2B.1	2B.1	2B.1
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *	Wide range of disabilities	Assess ability and differentiate in collaborative groups	Principal Asst. Principal	Progress Monitoring	Florida Alternative Assessment 2013
#2B:	0% [0]	33% [1]					
33% of Matched Students will Score a 7 on the 2013 FAA.			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3A.1. Need for clear learning goals.	3A.1. Students will receive instruction in the core curriculum for at least 50 minutes a day.	3A.1. Math SIP Team Administrators Classroom Teachers RTI Team	3A.1. Grade level teams will review common assessments data monthly to determine progress toward benchmark (75% on common assessment	3A.1. Benchmark Assessments; AIMSweb GO Math Florida Assessment Guide Weekly Lesson Plans
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Time to learn new curriculum  Lack of Teacher knowledge on extending curriculum  Lack of teacher training and follow through	In addition to regular curriculum Differentiated Instructional groups will include the Re-teach, ELL and Enrichment portion of the curriculum			
90% of all students will show learning gains in Math on the 2013 FCAT.	87 [206]	90% [333]					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3B.1 Wide range of disabilities	3B.1 Assess ability and differentiate in collaborative groups	3B.1 Principal Asst. Principal	3B.1 Progress Monitoring	3B.1 Florida Alternative Assessment 2013
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
33% of all matched students will show learning gains in Math on the 2013 FAA.	17 [1]	33% [2]					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>  Mathematics Goal #4: 80% of CES bottom 25% will show learning gains in Mathematics.	4A.1. Need for clear learning goals.	4A.1. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and rubrics, track student progress and celebrate success	4A.1. Principal/Assistant Principal	4A.1. Monitoring of progress toward goals	4A.1. Appropriate benchmark assessment; classroom observation tools; various classroom assessments			
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></td> <td style="width: 50%;"><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>76% [40]</td> <td>80 [36]</td> </tr> </table>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	76% [40]	80 [36]	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>							
76% [40]	80 [36]							
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		
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>  Baseline data 2010-2011  Math Goal #5A:  <i>By 2017 Buck Lake will reduce our achievement gap by 50%.</i>	<b>80% of students were proficient in Math.</b>	82% of students will be proficient in Math.	84% of students will be proficient in Math	86% of students will be proficient in Math	88% of students will be proficient in Math	90% of students will be proficient in Math		
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			
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>  Mathematics Goal #5B: <i>The percentage of students not proficient in math, within the subgroups, will decrease by at least 2% as evidenced by the performance on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	5B.1. White: Need for clear learning goals.  Black: Need for clear learning goals. Hispanic: Need for clear learning goals. More support with the English language	5B.1 Teachers will provide clear learning goals and rubrics, track student progress and celebrate success	5B.1 Principal/Assistant Principal	5B.1 Monitoring of progress toward goals	5B.1 Appropriate benchmark assessment; classroom observation tools; various classroom assessments			
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></td> <td style="width: 50%;"><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>White:19% [46] Black: 39% [12] Hispanic: 21% [4] Asian: 10% [5] American Indian:</td> <td>White:17% Black: 37% Hispanic: 19 Asian: 8 American Indian:</td> </tr> </table>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	White:19% [46] Black: 39% [12] Hispanic: 21% [4] Asian: 10% [5] American Indian:	White:17% Black: 37% Hispanic: 19 Asian: 8 American Indian:	Asian: Need for clear learning goals. More support with the English language  American Indian:		
<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>							
White:19% [46] Black: 39% [12] Hispanic: 21% [4] Asian: 10% [5] American Indian:	White:17% Black: 37% Hispanic: 19 Asian: 8 American Indian:							

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

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

			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
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
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
BLES does not have an ELL subgroup.							
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
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
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5D.1. Need for clear learning goals.	5D.1. Students not responding to the core curriculum and supplemental curriculum will receive targeted interventions through the problem solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence based and provided in addition to the core curriculum.	5D.1. Math SIP Team Administrators Classroom Teachers RTI Team	5D.1. . Grade level teams will review common assessments data monthly to determine progress toward benchmark (75% on common assessment	5D.1. Benchmark Assessments; AIMSweb GO Math Florida Assessment Guide Weekly Lesson Plans
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Time to learn new curriculum				
<i>The percentage of SWD not proficient in math will decrease by at least 2% as evidenced by the performance on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	26 [11]	24%	Lack of Teacher knowledge on extending curriculum				
			Lack of teacher training and follow through				
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.

## 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
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5E.1. Need for clear learning goals.	5E.1. Teachers will provide clear learning goals and rubrics, track student progress and celebrate success	5E.1. Principal/Assistant Principal	5E.1. Monitoring of progress toward goals	5E.1. Appropriate benchmark assessment; classroom observation tools; various classroom assessments
<b>Mathematics Goal #5E:</b> <i>The percentage of ED students not proficient in reading will decrease by at least 1% as evidenced by the performance on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 58% (18)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 56%					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

### Mathematics Professional Development

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b>						
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
Go Math	K-5	DISTRICT	All Teachers	September 2012	Classroom Observation	Principal, Assistant Principal
Pearson	K-5	P. Jeffries	All Teachers	August 2012	Classroom Observation	Principal, Assistant Principal
Marzano	K-5	S. Vicks	All Teachers	August 2012	Classroom Observation	Principal, Assistant Principal

August 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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*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]).

<b>Elementary and Middle Science Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b>			1A.1 Need for strategies that would allow for better understanding when identifying critical information .	1A.1 Adopts and creates new strategies for unique student needs and situations.	1A.1 Principal/Assistant Principal	1A.1 Monitoring of progress toward goals	1A.1 Appropriate benchmark assessment; classroom observation tools; various classroom assessments
<b>Science Goal #1A:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
% of SMC students will score a 3 or above on 2013 FCAT.	36 [47]	38 [42]					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>			1B.1 Wide range of disabilities	1B.1 Assess ability and differentiate in collaborative groups	1B.1 Principal Asst. Principal	1B.1 Progress Monitoring	1B.1 Florida Alternative Assessment 2013
<b>Science Goal #1B:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
33% of matched students will score a 4,5, or 6 on 2013 FAA.	0% [0]	33% [1]					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

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
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b>			2A.1. Scheduling / Planning	2A.1. Engages students in cognitively complex tasks and monitors the extent in which students are generating and testing hypotheses..	2A.1. Classroom teachers Administrators Science Advocates	2A.1. Monitoring of progress toward goals	2A.1. Appropriate benchmark assessment; classroom observation tools; various classroom assessments
<b>Science Goal #2A:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
			Lack of teacher knowledge			Lesson Plan reviews	

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

40% of students will score a 4 or 5 on 2013 Science FCAT.	36% [47]	40% [45]	Ability to use the materials and align them to the science benchmarks.			Planning logs	
				2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	Implementation of science benchmarks in daily lessons Hands-on science activities used at least once a week.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>			2B.1 Wide range of disabilities	2B.1 Assess ability and differentiate in collaborative groups	2B.1 Principal Asst. Principal	2B.1 Progress Monitoring	2B.1 Florida Alternative Assessment 2013
Science Goal #2B: 33% of matched students will score a 7 on 2013 Science FAA.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% [0]	33% [1]					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.

*End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals*

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
GEMS Training; Science Snapshot; explore other curricular	3-5	TBA	Grade level trainer	September/October 2011	Share information with grade level teachers	Administrator Science Advocate
Science SSS training for a teachers	K-5	All	All	On-going	Evidence in Science lessons; plan books	Administration
Other district provided science professional development	K-5	Classroom Teachers	All	On-going	Share with grade levels at faculty meeting and PLC's	Administrator Science Advocate

**Science Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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
RtI Grade Level Planning Days	Subs for teachers (2x year)	TEC, TITLE II, EDEP 20%	\$2730.00
Science SSS training for a teachers	Subs for teachers	TEC, TITLE II, EDEP 20%	200.00
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*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]).

<b>Writing Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>			1A.1 <i>Need for increased engagement in tasks that are complex tasks involving Hypothesis Generation and Testing.</i> Students only writing through draft stage Teacher time to review the writing with students	1A.1 Engages students in cognitively complex tasks and monitors the extent in which students are generating and testing hypotheses..	1A.1 Principal/Assistant Principal	1A.1 Monitoring of progress toward goals	1A.1 Appropriate benchmark assessment; classroom observation tools; various classroom assessments
<b>Writing Goal #1A:</b> 88% of students will Score a 3.0 or higher on 2012 FCAT Writes.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 88 [92]	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 90 [112]					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b>			1B.1 Wide range of disabilities	1B.1 Assess ability and differentiate in collaborative groups	1B.1 Principal Asst. Principal	1B.1 Progress Monitoring	1B.1 Florida Alternative Assessment 2013
<b>Writing Goal #1A:</b> 100% of matched students will score a GE of 4on the 2013 FAA.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 100%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 100%					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

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

**Writing Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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	3-5	District	3-5	September 2012	Classroom Observation	Michele Prescott
Writing	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	District	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teachers	October 2012	iObservation	

**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
RtI Grade Level Planning Days	Subs for teachers (2x year)	TEC, TITLE II, EDEP 20%	\$2730.00
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Writing Goals*

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

**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]).

<b>Attendance Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</b>				
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
<b>1. Attendance</b>			1.1. Lack of incentives to get parents to keep students in school.	1.1. .Investigate reasons why excessive absences are happening.	1.1. 1.1, Attendance Clerk Classroom Teacher Administrators	1.1. Monitor Attendance Logs	1.1. Genesis Attendance
Attendance Goal #1: 97% of students will be in attendance.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*	Lack of some student motivation to not want to miss school	Stricter policy on what is an excused absence.  Grade reflecting time missed in classroom and daily assignments			
	96.54%	97%					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	141	135					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
189	180						
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

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

**Attendance Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
	K-5	Teacher Leader	All teachers	Team Meetings once a month; Once a month faculty meetings	iObservation documentation; Teacher Portfolio	Principal/Assistant Principal
	K-5	Team leader	All teachers	Team meetings - ongoing throughout the year	iObservation documentation; Teacher Portfolio	Principal/Assistant Principal

**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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Attendance Goals*



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

**Suspension Goal(s)**

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

<b>Suspension Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension</b>				
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
<b>1. Suspension</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1. Principal/Assistant Principal	1.1. Monitoring of progress toward goals	1.1. Monitoring of Educators Handbook Data
<b>Suspension Goal #1:</b>	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
BLES does not have a problem with excessive suspensions.	0	0					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
Expected number of out of school suspensions for the 2011-2012 school year is 0.	0	0					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	1	0					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	1	0					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

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

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
Ed Handbook	K-12	B. McKay	All	Monthly Grade Level Meeting	Monitoring Educators Handbook Data	

**Suspension Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*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)).

<b>Dropout Prevention Goal(s)</b>		<b>Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention</b>				
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
<b>1. Dropout Prevention</b>		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*				
	<i>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i>				
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*				
	<i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

**Dropout Prevention Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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

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

**Dropout Prevention Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*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
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>			1.1. Parents are not informed of opportunities to volunteer	1.1. Bi Weekly PTO Newsletter listing specific opportunities to volunteer	1.1. Aimee Jessup	1.1. Monitor of Volunteer Sign In with PTO Manager	1.1. Volunteer Logs Final percentage of parents who volunteer
<b>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
85% of Buck Lake Elementary School parents will volunteer or mentor during the 2012-2013 school year.	80%	85%					
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

**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

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

**Parent Involvement Budget**

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*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
<b>STEM Goal #1:</b> Students scoring a level 4 or 5 will be provided STEM based curriculum.	1.1. Need for increased engagement is tasks that are complex tasks, Cost of Materials, and Training for Teachers.	1.1. Engages students in cognitively complex tasks, identify grants to assist with cost, and provide P for teachers.	1.1. Principal Asst. Principal S.T.E.M Advocates	1.1. Observation, Lesson Plans	1.1. IObservation Fusion Assessmnts

**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

**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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of STEM 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.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total:</b>
	<b>Total:</b>
	<b>Total:</b>
	<b>Grand Total:</b>

**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

Are you reward school?  Yes  No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

- 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.	
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.	
School Advisory Council will monitor the School Improvement Plan Process.	

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount