

Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

Name of School:

TROPICAL ELEMENTARY

Area:

NORTH

Principal:

DR. JANE K. RESPESS

Area Superintendent:

DR. RONALD BOBAY

SAC Chairperson:

MRS. DOROTHY HIXSON/MR.CHARLES PARKER

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli**Mission Statement:**

Tropical Elementary is committed to developing a community of learners by providing quality education in academics and encouraging critical thinking and creative processes in order to blaze new trails of learning.

Vision Statement:

Our Tropical students, staff, parents, and community blaze trails toward setting and achieving high academic goals as they develop a lifelong love of learning in a mutually respectful environment.

(updated 2012)

Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

One place to start – three year trend history (optional):

Tropical Elementary continues to be an “A” rated school with overall high performing scores. Our FCAT 2012 School Grade data indicate 78% scoring at or above grade level with 81% making Learning Gains in Reading; 82% scoring at above grade level with 81% making Learning Gains in Math; 94% scoring at or above grade level in Writing; 89% scoring at or above grade level in Science; 79% of our students within the lowest 25% made Learning Gains in Reading; 72% of our students within the lowest 25% made Learning Gains in Math.

As we implement the Common Core State Standards and in light of the more stringent FCAT levels implemented Spring 2012, teachers must actively participate in PLC/Collaborative team meetings with qualitative and quantitative data gained from consistently tracking student progress. Collaborative discussions must focus on tracking student progress, error analysis to determine trends and utilizing Marzano’s high yield instructional strategies in an effort to promote the highest levels of cognitive engagement in all content areas.

Tropical Elementary’s teachers and staff understand the importance and relevance of effective writing skills to prepare our students for college and career readiness. In 2012, we had 94% of our 4th graders score at or above grade level with a 3.0 being considered on grade level. A new state rubric was introduced in 2012. It is evident that there is a need for utilizing more effective research-based instructional strategies in each classroom grades K-6 in the area of writing.

89% of our 5th graders scored at or above grade level on 2012 FCAT Science. Through the utilization of high yield instructional strategies in this content area, including summarizing and interactive notebooks, as well as the continued implementation of our district’s science program in K-6, we anticipate continued learning gains in the content area of Science.

Proficiency is defined as scoring level 3 and above on FCAT.

Rank in State (of)	Level	School Number	Elementary School (sorted alphabetically)	2012 Grade	2011 Grade	2012 Adjusted Points for SG Calculation	2012 Actual Assessment Points Earned	2011 Assessment Points Earned	2011-2012 incr/ decr	Reading % at or above standards	Math % at or above standards	Writing % at or above standards	Science % at or above standards	Reading Points for Learning Gains	Math Points for Learning Gains	Reading Points for LG for L25%	Math Points for LG for L25%	F/R Lunch Rate	Minority Rate	Title 1
50	E	4041	TROPICAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	A	A	656	656	666	-10	78	82	94	89	81	81	79	72	35	20	NO

School Number	School	School Year	Grade	% at Level 3 or Higher in Reading	% at Level 3 or Higher in Math	% Meeting the Writing Standard	% at Level 3 or Higher in Science	% Making Learning Gains in Reading	% Making Learning Gains in Math	% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading	% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math	Earned (Sum of Previous 9	Percent Tested	Free and Reduced Lunch	Minority Rate
		Year to see detailed										(Includes Learning Gains)			
4041	TROPICAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	2010-11	A	92	94	89	78	77	81	72	83	666	100	35	20

School Number	Elementary School (sorted alphabetically)	2010 % of AYP Criteria Met	2010 Grade	2009 Grade	2008 Grade	2010 Points Earned	2009 Points Earned	2009-2010 incr/ decr	2008 Points Earned	% Meeting High Standards in Reading	% Meeting High Standards in Math	% Meeting High Standards in Writing	% Meeting High Standards in Science	% Making Learning Gains in Reading	% Making Learning Gains in Math	% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading	% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math	Percent Tested	Free or Reduced Lunch Rate	Minority Rate	Title 1
4041	TROPICAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	95	A	A	A	663	664	-1	655	93	93	87	91	78	79	67	75	100	28.0	15.1	NO

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

Brevard Public Schools espouses the mission “to serve every student with excellence as the standard” (BPS, 2012). In keeping with our district’s mission, Tropical Elementary expanded its implementation of our school-wide Professional Learning Community during the years of 2009 – 2012. A group of teachers and the administration received training during the summer of 2012 regarding PLC. The PLC teacher team along with two additional teachers who attended training on Brevard Effective Teaching Strategies (BEST) trained our faculty about collaborative teams and utilizing BEST strategies during the 2010-11 and 2011-2012 school years.

All teachers including the guidance counselor and ESE teachers attend a weekly collaborative team meeting that focuses on the lowest 25% of our students and in conjunction with our School Improvement Plan and District Strategic Plan. Collaborative teams typically meet each Wednesday, during a common planning time to discuss student concerns within the lowest 25%, effective instructional strategies, discuss implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS); establish common formative assessments and to share data as a grade level regarding formative and summative assessments. During preplanning 2012, administration discussed AllThingsPLC (2009) espoused teachers analyzing errors in students’ work and assessments to determine which concepts have not been mastered. Dr. Max Thompson also recommended this instructional

strategy during the summer 2012 High Performing Learning Culture inservice. A team of teachers and administrators attended training on High Performing Learning Culture during summer 2012; that team trained the teachers during preplanning. Tropical Elementary's faculty and staff demonstrate that they understand and effectively utilize the element of "culture" and "relationships" within the schoolhouse. Barth (2006) emphasized that "the nature of relationships among the adults within a school has a greater influence on the character and quality of that school and on student accomplishment than anything else" (p.9). However, teachers' feedback and data support that inconsistencies and differing interpretations exist in the definition of utilizing "rigor" within the classroom setting and instructional practice, particularly with on grade level students.

FCAT 2012 data indicated the lowest percentage of students scoring at Level 3 and above occurred within 4th grade. These data showed 70% of students in reading and 70% of students in math; this is a difference that our teachers and administration will be analyzing (Other Grade Level Data ~ 3rd Reading: 80% at Level 3 and above/Math: 78% at Level 3 and above; 5th Reading: 81% at Level 3 and above/Math: 87% at Level 3 and above/Science: 89% at Level 3 and above; 6th Reading: 79% at Level 3 and above/Math: 87% at Level 3 and above)

Teachers will continue to utilize BEST practices as evidenced in through classroom visitations. Our Common Core State Standards team presented an online planning tool that approximately 50% of the teachers have decided to implement. This will assist with the BEST practice and Marzano's Instructional Strategies of Lesson Design/Interdisciplinary Planning; Summarizing and Questioning Strategies. In keeping with the Instructional Personnel Performance Appraisal System as well as research based practice, teachers will include in their Professional Growth Plans how they will be tracking student progress.

A school-wide acceptance to new ideas, concepts and meeting to discuss current practices supported through research is embedded into our High Performing Learning Culture. Our weaknesses include progressing beyond the discussion of new practices and ensuring a complete implementation of research-based practices. The barrier of time constraints with regard to collaborative team meetings has been a concern raised in the past. During the 2012-2013 school year, seven Early Release dates were scheduled for teachers to utilize for planning and collaborating. We will also be utilizing direct resources with substitute monies to provide increased opportunities for teachers to engage in training, collaborative/PLC team meetings, and peer observations to increase their professional growth.

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

DuFour, DuFour, Eaker and Many (2012) espoused "a focus on and commitment to the learning of each student" (p.11). The authors emphasized that when faculty members collaborate a process is created "in which teachers work together interdependently in order to impact their classroom practice in easy that will lead to better results for their students, for their team, and for their school" (p.12). Effective collaborative teams create a safe learning environment where professionals embrace shared successes and foster a culture that acknowledges failure as part of the learning process. This culture reflects the same learning environment that all educators strive to create for our students in the classroom. According to York-Barr (et al), "the ultimate goal of school-wide reflective practice is continuous improvement of practice in order to increase student learning" (p. 123). Further researchers indicate that "as reflection increases, errors decrease" (p.123). AllThingsPLC (2009) advocated analyzing common formative and summative assessments to identify patterns and trends among students' mistakes. This instructional practice allows teachers to focus more time and specific strategies on those concepts to enhance comprehension and mastery of the CCSS.

Professional development to be effectively systemic and create real change toward high performing learning culture must require participants to not only learn new strategies, but put new strategies into practice and reflect on such practice; which can be realized through peer reflective dialogue and a "deprivatization of practice (i.e. more open sharing about practices). Educators are confronted with a vast array of programs, curriculum and/or strategies that are hailed to promote increased student achievement. With the ongoing changes in education as a part of NCLB, meeting AYP and high stakes testing, educators do not have the luxury of piloting unproven methods of instruction.

After a careful review of instructional practices, research and best practices, while taking into consideration the

findings above, it has been determined that raising student's cognitive engagement in the classroom is essential to raising and sustaining academic achievement. This is particularly applicable to students who begin the school year as having demonstrated on grade-level performance. Higher order thinking skills are critical to ensuring on grade-level performance. Marzano's research presents nine strategies that promote effective instruction. These strategies are researched based and Marzano's findings emphasize that the classroom teacher makes a significant impact on individual student achievement. Specific strategies may yield as much as 45 percentile gain points in student achievement. Several of the strategies emphasize exposing students to higher-level questioning strategies. For example the strategy of "Summarizing and Note Taking," when done effectively requires students to further analyze information at a deeper level. This specific strategy demonstrates the potential, when effectively implemented, to yield a student achievement gain of 35 percentile points. In addition, Tracking Student Progress and Scoring Scales, when implemented with fidelity, demonstrates the potential to yield a student achievement gain of a 34 percentile point increase.

CONTENT AREA:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Science	<input type="checkbox"/> Parental Involvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Drop-out Programs
<input type="checkbox"/> Language Arts	<input type="checkbox"/> Social Studies	<input type="checkbox"/> Arts/PE	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:		

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

Tropical Elementary will increase the effectiveness of our collaborative teams and vertical teams within our school-wide Professional Learning Community (PLC) by focusing each meeting on analyzing errors from common formative and summative assessments to discern patterns and trends to improve instruction as evidenced by an increase in student achievement.

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

Barrier	Action Steps	Person Responsible	Timetable	Budget	In-Process Measure
1. Time constraints and keeping meetings data-focused	1. establish ground rules & online agenda for teams to input their weekly notes on intranet server	CCSS team (Parsons, Rigdon, Castillo, Respass)	8/8/12- 5/15/13 Weekly upload of notes on intranet server	NA	Pre-planning agenda; Collaborative Team notes;
	1a. Hire substitutes to cover classes; this will enable teachers to have extended planning times to discern data for error analysis	Administration will establish schedule	At least 1 st nine weeks;	\$500.00 District Substitute Funds	Collaborative Team notes; substitute schedule;
2. Concerns about PGP development &	2. provide teachers support & training regarding the PGP;	Administrators	8/1/12-9/2012	NA	Pinpoint system

implementation for 2012-2013	allow discussion among collaborative teams to facilitate writing Distinguished PGP				
3. Misunderstandings of the connections and implementation of High Yield strategies into daily lessons	3. Connect High Yield strategies of Summarizing, Questioning Strategies & Lesson Design/Interdisciplinary planning to CCSS implementation & and collegial observations	Administrators/CCSS team/Literacy Coach	8/8/12- 5/15/13	NA	PLC/Collaborative Team notes/emails and handouts from Literacy Coach and/or CCSS team
4. Fluid documentation of students' entry and withdrawal	4. identify students within the lowest 25% in reading and math; provide names of identified students on our intranet server to Collaborative teams	Administrators District listing Technology Specialist Collaborative Teams	8/8/12- 5/15/13	NA	Lowest 25% listing on server; Collaborative team notes; PGPs
5. Understanding the similarities and differences between the new Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the previous Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) to ensure students' mastery	5. implementation of CCSS in K-2 and begin training for a preliminary implementation of CCSS in 3-6	K-2 ELA team; CCSS team; Administrators	8/1/12- 5/15/13	NA	Pre-planning Agenda
	5a. In keeping with the CCSS, Literacy Coach will train teachers regarding text complexity to increase achievement with students in the lowest 25% and SWD.	Kristen Turner ~ Literacy Coach	1 st 9 weeks Fall 2012	NA	Training Agenda from Literacy Coach; emails from Literacy Coach regarding CCSS and analyzing FAIR scores.
	5b. Administrator will run baseline DA reports from A3 as directed by the district.	Karry Castillo~ Asst. Principal	Beginning of the SY End of 1 st Sem/Beg of 2 nd Sem End of SY	NA	Baseline DA reports; Item Analysis in A3
	5c. Collaborative teams will analyze errors from FAIR, DA assessments, other formative assessments to discern	Kindy, 1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th , 5 th , 6 th , Activity & ESE teachers	DA Assessments are administered three (3) times a year; Formative assessments vary by grade level	NA	PLC/Collaborative Team notes

	CCSS/NGSSS concepts that need to be re-taught prior to summative assessments				
	5d. ASP teacher will collaborate with collaborative teams to share students' academic progress and error analysis of CCSS/NGSSS concepts	Karry Castillo, AP & Kathy Tremblay, ASP teacher	2-3x weekly through April 12, 2013	District ASP funds \$4125.00	PLC/Collaborative Team notes; ASP lesson plans
	5e. Encourage teacher professional development that will transfer into knowledge gained and implemented into the classroom	Administrators	August 2012 through May 2013	SAC Funds to pay for substitutes \$1000.00	SAC budget; listing of teachers and dates of inservices attended
	5f. Collaborative/PLC teams will analyze students' errors on common formative and summative assessments to determine patterns; engage in professional discussion about the 21 st century instructional strategies associated with CCSS to address specific errors and patterns;	Kindy, 1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th , 5 th , 6 th , Activity & ESE teachers	Weekly PLC/Collaborative Team notes	NA	PLC/Collaborative Team notes

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

Qualitative Professional Practice Outcomes:

We will be administering a qualitative survey to our teachers in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 to measure the level of implementation of our collaborative teams throughout the school. Our collaborative teams post the minutes of the weekly meetings on our intranet server so that data and instructional strategies can be analyzed and tracked to discern patterns and trends across grade levels.

Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes:

We will be utilizing the Professional Practices survey results in a qualitative and quantitative manner to measure and report the level of implementation of our collaborative teams and vertical teams. We will be comparing the Fall 2012 survey results to the Spring 2013 survey results.

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

Qualitative Student Achievement Expectations:

Tropical Elementary will utilize the spring BPS Student Survey and compare the results from the 2012 Student Survey to the results from the 2013 BPS Student Survey to measure our qualitative results. The following question **“I believe my school work will help me later in life (choose the one answer that most closely describes you):”** Tropical’s students indicated that 83.60% “strongly agreed all of the time” or “agreed most of the time”; 13.71% of students at Tropical agreed a little of the time.

2013 Qualitative Student Achievement Goal:

85% of students will indicate that they “strongly agree all of the time” or “agree most of the time” that their school work will help them later in life. This information will assist us in gauging whether we have emphasized the correlation of what we are teaching and students’ understanding that we are preparing them for college and career readiness in keeping with the CCSS.

Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations:

Tropical Elementary will utilize the FCAT scores in Reading, Writing, Math and Science to measure our quantitative results. We will compare our 3 year trend data with the 2013 FCAT results.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

<p style="text-align: center;">Reading Goal</p> <p>1. 2012 FCAT Reading data indicated 78% students in grades 3-6 scored at Levels 3, 4 and 5; 2013 FCAT Reading will increase the average percentage of students scoring Levels 3, 4 and 5 to an 80% average for grades 3-6 in Reading (*denotes a 10% decrease of students scoring at Levels 1 and 2; approximately 9 students)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2012 Current Level of Performance</p> <p><small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects i.e. 28%=129 students)</small></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2013 Expected Level of Performance</p> <p><small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects i.e. 31%=1134 students)</small></p>
<p>Anticipated Barrier(s):</p> <p>1. Increasing the reading scores of approximately 10% (9 students) of Level 1 and 2 students to an achievement Level 3, 4 or 5</p>		
<p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1. Weekly collaborative team meetings will focus on the progress of students within the lowest 25% as well as all</p>		

students within the Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroups. (In Process Measure: PLC Notes, PMPs in A3)
2. Maintain an up-to-date listing of levels 1 and 2 students within lowest 25%

<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 22% of students in grades 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th scored at Levels 1 and 2 (22% = 87 students) Keeping track of new students who scored at levels 1 and 2 in other BPS schools or state schools. <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Weekly collaborative team meetings will focus on the progress of students within the lowest 25% as well as all students within the Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroups. Maintain an up-to-date listing of levels 1 and 2 students within lowest 25% 	<p>2012 FCAT Reading</p> <p>25% of students in grades 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th scored at Level 3 (25% = 98 students)</p>	<p>2013 FCAT Reading Goal</p> <p>27% of students in grades 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th will score at Level 3 (27% = 107 students)</p> <p>(*this represents an increase of approximately 10% of students moving from Levels 1 or 2 to a Level 3)</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, 6 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013</p> <p>Strategy(s): NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013</p>	<p>2012 FAA Reading</p> <p>0% of our FAA students scored at Levels 4, 5 or 6; 100% scored students scored above level 6</p>	<p>2013 FAA Reading</p> <p>NA due to no current FAA students</p>
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): Levels 4 and 5 students can hit a plateau in their level of achievement and that is a consistent barrier</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring the text complexity regarding the independent reading selections for these students to ensure that continued growth in comprehension (i.e. can be monitored with AR selections and classroom novels for independent reading and classroom read alouds) Increasing opportunities for Literary Analysis regarding Non-fiction test. 	<p>2012 FCAT Reading</p> <p>53% of students in grades 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th scored at Level 4 and 5 (53% = 208 students)</p>	<p>2013 FCAT Reading Goal</p> <p>55% of students in grades 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th will score at Levels 4 or 5 (55% = 217 students)</p> <p>(*this represents an increase of approximately 10% of students increasing from Levels 1, 2, and 3 to Levels 4 and 5)</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 	<p>2012 FAA</p> <p>100% = 2 students</p>	<p>2013 FAA Goal</p> <p>NA due to no current FAA students</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013 	<p>2012 FAA</p> <p>100% = 2 students</p>	<p>2013 FAA Goal</p> <p>NA due to no current FAA students</p>
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing these students' scores to a level 3, 4 or 5 New students entering Tropical and determining their strengths and weaknesses in a timely manner to increase their academic achievement <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain an up-to-date listing of levels 1 and 2 students within lowest 25% <p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013</p>	<p>2012 FCAT Reading</p> <p>79% of the students within the Lowest 25% of Reading made learning gains</p>	<p>2013 FCAT Reading Goal</p> <p>80% of students within the Lowest 25% of Reading will make learning gains</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013</p>	<p>2012 FAA</p> <p>100%</p>	<p>2013 FAA Reading Goal</p> <p>NA due to no current FAA students</p>

Strategy(s): 1.		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline data 2010-11:	BASELINE 2010-2011 ALL STUDENTS ~ 77% ASIAN ~ 71% HISPANIC ~ 74% WHITE ~ 78% SWD ~ 49% ECON DISADV ~ 68%	2013 TARGET AMO FOR ALL STUDENT IN READING (81%)
Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading : <div style="text-align: right;"> <u>White:</u> → <u>Black:</u> → <u>Hispanic:</u> → <u>Asian:</u> → <u>American Indian:</u> → </div>	Enter numerical data for current level of performance EXCEEDED TARGET AMO (81%) NA 75% 61% NA	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance 82% TARGET AMO NA 78% TARGET AMO 76% TARGET AMO NA
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Students only speaking English at school Students not comprehending written English Students not connecting oral language structures to written word Strategy(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom teachers will routinely paraphrase and utilize repetition with ELL students to enhance listening and speaking Classroom Teachers will have ELL students routinely read and orally summarize a text passage with peers and/or the classroom teacher as a part of their daily/weekly schedule Classroom teachers will keep grammar and/or language structures prevalent in the spoken and written discourse of the class (i.e. questioning pattern; verb tenses; paragraph writing; pronoun usage; sentence formation; structural clue like roots, prefixes and suffixes) 	2012 FCAT Reading 6 out of 14 (43%) scored at Levels 3, 4 and 5 8 out of 14 (57%) scored at Levels 1 and 2	2013 FCAT Reading Goal ELL TARGET AMO (NA) 7 out of 14 (50%) of ELL students will score at Levels 3, 4, and 5 on 2013 FCAT Reading (*this represents an increase of approximately 10% of ELL students scoring at Levels 3, 4 and 5)
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	2012 FCAT Reading 20 out of 43 SWD students (47%) scored at Levels 3, 4 and 5 23 out of 43 SWD students (53%) scored at Levels 1 and 2	2013 FCAT Reading Goal TO MEET TARGET AMO (58%) 25 out of 43 (58%) SWD students will score at Levels 3, 4 and 5 (*this represents an increase of approximately 10% of SWD students)
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	2012 FCAT Reading 84 out of 124 ECD students (68%) scored at Levels 3, 4 and 5 40 out of 124 ECD students (32%) scored at Levels 1 and 2	2013 FCAT Reading Goal TO MEET TARGET AMO (73%) 90 out of 124 (73%) ECD students will score at Levels 3, 4 and 5 (*this represents an increase of approximately 10% of ECD students)

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
CCSS/Text Complexity	PLC/Collaborative Team Meetings/Literacy Coach	Collaborative team notes on server by each collaborative team; Literacy Coach's presentation agenda and/or PowerPoint

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/ Speaking: <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; width: fit-content; margin: 5px auto;">46% = 7 out of 15</div>	Students only speaking English at school	Classroom teachers will routinely paraphrase and utilize repetition with ELL students to enhance listening and speaking	Castillo/LEP folders/A3 reports/tracking of lowest 25% in Collaborative team notes
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; width: fit-content; margin: 5px auto;">26% = 4 out of 15</div>	Students not comprehending written English	Classroom Teachers will have ELL students routinely read and orally summarize a text passage with peers and/or the classroom teacher as a part of their daily/weekly schedule	Castillo/LEP folders/A3 reports/tracking of lowest 25% in Collaborative team notes
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing: <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; width: fit-content; margin: 5px auto;">37% = 6 out of 16</div>	Students not connecting oral language structures to written word	Classroom teachers will keep grammar and/or language structures prevalent in the spoken and written discourse of the class (i.e. questioning pattern; verb tenses; paragraph writing; pronoun usage; sentence formation; structural clue like roots, prefixes and suffixes)	Castillo/LEP folders/A3 reports/tracking of lowest 25% in Collaborative team notes

Mathematics Goal(s):	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
1. 2012 FCAT Math data indicated 82% students in grades 3-6 scored at Levels 3, 4 and 5; 2013 FCAT Math will increase the average percentage of students scoring at Levels 3, 4 and 5 to an 83% average for grades 3-6 (*denotes a 10% reduction in students scoring at Levels 1 and 2; approximately 7 students)		
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. Increasing the FCAT Math scores of approximately 10% (7 students) of Level 1 and 2 students to an achievement Level 3, 4 or 5 Strategy(s): 1. Weekly collaborative team meetings will focus on the progress of students within the lowest 25% as well as all students within the Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroups. (In Process Measure: PLC Notes, PMPs in A3) 2. Maintain an up-to-date listing of levels 1 and 2 students within lowest 25%	2012 FCAT Math 18% (74 students) scored at levels 1 or 2 on 2012 FCAT Math	2013 FCAT Math Goal 17% (67 students) will score at Levels 1 or 2 on 2013 FCAT Math (*denotes a 10% decrease of 7 students increasing to Levels 3, 4 and 5)
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s): 1. Increasing the FCAT Math scores of approximately 10% (7 students) of Level 1 and 2 students to an achievement Level 3, 4 or 5 2. Keeping track of new students who scored at levels 1 and 2 in other BPS schools or state schools. Strategy(s): 1. Weekly collaborative team meetings will focus on the progress of students within the lowest 25% as well as all students within the Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroups. (In Process Measure: PLC Notes, PMPs in A3) 2. Maintain an up-to-date listing of levels 1 and 2 students within lowest 25%	2012 FCAT Math 27% (106 students) scored at level 3 on 2012 FCAT Math	2013 FCAT Math Goal 28% (113 students) will score at Level 3 on 2013 FCAT Math (*denotes a 10% decrease of 7 students increasing from Levels 1 or 2)

<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics Barrier(s): NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013 Strategy(s): 1. NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013</p>	<p>2012 FAA Math 100% = 2 students</p>	<p>2013 FAA Math Goal NA due to no current FAA students enrolled in grades 3-6</p>
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Students scoring levels 4 and 5 have difficulty maintaining at that high level Strategy(s): 1. Continue to customize the instruction for each individual student to academically challenge them to fullest extent on the NGSSS and CCSS</p>	<p>2012 FCAT Math 55% (215 students) scored at Levels 4 or 5 on 2012 FCAT Math</p>	<p>2013 FCAT Math Goal 56% (219 students) will score at Levels 4 and 5</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics Barrier(s): NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013 Strategy(s): NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>NA due to no current FAA students in grades 3-6</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013 Strategy(s): NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013</p>	<p>??</p>	<p>NA due to no current FAA students in grades 3-6</p>
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): 1. New students moving into the school who scored a level 1 or 2 may present more challenges toward improving their score to Level 3 or above Strategy(s): 1. Weekly collaborative team meetings will focus on the progress of students within the lowest 25% as well as all students within the Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroups. (In Process Measure: PLC Notes, PMPs in A3) 2. Maintain an up-to-date listing of levels 1 and 2 students within lowest 25%</p>	<p>2012 FCAT Math 81% of students within the Lowest 25% made learning gains on 2012 FCAT Math</p>	<p>2013 FCAT Math Goal 82% of students within the Lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains on 2013 FCAT Math</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013 Strategy(s): NA due to no current FAA students for 2012-2013</p>	<p>2012 FAA Math 100% = 2 students</p>	<p>2013 FAA Math Goal NA due to no current FAA students enrolled in grades 3-6</p>
<p>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11:</p>	<p>BASELINE 2010-2011 ALL STUDENTS ~ 79% ASIAN ~ 79% HISPANIC ~ 74% WHITE ~ 80% SWD ~ 61% ECON DISADV ~ 71%</p>	<p>2013 TARGET AMO FOR ALL STUDENTS IN MATH (83%)</p>
<p>Student subgroups by ethnicity :</p>	<p>White: → EXCEEDED TARGET AMO (83%) Black: → NA Hispanic: → EXCEEDED TARGET AMO (82%) Asian: → EXCEEDED TARGET AMO (100%) American Indian: → NA</p>	<p>83% TARGET AMO NA 78% TARGET AMO 83% TARGET AMO NA</p>

English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	2012 FCAT Math 10 out of 14 ELL students (72%) scored at Levels 3, 4 and 5 4 out of 14 ELL students (28%) scored at Levels 1 and 2	2013 FCAT Math Goal TO MEET TARGET AMO (NA) 78% of ELL students will score at Levels 3, 4 and 5 (*this represents a 10% increase of ELL students)
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	2012 FCAT Math 23 out of 44 SWD students (53%) scored at Levels 3, 4 and 5 21 out of 44 SWD students (47%) scored at Levels 1 and 2	2013 FCAT Math Goal TO MEET TARGET AMO FOR SWD (68%) 30 out of 44 (68%) SWD students will score at Levels 3, 4 and 5 (*this represents an increase of approximately 10% of SWD students)
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	2012 FCAT Math 29% (36 out of 125) ECD students scored at Levels 1 and 2 71% (89 out of 125) ECD students scored at Levels 3, 4 and 5	2013 FCAT Math Goal TO MEET TARGET AMO FOR ECON DISADVAN (72%) 90 out of 125 (72%) of ECD students will score at Levels 3, 4 and 5 (*this represents an increase of 10% (4 ECD students) increasing from Levels 1 or 2 to a Level 3 or higher)

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
CCSS Team (Respass, Castillo, Parsons and Rigdon) trained teachers regarding Common Core State Standards during preplanning	August 2, 2012	Monitoring will occur by reviewing Collaborative Team meeting notes completed by each grade level and posted weekly on the intranet server.
Asst. Principal and Math Contact will train teachers regarding how to analyze errors within common formative and common summative assessments and problem solving strategies during collaborative team meetings	2 nd 9 weeks November 2012	Monitoring will occur by reviewing PGPs for error analysis strategies and reviewing Collaborative Team notes completed by each grade level and posted weekly on the intranet server.

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
2012 FCAT Writing data indicate that 64% scored at 3.5 or above; 2013 FCAT Writing will increase to 70% scoring at 3.5 or above	2012 FCAT Writing	2013 FCAT Writing Goal
Barrier(s): Since the FCAT Writing rubric was changed for the 2012 FCAT Writing exam, teachers and students need to make sure they thoroughly understand the differences between the new rubric and the prior rubric.	64% (57 out of 89 students) of 4 th graders scored at 3.5 and above	70% (59 of 84 4 th graders) will score a 3.5 or higher

Strategy(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review anchor papers as a 4th grade collaborative team 2. Review anchor papers with students 3. Administer District Wide Writing Assessment and discuss results and trends within Collaborative Teams 	94% (84 out of 89 students) of 4 th graders scored a 3.0 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Writing	95% (80 out of 84 4 th graders) will score a 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	2012 FCAT Writing 94% (84 students) scored a 3.0 or higher	2013 FCAT Writing Goal 95% (80 out of 84 4 th graders) will score a 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	2012 FAA Writing NA due to no 4 th grade FAA students enrolled in 2012	2013 FAA Writing Goal NA due to no current FAA students enrolled in 4 th grade

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2012 FCAT Science data indicated 89% of students scored at Levels 3, 4 and 5; 2013 FCAT Science will increase to 90% of students scoring at Levels 3, 4 and 5 on 2013 FCAT Science 	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): This is a different group of 5 th graders so we do not have a previous year's FCAT to compare regarding Science Strategy(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue to analyze non-fiction questions and student responses to discern patterns 2. Implement appropriate and customized instructional strategies with regard to non-fiction text complexity and comprehension 	2012 FCAT Science 89% (108 out of 122) of 5 th graders scored at Levels 3, 4 and 5 on 2012 Science	2013 FCAT Science Goal 90% (84 out of 93) of current 5 th graders will score at Levels 3, 4 and 5 on 2013 FCAT Science
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:	2012 FCAT Science 39% (47 out of 122 students) scored at Level 3	2013 FCAT Science Goal 40% (37 out of 93 students) Of current 5 th graders will score at Level 3
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	2012 FAA Science NA due to no 5 th grade FAA students in 2012	2013 FAA Science Goal NA due to no current FAA students enrolled
Students scoring at or above	2012 FCAT Science	2013 FCAT Science Goal

Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	49% (60 out of 122 students) scored at Levels 4 and 5	50% (47 out of 93 students) will score at Levels 4 and 5
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading	2012 FAA Science NA – no 5 th grade FAA students in 2012	2013 FAA Science Goal NA due to no current FAA students enrolled

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

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and its role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

Jane K. Respass, Principal
 Karry Castillo, Asst. Principal
 Lauraine McCommon, Guidance Counselor
 Linda Shelton, Staffing Specialist
 Tristan Bennett, School Psychologist
 Parent(s) of child being referred
 ESE teachers
 General Education teachers

Our Guidance Counselor, Lauraine McCommon trains teachers about the MTSS/RtI process at the beginning of each school year during PLC/Collaborative team meetings. During the 2012-2013 school year, this will occur prior to the end of September 2012. The MTSS leadership team is itself a collaborative team that works to best meet the needs of each individual student. This collaborative process coincides with Tropical's SIP. Our MTSS leadership team looks at data from summative assessments like FCAT and FAIR as well as formative assessments and instructional strategies implemented within the classroom setting. Each of these is reviewed to determine whether a student is meeting with success, not meeting with success, working below grade level, working above grade level and/or should be referred for further assessment. Each aspect of our MTSS works in conjunction with our SIP and district strategic plan which strive to serve every student with excellence as the standard.

The 2012 Parent Survey indicated the following percentage of Excellent/Good/Fair responses for Guidance and for Teachers: Teachers (98.2%); Guidance Counselors (71.3%) (2012 AVERAGE OF TEACHERS & GUIDANCE: 84.75%)

2012-2013 RtI/MTSS Goal:

- To increase the percentage of Excellent/Good/Fair responses for Guidance Services and Teachers by .5%; our teachers and counselor work as team to meet the academic needs of our students (e.g. Teachers Goal: 98.7%; Guidance Goal: 71.8% or an average of the two would increase to 85.25%)**

Barriers:

- Parents may choose not to participate in the survey.**
- Not every parent has a student whose needs require RtI/MTSS.**

Strategies:

- Increase communication with parents about the RtI/MTSS process and the individual instructional strategies being utilized with students.**

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

The 2012 Parent Survey indicated that only 217 responses with the online survey; years past we used to have approximately 400-500 responses.

2012-2013 Parent Survey Goal:

- To increase the number of responses by at least 10% which would set our goal at 231 responses.**
- To increase the percentage of Excellent/Good/Fair responses by .5% per grouping (e.g. Principal/AP/Dean; Cafeteria Staff; Clinic/Nurse;**

Barriers:

- Parents may still choose not to participate.**

Strategies:

- We will still utilize the marquee, email, Edline and newsletters to advertise the Parent Survey timeline and link.**

Data from the 2012 Parent Survey indicate the following responses to questions 5, 24 and 37:

#5. How responsive are the following staff members to your needs, concerns and questions?

(Percentage of Excellent/Good/Fair responses)

Principal (85.9%); Asst. Principal (85.0%); Dean (20.2% ~ note that 79.3% marked NA); Office Staff (92.0%); Cafeteria Staff (70.7%); Clinic/Nurse (72.7%); School Age Child Care (42.2%~ note that 54.3% marked NA. #24.

Tropical Elementary will provide parents with information regarding homework help, science skills, study skills and Frequently Asked Questions associated with Exceptional Student Education in an effort to increase parent engagement.

ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)

2012-2013 Goal: 96.12% annual average attendance rate
2011-2012 96.02% annual average attendance rate
2010-2011 95.86% annual average attendance rate

SUSPENSION:

During the 2011-2012 school year, 14 events resulted in either an in-school or out-of-school suspension.

2012-2013 Goal:

The goal for 2012-2013 is to reduce our events resulting in an in-school or out-of-school suspension to a maximum of 13 events which would be a 10% decrease.

Strategies:

1. Among the strategies employed to reduce discipline incidents are: anti-bullying training for teachers during preplanning; anti-bullying training for students by the guidance counselor, administration and teachers; Tropical Elementary’s School-wide Discipline Plan;
2. Tropical Elementary’s Hall Duty and Lunch Duty Supervision Schedules which are proactive in nature to support safety and security.
3. We will continue to educate faculty, staff, students and parents about the difference between bullying and conflict.
4. We will continue to educate and model verbal strategies for students that promote the lifelong strategy of how to handle conflicts when they arise with others.

Barriers:

We are not able to be in all places of the school at all times.

We are not able to hear every comment that may be perceived as bullying.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

Not Applicable

POSTSECONDARY READINESS: (How does the school incorporate students’ academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students’ course of study is personally meaningful? Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.)

Science Goal(s) (High School) 1. NA	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)

Barrier(s):		
Strategy(s): 1.		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. <div style="text-align: right;"> <u>White:</u> → <u>Black:</u> → <u>Hispanic:</u> → <u>Asian:</u> → <u>American Indian:</u> → </div>		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level
---------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------

	Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11 <input type="text"/>		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. White: → Black: → Hispanic: →		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

Geometry EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		

Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11 <input type="text"/>		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. <u>White:</u> → <u>Black:</u> → <u>Hispanic:</u> →		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		

Biology EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
-------------------------	---	--

Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Biology:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology:		

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

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

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

--	--	--	--

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

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

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

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

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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