FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Miami Heights Elementary

DRAFT 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: Miami Heights Elementary	District Name: Miami-Dade
Principal: Mr. Jorge A. Rivas	Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho
SAC Chair: Maria Diaz-Almendral	Date of School Board Approval: Pending

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	Jorge Rivas	SOCIAL SCIENCE, GUIDANCE & COUNSELING, ED LEADERSHIP	2	6	<table><tr><td></td><td>'12</td><td>'11</td><td>'10</td><td>'09*</td><td>'08*</td></tr><tr><td>School Grade</td><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>D</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>High Standards Rdg.</td><td>57</td><td>67</td><td>22</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>High Standards Math</td><td>59</td><td>67</td><td>51</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>Learning Gains-Rdg.</td><td>77</td><td>62</td><td>41</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>Learning Gains-Math</td><td>79</td><td>61</td><td>70</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>Gains-Rdg-25%</td><td>80</td><td>53</td><td>44</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td></tr><tr><td>Gains-Math-25%</td><td>73</td><td>60</td><td>66</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td></tr></table> * Assigned to District
Assistant Principals	Sarah R. Fair	ELEM ED, MG MATH, ED LEADERSHIP	6	6	<table><tr><td></td><td>'12</td><td>'11</td><td>'10</td><td>'09*</td><td>'08*</td></tr><tr><td>School Grade</td><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>A</td><td>A</td><td>B</td></tr><tr><td>High Standards Rdg.</td><td>57</td><td>67</td><td>75</td><td>75</td><td>73</td></tr><tr><td>High Standards Math</td><td>59</td><td>67</td><td>72</td><td>73</td><td>67</td></tr><tr><td>Learning Gains-Rdg.</td><td>77</td><td>62</td><td>70</td><td>75</td><td>67</td></tr><tr><td>Learning Gains-Math</td><td>79</td><td>61</td><td>57</td><td>68</td><td>63</td></tr><tr><td>Gains-Rdg-25%</td><td>80</td><td>53</td><td>59</td><td>74</td><td>59</td></tr><tr><td>Gains-Math-25%</td><td>73</td><td>60</td><td>59</td><td>69</td><td>73</td></tr></table>
	Deidre Reed	ELEM ED, ESOL, ED LEADERSHIP	1	4	<table><tr><td></td><td>'12</td><td>'11</td><td>'10</td><td>'09*</td><td>'08*</td></tr><tr><td>School Grade</td><td>A</td><td>D</td><td>C</td><td>C</td><td>C</td></tr><tr><td>High Standards Rdg.</td><td>57</td><td>37</td><td>57</td><td>51</td><td>52</td></tr><tr><td>High Standards Math</td><td>59</td><td>51</td><td>62</td><td>58</td><td>46</td></tr><tr><td>Learning Gains-Rdg.</td><td>77</td><td>53</td><td>58</td><td>62</td><td>65</td></tr><tr><td>Learning Gains-Math</td><td>79</td><td>48</td><td>59</td><td>70</td><td>60</td></tr><tr><td>Gains-Rdg-25%</td><td>80</td><td>70</td><td>50</td><td>61</td><td>63</td></tr><tr><td>Gains-Math-25%</td><td>73</td><td>36</td><td>61</td><td>71</td><td>69</td></tr></table>

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading, Math and Science	Maria Martinez	Primary Ed, Elementary Ed, Reading K-12, Gifted, ESOL	5	0	*(see table below)*

	'12	'11	'10	'09*	'08*
School Grade	A	B	A	A	B
High Standards Rdg.	57	67	75	75	73
High Standards Math	59	67	72	73	67
Learning Gains-Rdg.	77	62	70	75	67
Learning Gains-Math	79	61	57	68	63
Gains-Rdg-25%	80	53	59	74	59
Gains-Math-25%	73	60	59	69	73

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 Appreciation/Team Building activities/Professional Development	Esther Sanchez/PTA/Maria Martinez	Ongoing
2. Grades K-5 Teacher PLCs	Amy Singh/ Arlene Ortiz-Rodriguez	Monthly (4th Wednesday)
3. Vertical Team Cohorts	Maria Martinez	May 31, 2013
4. Mustang Awards	Maria Martinez/ Vanessa Diaz	Monthly (2nd Wednesday)

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
NA	NA

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
88	5 (5.68%)	17 (19.32%)	44 (50.00%)	22 (25.00%)	30 (34.09%)	88 (100%)	8 (9.09%)	5 (5.68%)	59 (67.05%)

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
NA			

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 Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through extended learning opportunities (In-School tutoring, after-school programs, Saturday Academy or summer school). Curriculum Coaches develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs and provide professional development to teachers; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of intervention; and provide support for assessment and progress monitoring. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include an extensive Parental Program and Supplemental Educational Services.
Title II The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows: • training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program • training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols.
Title III Miami Heights Elementary offers after school tutorial programs to enhance educational programs and to assist ELL students by utilizing supplementary reading instructional materials and technology software. Additionally, parent outreach courses and activities are offered with the assistance of the Parent Academy and Bilingual Department. The above services will be provided should funds become available for the 2010-2011 school year and should the FLDOE approve the application.
Title X- Homeless Miami Heights Elementary receives services as needed from Project Upstart Homeless Children and Youth in Transition for identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students. The Homeless Liaison provides training for school registrars on the procedures for enrolling homeless students and for school counselors on the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act-ensuring homeless children and youth are not to be stigmatized or separated, segregated, or isolated on their status as homeless-and are provided with all entitlements. Project Upstart provides a homeless sensitivity and awareness campaign to all the schools-each school is provided a video and curriculum manual and a contest is sponsored by the homeless trust-a community organization. At this time, no students are identified to receive services.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) Miami Heights will receive funding from Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) as part of its Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) allocation.
Violence Prevention Programs Peer Mediation, Anti-Bullying Campaigns and Curriculum, and Character Education are all used at Miami Heights Elementary School to decrease the number of violent occurrences at the school. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program addresses violence and drug prevention and intervention services for students through curriculum implemented by classroom teachers and counselors.
Nutrition Programs 1) The school adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy. 2) Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through physical education. 3) The School Food Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after care snacks, follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the District's Wellness Policy. 4) The school participates in the Healthy Schools grant program.

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

Housing Programs N/A
Head Start N/A
Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education N/A
Job Training N/A
Other N/A

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 Principals, Reading Coach, Counselors, School Psychologist, and Social Worker.
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 MTSS/RtI team meets weekly to discuss and review data systematically to ensure student growth and progress. The team examines core systemic procedures and practices and proposes reform to daily curricular programs for students in need (in the form of supplemental instruction and intervention). Areas such as student achievement, intervention (by Coaches and Administration), school climate, safety, attendance, and student services (by Counselors and Support Staff) are examined on an ongoing basis. Teams meet and coordinate resources depending on students' needs. Via data collection, data analysis, problem solving, and progress monitoring, teams communicate to examine standards and benchmarks being taught, to review assessments and data, to monitor interventions and strategies, to assist with improving instructional delivery, and to monitor subgroups for Adequate Yearly Progress.
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 MTSS Leadership team will work to monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals by gathering and analyzing data, monitoring instruction and interventions, and by providing support to students in need of improvement. In addition, the MTSS/RtI team examines opportunities for students who are high achieving students in need of enrichment. SIP goals are data driven based on areas of student need. Targeted benchmarks for given AYP subgroups are identified and these are included in the intervention strategies and best practices implemented within the tier framework.
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. Data (FCAT, FAIR, Interim Assessments, mini benchmark assessments) is used to guide instruction by adjusting delivery of the curriculum for the needs of the students. School resources are allocated based on the academic needs of the students and Professional Development needs of the teachers. In addition, data will drive instruction for interventions, remediation, and behavior management (Student Case Management for behavior, suspension rate, attendance, referrals to Special Education programs).

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

As students enter higher tiers of the MTSS/RtI process, Voyager checkpoint data is graphed and compared to the norm group at the respective grade level to determine progress/achievement. At Tier III, Success Maker data is pulled weekly in the form of a student performance report for usage and progress to compare student progress and growth to that of his/her peers within the grade level. Behavior is documented by the teacher via observations, checklists, and anecdotal records. Behavior Intervention Plans and Functional Assessments of Behavior are also used to document student behavioral patterns.

Students in the lowest 25th percentile are identified based on previous year's FCAT/SAT scores. Non SPED students are integrated into an intervention schedule developed by the Instructional Coaches based on MTSS/RtI criteria. In academic areas, the following data is used for MTSS/RtI purposes at each and all Tiers. FAIR assessment (Broad Screening, Progress Monitoring, Targeted Diagnostic Indicators, Broad Diagnostic Indicators, Ongoing Progress Monitoring Tools, Phonics Screening Inventory (Tier 1, 2, 3); Oral Reading Fluency Measures (Tier 1, 2, 3); Voyager Checkpoints (Tier 2 & 3); Voyager Benchmark Assessments (Tier 2 & 3); Baseline Benchmark Assessments (Tier 1, 2, 3); Success Maker Utilization and Progress Reports (Tier 3); Interim assessments (Tier 1, 2, 3); State/Local Math and Science assessments (Tier 1, 2, 3-when applicable).

Students who are in need of MTSS/RtI for behavioral component are assimilated into Tiers through the use of Student Code of Conduct, referrals, conference logs, counseling logs, etc. Students are placed on an informal behavior contract for a length of time before a FAB/BIP is implemented. If a FAB/BIP is deemed necessary, MTSS team along with the referring teacher and other teachers will hold a meeting to implement. Customary procedures and protocol for data collection and BIP implementation will be discussed and followed.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
Counselors provide the faculty and staff with an in-depth training with updated information and new protocols on a yearly basis at the opening of schools meeting. As additional training becomes available from the district to administrators, counselors, psychologists, and school support staff who serve as a member of the MTSS/RtI team, training will be provided to the staff in data analysis and MTSS/RtI procedures. Samples of all data collection documents and MTSS/RtI informative pamphlets are distributed with updated and new information, along with timelines and FAQ's. Ongoing support will be provided by the region.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.
Consistent communication will occur between members of the MTSS leadership team. The MTSS Leadership Team will meet on a bi-weekly basis to discuss and analyze students referred for or in MTSS/RtI . In these MTSS Leadership meetings, we will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis (as needed). Our plan to support MTSS in our school is further exceeded by providing levels of support and interventions to students based on data, while monitoring the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention that students are receiving. Teachers and Interventionists will receive updates at the conclusion of the MTSS Leadership team meetings. Faculty meetings will also be used to update all faculty/staff members of any new information gathered. Ongoing support will be provided by the region.

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). Jorge Rivas, Principal; Sarah Fair, Assistant Principal; Deidre Reed, Assistant Principal; Maria Martinez, Reading Coach; Vanessa Diaz, Counselor; Rose Milian, Counselor; Kimberley Renick, Media Specialist; Jessica Fernandez, Kindergarten; Lourdes Lopez, First Grade; Chernae Brown-Storr, Second Grade; Laura Dreher, Third Grade; Latonya Trent, Fourth Grade; Stacey Agostini, Fifth Grade; Donna Porter, Spanish/ELL; Brandy Boone, Art/Music/PE Subject Areas
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The principal will cultivate the vision for increased school-wide literacy across all content areas by being an active participant in all Literacy Leadership Team meetings and activities. During school site visits, the District team will review the minutes from Literacy Leadership Team meetings and have a dialogue with the principal/assistant principal regarding the meetings. The principal will provide necessary resources to the Literacy Leadership Team. The reading coach will serve as a member of the Literacy Leadership Team. The coach will share his/her expertise in reading instruction, assessment and observational data to assist the team in making instructional and programmatic decisions. The reading coach will work with the Literacy Leadership Team to guarantee fidelity of implementation of the K-12 CRRP. The reading coach will provide motivation and promote a spirit of collaboration within the Literacy Leadership Team to create a school-wide focus on literacy and reading achievement by establishing model classrooms; conferencing with teachers and administrators; and providing professional development. The Literacy Leadership Team will meet weekly to discuss student progress, data, weekly benchmarks, CRRP implementation, CELLA, Edusoft Reports and progress monitoring of students needing intervention. The Reading Coaches will provide weekly focus calendars to teachers and provide peer mentoring as necessary. The Media Specialist prints and reviews reports (data) to disseminate to the team. The administration will monitor student progress and uses data to drive weekly/monthly instructional focus. The team will meet quarterly with instructional staff to conduct data chats, to revisit focus calendar, and discuss strategies for targeting deficient benchmarks and standards. The principal and assistant principal will monitor implementation of the K-12 CRRP through a variety of methods including weekly classroom walkthroughs, monthly grade/departmental meetings, and literacy leadership team meetings. In addition, student performance data in reading will be reviewed regularly during Data Team meetings. The Principal Reading Walkthrough Guidelines from the Just Read, Florida! office provide principals with a tool to effectively structure classroom visits in order to observe effective reading instruction. This tool provides a snapshot of classroom organization, instruction, and learning opportunities in the reading classroom. Indicators focus on the learning environment and include instructional strategies essential for reading including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The principal and assistant principal will create a reading goal, specific objectives and action steps in their School Improvement Plan that will increase reading achievement in all subgroups in order to meet the goals of AMO. By participating in the analysis of student data and interpreting various reports that drive instructional implications across the curriculum, principals will serve as literacy leaders.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? To closely monitor intervention students, to model and mentor developing teachers, and to analyze data to ensure progress of at risk (tier 2 & 3) students in the lower quartiles of performance. To communicate effectively with the MTSS/RtI team to ensure student identification, remediation, and academic success. To increase student performance in effective writing and vocabulary acquisition for holistic literacy attainment. The principal, assistant principal, reading coach, and curriculum support specialist will utilize student assessment data, classroom observational data, and the professional

development listed on the teachers' IPEGS Goal Setting form, and School Improvement Plan, when planning professional development for the school. The principal, assistant principal, reading coach, and curriculum support specialist will meet regularly to discuss and review the needs of teachers and students. During these meetings the reading coach will advise the principal regarding professional development planned based on follow up visits from classroom observations. The principal will also update the assistant principal, reading coach, and curriculum support specialist about district and state reading requirements that could impact reading instruction at the school. Additionally, the principal, assistant principal, reading coach, and curriculum support specialist will collaborate with Region and District reading support staff to deliver targeted professional development needed at the school.

The principal will monitor collection and utilization of assessment data, including progress monitoring data (FAIR Assessments), District interim assessment data, observational data, and in-program assessment data. Progress monitoring and interim data will be collected a minimum of three times per year. Observational data is collected via principal and assistant principal classroom walkthroughs. In-program assessments will be administered based upon program guidelines/requirements (weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly). This data will be used to determine intervention and support needs of students by:
• participating in Data Analysis Team meetings after each FAIR/District Interim assessment period;
• analyzing progress monitoring data with the reading coach;
• directing the reading coach to meet with each grade level to review their progress monitoring (FAIR) data;
• monitoring that the reading coach uses available data to differentiate teachers support as evidenced by the coach's log, daily/weekly schedule, classroom visitations; and
• monitoring the teacher's use of data driven instruction during classroom visitations
• participating in data reviews of all CELLA results

The principal will provide time for the media specialist to attend grade-level planning meetings so that collaborative planning between the media specialist and the classroom teachers can occur. Increasing collaborative planning and teaching between the classroom teacher and the media specialist will positively impact media center circulation. The principal will take an active role in promoting library resources and services through faculty meetings, PTA meetings, and encouraging participation in school-wide media center reading promotion campaigns. The principal and the media specialist will review circulation statistics provided through the Destiny Library Management System to identify circulation trends and set circulation goals. Additionally, the media specialist will be a member of the Literacy Leadership Team. The principal will work with the reading and the Literacy Leadership Team to guarantee fidelity of implementation of the K-12 CRRP.

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.

Miami Heights Elementary offers opportunities for local early childhood agencies (Head Start, private pre-schools, etc.) to visit the school during the school day. Students are invited with their parents to tour the Kindergarten classrooms.
All incoming kindergarten students are screened by the school's certified kindergarten teachers in order to determine each child's readiness rates utilizing the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS) Assessment. The resulting data is disaggregated in order to identify individual student needs. Low performing students will be placed in intervention groups in order to provide specific skill remediation.
Parents will be notified through flyers, monthly calendars, and Connect Ed messages of upcoming parent workshops that will better enable them to work with their child at home, especially in the area of reading.

Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

N/A

High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

N/A

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1A: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 25% of students achieved proficiency (Level 3). Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (level 3) by 2 percentage points to 27%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 25% (134)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 27% (147)	1A.1. The area of deficiency demonstrated on the 2012 FCAT was Reading Reporting Category 3, Literary Analysis in Fiction and Nonfiction for grades 4 and 5 students. Difficulty lies in identifying and explaining the purpose of text features (e.g., table of contents, glossary, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, and illustrations).	1A.1. Teachers will infuse the Social Studies textbook into the Reading and Language Arts curriculum in order to teach students to identify and interpret elements of story structure within and across texts. Time For Kids and Scholastic News magazines will be utilized to expose students to world-wide current events, identify text features (subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc) and to locate, interpret and organize information.	1A.1. Literacy Leadership Team	1A.1. Monitor and make adjustments to ongoing Social Studies assessments, student engagement and teacher feedback	1A.1. Formative: Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0
			1A.2. The area of deficiency demonstrated on the 2012 FCAT was Reading Reporting Category 3, Literary Analysis/Fiction/ Nonfiction for grades 4 and 5 students. Difficulty lies in identifying and explaining an author's use of descriptive, idiomatic, and figurative language (e.g., personification, similes), and examine how it is used to describe people, feelings, and objects.	1A.2. Conduct a month-long poetry unit to study different types of poems and practice identifying descriptive language that defines moods and provides imagery. One week per month will be dedicated to a theme-based study of poetry for the purposes of reading, analyzing, writing and reciting. Organize a Poetic Social event for stakeholders as a culminating activity where students can recite the poems created during the school year.	1A.2. Literacy Leadership Team	1A.2. Monitor and assess quality of student-created poetry over time Observe evidence of descriptive, idiomatic, and figurative language in student recital for the Poetic Social culminating activity	1A.2. Formative: Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reading Reporting Category 3, Literary Analysis/Fiction/ Nonfiction for grades 4 and 5 students.	2A.1. Incorporate more literary texts, recommended by the Common Core Standards, to identify and interpret elements of story structure within a text.	2A.1. Literacy Leadership Team	2A.1. Monitor student performance on Accelerated Reader Tests, teacher feedback, student engagement and parental involvement.	2A.1. Formative: Interim Assessments; Monthly Reading Benchmark Assessment
Reading Goal #2A: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 32% of students achieved proficiency levels at or above 4. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 4 by 1 percentage point to 33%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 32% (175)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 33% (180)		Difficulty lies in identifying and explaining the elements of plot structure, including exposition, setting, and character development.			Summative: 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.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
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test, the percentage of students making learning gains increased by 15 percentage points as compared to the 2011 FCAT Reading Test.	3A.1. Schedules for Reading Plus in computer labs will be changed to two 45-minute sessions. Other classes will create a rotation schedule so that all students utilize the computers in the classroom for Reading Plus twice per week.	3A.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	3A.1. Monitor the Number of Sessions Completed Report from the Reading Plus technology program will be reviewed for monthly rewards to the classes with the most number of sessions completed.	3A.1. Formative: Interim Assessments; Guided Reading Scores from Reading Plus
Reading Goal #3A: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 77% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 82%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 77% (270)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 82% (288)	Access to technological programs is limited due to schedule constraints for computer lab visits.	The door to the computer lab will be re-keyed so that it remains locked at all times and those classes scheduled for the lab will have access.			Summative: 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.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 group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test, the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains increased by 33 percentage points as compared to the 2011 FCAT Reading Test. Students are in need of remediation and intervention. Voyager Passport inconsistently used to provide remediation for targeted groups.	4A.1. An Instructional Focus Calendar will be created for A and B Intervention groups. Attendance/score sheets for intervention progress monitoring assessments will be collected bi-weekly. Implement tutoring after school 2 times per week and also Saturday Academy utilizing SuccessMaker, Reading Plus, and other supplemental materials. Push-In intervention for lowest 25% in Retainee & ELL self-contained classrooms.	4A.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	4A.1. Monitor the input of Student Scores on Lesson Checkpoints and Benchmark tests will be monitored from Voyager Teacher Management System. Monitor the increase or decrease of student scores on the Monthly Assessments.	4A.1. Formative: Voyager Benchmark Tests; District Reading Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 Formative: District Reading Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0
Reading Goal #4: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 80% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase in the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 85%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 80% (73)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 85% (77)					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** **53%**	57%	61%	65%	69%	73%	77%
Reading Goal #5A: The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 57% of students achieved proficiency levels 3 or above. Our goal from 2011- 2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.							

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 subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**			5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: As identified on the 2012 FCAT Reading, the White and Black subgroups demonstrated an area of deficiency in Reading Reporting Category 3, Literary Analysis in Fiction and Nonfiction. Difficulty lies in identifying and explaining the purpose of text features (e.g., table of contents, glossary, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, and illustrations).	5B.1. Teachers will infuse the Social Studies textbook into the Reading and Language Arts curriculum in order to teach students to identify and interpret elements of story structure within and across texts. Time For Kids and Scholastic News magazines will be utilized to expose students to world-wide current events, identify text features (subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc) and to locate, interpret and organize information.	5B.1. Literacy Leadership Team	5B.1. Monitor and make adjustments to ongoing Social Studies assessments, student engagement and teacher feedback	5B.1. Formative: Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0
Reading Goal #5B: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 53% of the White student subgroup and 37% of the Black student subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the White student subgroup proficiency by 10 percentage points to 63% and increase the Black student subgroup proficiency by 9 percentage points to 46%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 53% (8) Black: 37% (17)	2013 Expected Level of - Performance:* White: 63% (9) Black: 46% (22)					

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. NA	5C.1. NA	5C.1. NA	5C.1. NA	5C.1. NA
Reading Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 54% of students in the English Language Learners subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 56%.	54% (75)	56% (77)					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 25% of students in the SWD subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 13 percentage points to 38%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 25% (20)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 38% (30)	5D.1. As identified on the 2012 FCAT Reading, the SWD subgroup did not make satisfactory progress. Placing students in intervention within timely and appropriate manner has been an obstacle. Inconsistent use of Voyager Passport intervention.	5D.1. Identify tier 2 and 3 students and begin appropriate interventions within the first three weeks of the 2012 – 2013 school year. An Instructional Focus Calendar will be created for Intervention groups. All attendance sheets and score sheets for Intervention progress monitoring assessments will be collected every two weeks.	5D.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5D.1. Review program data reports to ensure students are making adequate progress and adjust intervention as necessary The input of Student Scores will be monitored from Voyager Teacher Management System.	5D.1. Mini-Assessments; SuccessMaker, Reading Plus, and Ticket to Read reports; District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.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
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. NA	5E.1. NA	5E.1. NA	5E.1. NA	5E.1. NA

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

Reading Goal #5E: The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 59% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 63%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	59% (294)	63% (314)					

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
CCSS	K-3 Grade	Reading Coach	Reading Teachers	August 16, 2012	Turn Key Training for other teachers who did not attend	Reading Coach
Lesson Study	3-5 Grade	Reading Coach	Reading and Language Arts, Social Studies and Spanish teachers	Monthly September 2012- May 2013	Lesson Study observations	Instructional Coaches
Accelerated Reader (AR) Program	Grades K-5	Media Specialist	Reading and Language Arts teachers	September 26, 2012	Quarterly incentives for students who meet the grade level AR goal	Reading/LA teachers, Media Specialist and Instructional Coaches

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
Goal 2.1	Novels recommended by Common Core	Title I	$2000.00

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

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

	Standards		
Goal 1.1	Time for Kids and Scholastic News magazines	EESAC Funds	$1701.70
			Subtotal: $3701.70
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Goal 5A.2.	Materials for Lesson Study PLC	02 Funds (supplies)	$1000.00
Goal 5B.2.	PD for ELL teachers to utilize FAIR scores to create lessons for small group instruction	02 Funds (supplies)	$100.00
			Subtotal: $1100.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Identify tier 2 and 3 students and begin appropriate interventions within the first three weeks of the 2012 - 2013 school year. Consistently monitor progress.	After School Tutoring Staff After school Tutoring	Title I	$18,127.00
Goal 1.3 Poetic Ice Cream Social	Culminating activity from year-long poetry units to build skillful writers.	PTA	$300.00
			Subtotal: $18,427.00
			Total: $23,228.70

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: The results from the CELLA 2012 CELLA test indicate that 49% of students are proficient in Listening and Speaking.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 49% (202)	1.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the CELLA Test was in the Beginning LEA Proficiency levels for Kg, 3rd and 4th grade.	1.1. Provide opportunities for students to produce language in response to first-hand, multi-sensorial experiences. Facilitate language production, allowing students to interact with each other and retell events or reactions.	1.1. Leadership Team	1.1. Ongoing Classroom Assessments focusing on students' ability to facilitate language production and retelling of events while creating a personal view representation of the lesson.	1.1. Formative: Mini Assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA Test
		1.2. The noted deficiency levels for grades 1st. 2nd and 5th was in the Low Intermediate LEA	1.2. Implement teacher lead groups and modeling consistently. Provide opportunities for students to use Total Physical Response (TPR), illustrations/diagrams, and simple, direct language	1.2. Leadership Team	1.2. Ongoing Classroom Assessments focusing on students' ability to paraphrase what they have read accounting for vocabulary words and concepts important to the lesson while using their own vocabulary words and concepts to recreate the story.	1.2. Formative: Mini Assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA Test
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in Reading. CELLA Goal #2: The results from the CELLA 2012 CELLA test indicate that 35% of students are proficient in Reading.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : 35% (143)	2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the CELLA Reading Test was in the Low Intermediate Proficiency levels for 1st, 2nd and 4th grade.	2.1. Students will utilize the newly acquired language to develop reading skills and depending on their differentiated instruction, the assignment will be more complex (A8).	2.1. Leadership Team	2.1. Ongoing Classroom Assessments focusing on students' ability to write what they have discussed in class thru cooperative learning while focusing on key vocabulary. Vocabulary context clues as well as Vocabulary Improvement Strategies (VIS) to help students recognize clues within the text.	2.1. Formative: Mini Assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA Test
		2.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the CELLA Reading Test was in the High Intermediate Proficiency levels for Kg and 5th grade.	2.2. Students will utilize the newly acquired language to develop reading skills while using Interactive words walls and cognates to help them in their understanding of the reading passage.	2.2. Leadership Team	2.2. Ongoing Classroom Assessments focusing on students' ability to write thru the use of Venn Diagrams, Story maps and structural analysis.	2.2. Formative: Mini Assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA Test
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
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. CELLA Goal #3: The results from the CELLA 2012 CELLA test indicate that 31% of students are proficient in Writing.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 31% (129)	2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the CELLA Writing Test was High Intermediate levels for 1st, 2nd, 4th and 5th grade.	2.1. Students will utilize the newly acquired language to develop writing skills using Summarizing along with Writing prompts and samples such as narrative, expository, persuasive and/or reference papers.	2.1. Leadership Team	2.1. Ongoing Classroom Assessments focusing on students' ability to write thru the use of writing prompts.	2.1. Formative: Mini Assessments Writing Prompts-Edusoft Summative: 2013 CELLA Test
		2.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the CELLA Writing Test was Beginning for Kindergarten.	2.2. Students will utilize the s newly acquired language to develop writing skills using illustrating and labeling to identify key concepts when writing along with Graphic Organizers.	2.2. Leadership Team	2.2. Ongoing Classroom Assessments focusing on students' ability to write thru the use of Graphic Organizers and Story maps.	2.2. Formative: Mini Assessments Writing Prompts-Edusoft Summative: 2013 CELLA Test

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

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
		Subtotal:	
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:	

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. Mathematics Goal #1A: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 25% of students in grades 3-5 achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to maintain or increase level 3 student proficiency.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 25% (135)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 25% (136)	1A.1. The area of deficiency demonstrated on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement, for grade 3 students. Difficulty lies in Describing and analyzing properties of two-dimensional shapes; selecting appropriate units, strategies and tools to solve problems involving perimeter; and measuring objects using fractional parts.	1A.1. Utilize current technology classroom tools, Mimio and/or Smartboard, in order to provide students with opportunities to engage in virtual activities focused on developing conceptual understanding of geometric and measurement concepts, such as Gizmos. Provide grade-level appropriate activities that promote the use geometric knowledge and spatial reasoning to develop foundations for understanding perimeter, area, volume, and surface area (Grade 5 concept).	1A.1. Instructional coach(es) and Administrators	1A.1. Results of biweekly assessments will be reviewed by instructional team to ensure progress. Adjustments to curriculum focus will be made as needed. District interim data reports will be reviewed by EESAC and adjustments to strategies made as needed.	1A.1. Formative: Edusoft reports of biweekly assessments and District Interim Data reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment
			1A.2. Difficulty lies in solving non-routine problems using various strategies such as "solving a simpler problem" and "guess, check and revise".	1A.2. Increase the use of writing in math by using journals in order to help students communicate their understanding of practical mathematical situations, reinforce difficult concepts and skills as well as mathematical vocabulary while also reinforcing strategies for solving problems.	1A.2. Instructional coach(es) and MTSS Leadership Team	1A.2. Results of Go Math End-of-Chapter assessments will be reviewed by classroom teachers and instructional coach to ensure progress. District interim data reports will be reviewed by EESAC and adjustments to strategies made as needed.	1A.2. Formative: ThinkCentral reports of Go Math End-of-Chapter assessments and District Interim Data reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.

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

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. The area of deficiency demonstrated on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was in the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement, for grade 3 students. Difficulty lies in Describing and analyzing properties of two-dimensional shapes; selecting appropriate units, strategies and tools to solve problems involving perimeter; and measuring objects using fractional parts.	2A.1. Engage students in activities to use technology (such as Gizmos, Riverdeep® or the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives) that include visual stimulus to develop conceptual understanding of measurement and students' geometry and spatial sense. Select rigorous, real-world problems, aligned to content for an opening routine/ problem-of-the-day and provide students opportunities to solve them in a cooperative group setting.	2A.1. Instructional coach(es) and MTSS Leadership Team	2A.1. FOCUS Achieves reports will be reviewed by instructional coach to ensure progress. District interim data reports will be reviewed by Leadership Team and adjustments to selection of problem solving content and strategies will be made as needed.	2A.1. Formative: FOCUS Achieves assessments and District Interim Data reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.
Mathematics Goal #2A: The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 34% of students in grades 3-5 achieved proficiency levels 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 35%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 34% (187)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 35% (191)					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test, the percentage of students making learning gains increased by 18 percentage points as compared to the 2011 FCAT Mathematics Test. In the Reporting Category of Geometry and Measurement, grade 3 exhibited a decrease of 8 percentage points.	3A.1. Utilize a practice to maintain knowledge with daily warm-ups/problem of the day to increase problem solving skills using On-Target comprehensive review workbooks. Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts by support the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice.	3A.1. Instructional coach	3A.1. Results of District Mini-Benchmark Assessments (Mini- BATs) given for each benchmark will be reviewed on a bi-weekly basis by the instructional coach to ensure progress. Monthly Edusoft data reports for performance of each benchmark	3A.1. Formative: Mini-BATs and District Interim Data Reports Summative: 2013 Mathematics FCAT 2.0
Mathematics Goal #3A: The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 79% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 84%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 79% (278)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 84% (296)					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3. .	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.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
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 73% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students by 5 percentage points to 78%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 73% (70)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 78% (75)	4A.1. Based on the 2012 Mathematics FCAT, the percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains increased by 13 percentage points. Difficulty lies in understanding and implementing problem-solving strategies.	4A.1. Mathematics intervention will be provided for those students in the lowest 25% in the form of a Before School 30 minute Tutoring Session utilizing Pearson Learning's SuccessMaker program. Utilize a practice to maintain knowledge with daily warm-ups/problem of the day to increase problem solving skills using On-Target comprehensive review workbooks.	4A.1. Instructional coach and MTSS Leadership Team	4A.1. Measure of student performance taken from weekly SuccessMaker Cumulative Performance reports will be reviewed by the program leader and Instructional coach. District interim data reports will be reviewed by Leadership Team and adjustments will be made as needed.	4A.1. Formative: SuccessMaker Cumulative Performance reports and District Interim Data Reports Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 54%	58%	62%	66%	69%	73%	77%
Mathematics Goal #5A: The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 58% of students achieved proficiency levels 3 or above. Our goal from 2011- 2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.							

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 subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**			5B.1. As identified on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test, the White and Black student subgroups are not making satisfactory progress.	5B.1. Teachers will utilize the Go Math Differentiated Instruction Online Resources in order to meet the students' individualized needs during small-group instruction.	5B.1. Instructional coach and Administrators	5B.1. Online Go Math assessments results on ThinkCentral will be monitored by classroom teachers and instructional coaches bi-weekly in order to ensure progress.	5B.1. Formative: Go Math online reports and District Interim Data Reports
Mathematics Goal #5B: The results of the 2012 FCAT math test indicate that 47% of the White student subgroup and 37% of the Black student subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the White student subgroup proficiency by 6 percentage points to 53% and increase the Black student subgroup proficiency by18 percentage points to 55%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 47% (7) Black: 37% (17)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 53% (8) Black: 55% (26)		Differentiated small group instruction has not been an emphasis in math.			District interim data reports will be reviewed by Leadership Team and adjustments will be made as needed.	Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment
			5B.2. Sufficient time allocated for much needed remediation and intervention.	5B.2. Implement tutoring after school twice a week utilizing SuccessMaker and other supplemental materials. Incorporate a during-school 30- minute intensive "push-in" small group intervention to maintain learning gains.	5B.2. Instructional coach and MTSS Leadership Team	5B.2. SuccessMaker Cumulative Performance reports and progress monitoring charts will be reviewed and monitored on a bi-weekly basis in order to ensure progress. District interim data reports will be reviewed by Leadership Team and adjustments will be made as needed.	5B.2. Formative: SuccessMaker Cumulative Performance reports and District Interim Data Reports Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. NA	5C.1. NA	5C.1. NA	5C.1. NA	5C.1. NA
Mathematics Goal #5C: The results of the 2012 FCAT math test indicate that 60% of the English Language Learners student subgroup achieved proficiency.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 60% (83)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 64% (88)					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 64%.			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. NA.	5D.1. NA	5D.1. NA	5D.1. NA	5D.1. NA
Mathematics Goal #5D: The results of the 2012 FCAT math test indicate that 37% of the SWD student subgroup achieved proficiency.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 37% (30)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 40% (32)					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2. NA	5D.2.	5D.2.
Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 40%.			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. NA	5E.1. NA	5E.1. NA	5E.1. NA	5E.1. NA
Mathematics Goal #5E: The results of the 2012 FCAT math test indicate that 60% of the Economically Disadvantaged student subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 63%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 60% (299)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 63% (314)					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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
Go Math! Online Instructional Resources	Grades K-5	Instructional Coach	Mathematics teachers of grades K-5 students	September 7, 2012	Monitor student progress through Go Math! Online Reports	Mathematics Chairperson
Smartboard "Notebook" Training	Grades 3-5	Instructional Coach	Mathematics teachers of grades 3-5 students	October 12, 2012	Monitor student progress on mathematic benchmarks assessments	Mathematics Chairperson
Edusoft Refresher Training	Grades K-5	Instructional Coach and Media Specialist	Mathematics teachers of grades K-5 students	October 5, 2012	Monitor student progress through reports generated on Edusoft.	Mathematics Chairperson

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

<u>Mathematics Budget</u> (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
Strategy 3a.3.	Florida Coach, Standards-Based Instruction, New Gold Edition	EESAC Funds	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
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
4a.1. - Identify the lowest performing students in grades 3 – 5 based on instructional needs; provide before school tutoring three days per week.	Before School Tutoring Staff	Title I	$12,362
5a.-5e. - Identify the lowest performing students in grades 3-5 based on instructional needs; provide after school tutoring twice a week.	After School Tutoring Staff	Title I	$16,265
			Subtotal: $28,627.00
			Total: $29,127.00

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]).

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Elementary and Middle Science Goals</th><th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</td>
<td>1A.1.
The area of deficiency demonstrated on the 2012 FCAT was Science Reporting Category: Nature of Science.

There is a lack of exposure to inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Nature of Science.</td>
<td>1A.1.
Develop Professional Learning Communities (PLC) of elementary science teachers in order to research, collaborate, design, and implement instructional strategies to increase rigor through inquiry-based learning in Nature of Science

Provide activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Nature of Science.

Provide opportunities for teachers to integrate literacy in the science classroom in order for students to enhance scientific meaning through writing, talking, and reading science.</td>
<td>1A.1.
Literacy Leadership Team</td>
<td>1A.1.
Review data from Mini-Assessments and District Interim Assessments to monitor student progress

Data Chats with Science teachers</td>
<td>1A.1.
Formative: Monthly Benchmark Assessments and District Interim Assessments

Summative: 2013 Science FCAT 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Goal #1A:

The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicate that 31% of students achieved level 3 proficiency.

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels by 4 percentage points to 35%.</td>
<td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*

31% (58)</td>
<td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

35% (66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td><td colspan="2"></td>
<td>1A.2.</td>
<td>1A.2.</td>
<td>1A.2.</td>
<td>1A.2.</td>
<td>1A.2.</td>
</tr>
</table>

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: The results of the 2012 FCAT Science Test indicate that 12% of students achieved proficiency levels 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase proficiency levels by 2 percentage points to 14%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 12% (23)	2013Expected Level of Performance:* 14% (26)	2A.1. The area of deficiency demonstrated on the 2012 FCAT was Science Reporting Category: Nature of Science. There is a lack of exposure to inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Nature of Science.	2A.1. Provide rigorous science enrichment opportunities to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Nature of Science. Provide instruction in grades K-5 that adheres to the depth and rigor of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards as delineated in the District Pacing Guides.	2A.1. Literacy Leadership Team	2A.1. Review data from Mini-Assessments and District Interim Assessments to monitor student progress.	2A.1. Formative: Monthly Benchmark Assessments and District Interim Assessments
			2A.2. Students demonstrate difficulty in higher order thinking skills.	2A.2. Provide activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Nature of Science.	2A.2. Literacy Leadership Team	2A.2. Data Chats with Science teachers	2A.2. Summative: 2013 Science FCAT 2.0
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science 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
Smartboard Training	Grades 3 & 4	District Personnel	Grades 3 & 4 Science Teachers	November 15, 2012	Classroom Observation	Administration

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
Goal 2.2	Assistance for students unable to pay for field trips	PTA	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Goal 2.1 & 2.2	Provide Smartboards in Third Grade Science Classrooms	Title I Funds	$12000.00
			Subtotal: $12000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Total: $12,500.00

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. Writing Goal #1A: The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing test indicate that 87% of students achieved proficiency (level 3.0 or higher). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase proficiency levels in writing by 1 percentage point to 88%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 87% (155)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 88% (157)	1A.1. The 2012 FCAT Writing proficiency rate dropped by 5 percent as compared to the 2011 Writing FCAT.	1A.1. There will be a monthly focus on one of the three writing styles; expository, narrative and persuasive, with emphasis on grammar and punctuation. Writing Camp involving students learning writing techniques as a grade level in the cafeteria twice a week.	1A.1. Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)	1A.1. Administer and score monthly writing assessments to monitor student progress. Adjust instruction as necessary to address areas of need.	1A.1. Formative: District Writing Pre- and Post Tests; Monthly Writing Prompts Summative: Grade 4 2013 Writing FCAT
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.

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 Workshop (for Writing Camp)	4th grade	Reading Coach	Reading Teachers	(Weekly on Tuesday) August 2012 – February 2013	Collaborative Planning Meetings Visit Writing Camp	Reading Coach

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

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

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
			Subtotal:
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
Goal 2A.1	Materials, snacks and prizes for Writing teachers to conduct Monthly Scoring parties to help score one another's student writing.	PTA	$200.00
Goal 2B.1	Papers/sentence strips/markers to create schools-wide word wall in the halls so that all students are exposed to the best practices of writing.	02 Funds (supplies)	$100.00
Goal 2D.1.	Transparencies for Quarterly Writing Workshops	02 Funds (supplies)	$100.00
			Subtotal: $400.00
			Total: $400.00

End of Writing Goals

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. Our highly transient population travels frequently out of the country, removing students from school for weeks at a time. Students are excessively absent due to Many parents do not understand the importance of continuous daily attendance in school; therefore it is common for them to not send their child to school even though the child is healthy and able to be in school.	1.1. Inform parents and students about the importance of attendance in school via a parent workshop at the beginning and towards the middle of the school year. Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of non-attendance to MTSS/RtI team for intervention process. Implement an attendance incentive program to reward students who achieve perfect attendance quarterly.	1.1. Assistant Principals Student Services	1.1. Conduct bi-weekly review of COGNOS Report. MTSS/RtI will provide updates to administration and faculty at faculty meetings.	1.1. COGNOS Reports, truancy logs, quarterly attendance reports provided by the district and CIS' Home Visit logs.
Attendance Goal #1: Our goal for the 2012- 2013 school year is to increase attendance to 96.06% by minimizing absences due to illness and truancy, and to create a climate in our school where parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated. Another goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardies (10 or more) for the 2012-2013 school year by .5%.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* 95.56% (1182) 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 392 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 270	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* 96.06% (1188) 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 372 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 257					
			1.2. Many of our students arrive to school late missing the start of instructional hours.	1.2. Increase number of home visits by the Community Involvement Specialist (CIS) for students with excessive absences/tardies.	1.2. Assistant Principals Student Services	1.2. Bi- weekly review of COGNOS report. Monthly review of home visit logs	1.2. COGNOS Reports, truancy logs, quarterly attendance reports provided by the district and CIS' Home Visit logs

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
Truancy Prevention	Student Services	District Staff	All counselors and attendance staff.	September 26, 2012	A truancy intervention program must be developed during the PD. An Assistant Principal will monitor the implementation of the program.	Assistant Principals and Counselors

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
Truancy Prevention	Provide incentives for students with improved attendance	PTA	$500.00
			Subtotal:
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: 500.00
			Total: 500.00

End of Attendance Goals

August 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 Suspension Goal #1: Our goal for the 2012- 2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 2.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions	1.1. The total number of outdoor suspensions increased from 14 incidents during the 2010-2011 school year to 18 in the 2011-2012 school year demonstrating an increase of 4 incidents. Opportunities to recognize students for positive behavior have not been prioritized.	1.1. Utilize the Code of Student Conduct by providing incentives for compliance through the use of Elementary SPOT Success Recognition program. Utilize all personnel, where feasible, to monitor and supervise common areas to reduce number of student incidents.	1.1. Administration, Counselors, CIS	1.1. Monitor SPOT Success report by grade level and monitor COGNOS report for suspension rates.	1.1. Participation log for students who are recognized for complying with the Student Code of Conduct Monthly COGNOS suspension report
	0	0					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	0	0					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	18	16					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	13	12					
			1.2. Parental awareness and knowledge of Code of Student Conduct (COSC) is limited.	1.2. School counselors will contact parents of students who have been placed on suspension and provide them with training to build an understanding of the Code of Student Conduct. Provide access to COSC via student handbook and link on school's website.	1.2. Counselor	1.2. Monitor parent contact log for evidence of communication with parents of students who have been placed on indoor suspension.	1.2. Parent communication log Parent Sign-In Log

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

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
The Student Code of Conduct	K-5	Administrator	Schoolwide	August 17, 2012	Monitor SPOT Success monthly report	Leadership Team

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
			Subtotal:
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:

End of Suspension Goals

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

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 Parent Involvement Goal #1: NA Please see Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP)	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* *Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.*	1.1.	1.1	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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
Distribute monthly flyers/calendars of activities/seminars involving parents	Flyers/ Calendars	Title I	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
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: $100.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: Our goal for the 2012- 2013 school year is to increase participation in the Science Fair by at least 95% of students in grades 3-5. This will allow for greater emphasis on inquiry-based learning as well as a greater involvement of students in the development of science projects through the extensive study of science, mathematics and technology. .	1.1. There has been limited opportunity for students to participate in inquiry-based activities, analyze, and explain variables and experimental design.	1.1. Increase activities for students to design and develop science, math and engineering projects utilizing technology by providing opportunities for students to increase scientific thinking through the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities. Provide opportunity for students to showcase and compete in the Science Fair.	1.1. Administration Curriculum Coach Science Leader	1.1. Review data from Mini-Assessments and District Interim Assessments to monitor student progress. Increased participation in Science Fair	1.1. Formative: Monthly Benchmark Assessments and District Interim Assessments Science Fair Projects Summative: 2013 Science FCAT
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Leaders Dialogue	3-5	District Personnel	Science Leader	Quarterly, Beginning September 24, 2012	Sign-in Sheets /Collaborative Planning	Administration, Leadership Team

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

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
		Subtotal:	
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:	

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.	
Reading Budget	
	Total:
CELLA Budget	
	Total:
Mathematics Budget	
	Total:
Science Budget	
	Total:
Writing Budget	
	Total:
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:
	Grand Total:

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		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐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.
The School Advisory Council monitors the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The EESAC, in collaboration with the leadership team, will monitor fidelity of the implementation of the School Improvement Plan and review data regularly. EESAC has recommended that the EESAC budget be used to fund additional instruction such as, after-school tutoring and provide additional student incentives and administrative projects that will assist in the continued academic achievement of the student body. The EESAC fully supports academic programs provided by the District office. All instruction will be aligned to the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and will be in compliance with all District and school guidelines.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Time for Kids and Scholastic News magazines	$1701.70
Florida Coach, Standards-Based Instruction, New Gold Edition	$500.00