# Brevard County Public Schools
# School Improvement Plan
# 2012-2013

**Name of School:**

Lockmar Elementary School

**Area:**

South Area

**Principal:**

Mrs. Norma L. Hostetler

**Area Superintendent:**

Dr. Mark W. Mullins

**SAC Chairperson:**

Mrs. Linette H. Lochner

**Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli**

**Mission Statement:**

Lockmar parents, staff and students will strive to achieve our vision for excellence:

ACHIEVEMENT- To continue the pursuit of outstanding academic performance.

CURRICULUM - To monitor our curriculum and update technological areas for the future needs of our children and society.

UNITY - To unify the staff, students, parents, and members of the community to mold Lockmar into extended family.

RESPECT - To develop self-esteem, respect for others and positive attitudes.

COMMUNITY- To use all resources in providing enrichment experiences for our students.

**Vision Statement:**

LOCKMAR, WHERE MINDS OPEN TO THE FUTURE

# 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)*

- In analyzing our data from 2011-2012, the number of points earned for the School Grade increased from 579 to 617.
- Students at the Lowest 25% in both reading and math exceeded the set target for improvement.
    - Reading 2011 77% 2012 87%
    - Math 2011 58% 2012 72%
- Learning gains for all students in both reading and math exceeded their established target for improvement.
    - Reading 2011 66% to 2012 77%
    - Math 2011 57% to 2012 74%
- The target for improvement in both science and writing was also exceeded.
    - Science 2011 61% to 2012 70%
    - Writing 2011 85% to 2012 87%
- Three subgroups (White, Hispanic & the Economically Disadvantaged) did not meet their targets for improvement in reading and math.
- The data that was available included all curriculum groups since the 2012 School Report card data is not currently available.
- Although our overall attendance rate is above 95%, attendance records indicate 77% of absences are unexcused. students must be present to increase instructional time, which will affect student achievement.
- Although our attendance rate is at or above the district goal, the amount of unexcused absences is extremely high. In order for students to be successful, attendance in crucial therefore, we encourage attendance unless students are ill.
    - **By grade level and % of unexcused absences**:
        - K 486/630 77%
        - 1st 382/505 76%
        - 2nd 411/596 75%
        - 3rd 610/718 85%
        - 4th 419/528 79%
        - 5th 425/574 74%
        - 6th 552/750 74%
- Teacher survey indicates a need for additional training to foster the implementation of higher order thinking skills necessary in Common Core State Standards (CCSS).

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

Robert J. Marzano's book *Classroom Instruction That Works,"* contains nine strategies to help teachers increase their students' achievement. At Lockmar, we have focused on the implementation of three of these instructional strategies:

Identifying Similarities and Differences; Cues, Questions, and Advance Organizers; and Nonlinguistic Representations. After analyzing our data, for 2012-2013 we will continue to use these strategies, and we will add three more to address the areas we feel need improvement. The three strategies we chose are strategies that we feel are being under-used or not used at all. The strategies are: Summarizing and Note Taking (to advance our Level 3 students), Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback; and Generating and Testing Hypotheses (for all students).

**Summarizing and Note Taking:** According to Marzano, "Although we sometimes refer to summarizing and note taking as mere "study skills," they are two of the most powerful skills students can cultivate. They provide students with tools for identifying and understanding the most important aspects of what they are learning". (*Classroom Instruction that Works,* pg. 48) To effectively summarize, students must be able to analyze information at a fairly deep level to effectively delete, substitute, and keep information. Students must also be aware of the explicit structure of information which will aid in summarizing information. Note taking is closely related to summarizing. To take effective notes, a student must be able to determine what is most important, and then state that information in a concise way.

**Applications**: Science Interactive Notebooks, Discovery Learning, DBQ's, Math Journals, Reading Journals

**Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback:** Setting objectives is the process of establishing a direction for learning. This is helpful for realizing short and long-term goals. Feedback should be given relative to how well the student is doing. According to Marzano, feedback should be "corrective" in nature, timely, and specific to a criterion. Students can effectively provide some of their own feedback. (*Classroom Instruction that Works,* pg. 96)

**Applications:** Student-Led Conferences, Reading Counts, assessments, classroom behavior, personal learning goals,

**Generating and Testing Hypotheses:** According to Marzano, this instructional strategy is one of the most powerful and analytic of cognitive operations. This process involves the application of knowledge. It is something we often do naturally in many situations. The hypothesis generation and testing can be inductive or deductive, and teachers should ask students to clearly explain their hypotheses and their conclusions.

**Applications:** Science projects, student-designed projects in any subject area, reading predictions, creating inventions, decision making, problem solving,

Continuing to study and implement Marzano's strategies will assist our teachers and help them to scaffold their instructional growth for individualized student achievement at all levels.

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

*In 2011-2012, we advanced our use of the Continuous Improvement Cycle (Learn, Plan, Do, Measure) and BEST's Dimensions of Success Model (Results, Relationships, Process). We used data to drive instruction, and this instruction was based on BEST practices, Marzano's Classroom Instruction that Works Research-Based Strategies, and other research-based strategies such as CRISS, ESOL, Thinking Maps, Glasser, Multiple Intelligences, 4MAT, and others. Our Academic Support Program, which focused on Reading, Math and Science, addressed the needs of substantially deficient students. Data Analysis drove instructional planning, and differentiated lessons were delivered through various modes of instruction to meet the needs of all learners. Achievement was measured through progress monitoring and both formative and summative assessments. Through Professional Learning Communities meetings, our teachers collaborated and developed research-based strategies to increase achievement and meet the needs of our lowest 25%. Our 90 minute uninterrupted Reading block included support from our ESOL teacher and assistant, as well as ESE inclusive services. During this time, teachers*

*integrated small group guided instruction, as well as learning centers to provide students with differentiated instruction. Beyond the 90 minute Reading block, teachers implemented Multi-Tiered System of Supports (formerly RtI) in an effort to support identified students. Lessons were individualized to scaffold learning according to individual strengths and weaknesses. SuccessMaker and Pearson SuccessNet were implemented to support reading and math instruction. Through PLC and collegiality building activities (process), we developed greater unity as a staff (relationships), which in turn, optimized our effectiveness to increase student achievement (results). As we continue to build our Learning Cultures, we expect to see even more advances in student achievement.*

*In looking at our areas we have determined "need improvement", we have determined that while the above strategies were being used, they were not being used enough, and with enough consistency throughout each grade level and the school. For example, while all teachers used Marzano's instructional strategies, some teachers used them weekly, while others used them monthly. The same lack of consistency is true of learning centers and the use of the 90 minute reading block. This lack of consistency may account for differences in achievement levels within and across grade levels.*

## CONTENT AREA:

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

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

The faculty at Lockmar Elementary will implement at least three of the six targeted Marzano's Instructional Strategies to increase student achievement. We will continue to use the previously introduced strategies of Identifying Similarities and Differences; Questions, Cues and Advance Organizers; and Nonlinguistic Representations. We will be adding the strategies of Summarizing and Note Taking; Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback; and Generating and Testing Hypothesis.

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

| ***Barrier*** | ***Action Steps*** | ***Person Responsible*** | ***Timetable*** | ***Budget*** | ***In-Process Measure*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.New staff members are not familiar with Marzano Strategies | 1. Marzano's Instructional Strategies books will be bought for all new staff members. Book is also available in the online professional research library. | Media Specialist | October 2012 | $50 | Purchase Order |
| | Use of strategies will be discussed at PLC and grade level meetings | PLC Leaders and Grade Level Chairs | One time per month beginning in October 2012 | $0 | Agendas from meetings |
| 2.Transportation from ASP (Academic Support Program) often prevents bus riders from attending | 2. The Computer Lab will be open three mornings each week for identified students to use SuccessMaker and programs aligned to CCSS & NGSS. | ASP Teacher | October 2012 – April 2013 | R/M $10,725.00<br>Science $ 690.00 | ASP Attendance Records |
| 3. Teachers do not collaborate to develop and share "lessons that work". | 3.Implement Action Plan from "Building High-Performing Learning | Leadership Team | February 2013 | $0 | Meeting Minutes |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| This leads to a lack of consistency in classrooms on a grade level | Cultures" | | | | |
| | Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will be used as a collaborative time to share ideas | PLC Leaders | One time per month September 2012-May 2013 | $0 | PLC Agendas |
| 4. | 4. Implement Common Core Action Plan | Common Core Team | August 2012-May 2013 | $0 | |
| 5.Lowest 25% students need additional time and support | 5.Academic Support Program | ASP Teachers | October 2012-April 2013 | | Teacher Lesson Plans |
| | Students are divided among teachers of 3 PLC. PLC members will collaborate with the homeroom teacher. | PLC Leaders | One time per month September 2012-May 2013 | $0 | PLC Agendas |
| 6.Attendance | 6. review data | Attendance committee | monthly | $0 | AS400 Report |
| | Parent/Student Conferences letters sent home for excessive tardiness or absences | | Monthly | $0 | Conference form |

## EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

By 2013, 100% of Lockmar teachers will utilize three of six targeted Marzano's instructional strategies. Professional Development surveys show which of the strategies will be used in each teacher's classroom, documentation will include lesson plans and student work samples.

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

At the end of the 4th nine weeks, 75% of students in Kindergarten will perform at the required Running Record level of performance indicated on their grade level Decision Tree. (Level 2)

At the end of the 4th nine weeks, 75% of students in first and second grade will perform at the required Running Record level of performance indicated on their grade level Decision Tree. (Level 16 first grade, level 28 second grade)

At the end of the 4th nine weeks, 75% students in Kindergarten, first and second grade will have mastered the required number of high frequency words indicated on the Brevard County Decision Trees. (Kindergarten, 36/40 KLS High Frequency Words; First Grade, 100 words from Fry Word List, Second Grade, 200 words from Fry Word List)

78% of all students taking the FCAT in Reading will demonstrate learning gains and 75% of all taking the FCAT in Math will demonstrate learning gains. 72% of the fifth grade students will score a level 3 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Science test.

At the end of the 4th nine weeks, 75% of students in grades 4-6 will have 75% mastery of their multiplication facts documented on 50 question multiplication fact tests.

At the end of the 4th nine weeks, 75% of students in grades 1-3 will have 75% mastery of their addition facts documented on 20 question addition fact tests.

Student work samples will reflect the use of Marzano Strategies in classroom instruction.

# APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

| Reading Goal<br>1. | 2012 Current Level of Performance<br>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects i.e. 28%=129 students) | 2013 Expected Level of Performance<br>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects i.e. 31%=1134 students) |
|---|---|---|
| **Anticipated Barrier(s):**<br>**1. Students do not read for meaning in all content areas.**<br>**2. Students are not critical independent thinkers.**<br>**3. Students do not analyze their strengths and weakness and therefore cannot effectively participate in setting goals.** | | |
| **Strategy(s):**<br>**1. Close Reading**<br>**2. Shared Inquiry**<br>**3. Common Core Anchor Standards**<br>**4. Guiding students to question their own needs and goals as learners.** | | |
| **FCAT 2.0**<br>Students scoring at Achievement Level 3<br><br>**Barrier(s):**<br>**Students are considered on grade level and successful at level 3 and are often not targeted for small group and/or explicit instruction.**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>**1. Using formative assessment (B.E.S.T.) to differentiate instruction**<br>2. **Small group instruction using materials such as SRA Reading**<br>3. **Using Computer Based Resources including but not limited to SuccessMaker & FCAT Explorer** | 28%<br>119 students | 32%<br>136 students |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>**Strategy(s):** | 22%<br>4 students | 25%<br>5 students |
| **FCAT 2.0**<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>**Strategy(s):** | 48%<br>204 students | 52%<br>221 students |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>**Strategy(s):** | 28%<br>5 students | 32%<br>6 students |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>**Strategy(s)** | 33%<br>6 students | 44 %<br>8 students |
| **FCAT 2.0**<br>Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading<br><br>**Barrier(s):**<br>**Students often do not feel self confident in their abilities and therefore do not set high expectations for themselves.** | 87%<br>75 students | 91%<br>78 students |

**Strategy(s):**

1. **Using formative assessment (B.E.S.T.) to differentiate instruction**
2. **Heggerty Phonics**
3. **CRISS Strategies**
4. **Small group instruction using materials such as SRA Reading**
5. **Using Computer Based Resources including but not limited to Starfall, SuccessMaker & FCAT Explorer**

**Florida Alternate Assessment:**
Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading
**Barrier(s):**
**Strategy(s):**

**Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:**

| Name | Subgroup | School Grade | % Tested Rdg | Rdg % Scoring Satisfactory 2011 | Rdg % Scoring Satisfactory 2012 | High Perf Qualifying in Rdg | Target AMO Rdg | Met Target Rdg | Safe Harbor, Rdg | Improving, Rdg | Maintaining or Declining, Rdg | Declining, Rdg | Target AMO Rdg, 2013 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOCKMAR | ALL STUDENTS | A | 100 | 75 | 76 | N | 77 | N | N | Y | N | N | 79 |
| LOCKMAR | AM INDIAN | | | | | NA | | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| LOCKMAR | ASIAN | | | | | NA | | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| LOCKMAR | BLACK/AF AM | | 100 | 70 | 54 | N | 73 | N | N | N | Y | Y | 75 |
| LOCKMAR | HISPANIC | | 100 | 70 | 71 | N | 73 | N | N | Y | N | N | 75 |
| LOCKMAR | WHITE | | 100 | 77 | 81 | N | 79 | Y | NA | NA | NA | NA | 81 |
| LOCKMAR | ELL | | 100 | 42 | 45 | N | 47 | N | N | Y | N | N | 52 |
| LOCKMAR | SWD | | 100 | 41 | 35 | N | 46 | N | N | N | Y | Y | 51 |
| LOCKMAR | ECON DISADV | | 100 | 67 | 67 | N | 70 | N | N | N | Y | N | 73 |

**Baseline data 2010-11:**

| **Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :** | Enter numerical data for current level of performance | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance |
|---|---|---|
| White: | 25% 48 Students | 21% |
| Black: | 34% 12 Students | 29% |
| Hispanic: | 13% 14 Students | 10% |
| Asian: | N/A | |
| American Indian: | N/A | |
| **English Language Learners** (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>**Strategy(s):**<br>**1.** | 33% | |
| **Students with Disabilities** (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading<br>**Barrier(s):** | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Strategy(s): 1.** | 35% | |
| **Economically Disadvantaged** Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>**Strategy(s): 1.** | 34% | |

## Reading Professional Development

| PD Content/Topic/Focus | Target Dates/Schedule | Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring |
|---|---|---|
| Close Reading | Spring 2013 | Action Plan |
| Student-Led Conferences | Spring 2013 | Action Plan |
| Shared Inquiry | Spring 2013 | Action Plan |

| CELLA GOAL | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person/Process/Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:** 2 | Not enough practice | 1. Listening- Spotlight<br>2. Speaking- small group interaction | ESOL Teacher |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:** 9 | -Reading for meaning<br>-Lack of engagement | 1. Visualizing and verbalizing<br>2. Monitoring understanding | ESOL Teacher |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**: 7 | Student frustration due to their lack ability to clearly express their thoughts in writing. | 1. Small groups instruction<br>2. Using background knowledge to enhance writing | ESOL Teacher |

| **Mathematics Goal(s):**<br>**1.** | **2012 Current Level of Performance** (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) | **2013 Expected Level of Performance** (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) |
|---|---|---|
| **Anticipated Barrier(s):**<br>**1. Students lack math foundations: basic math facts, understanding real world math problems.**<br>**2. Students lack problem solving strategies (especially those necessary in solving multi-step problem**<br>**3. Students do not analyze their strengths and weakness and therefore cannot effectively participate in setting goals.** | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Strategy(s):**<br>**1. Use of CRA (Concrete-Representational-Abstract) Methods**<br>**2. Have students identify key words necessary to determine operation(s) to solve word problems.**<br>**3. Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice**<br>**4. Use of computer based programs including but not limited to SuccessMaker, Planet Turtle, Xtra Math, FCAT Explorer (5th grade)**<br>**5. Using programs that utilize Multiple Intelligence to help memorizing Math Facts including but not limited to Calendar activities, U-Can Do DVD (math fact/exercise) and Rhymes N Times**<br>**6. 50 question multiplication tests given in 4th-6th grade** | | |
| **FCAT 2.0**<br>Students scoring at Achievement Level 3<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>**Students are considered on grade level therefore Teachers, Parents and students often do not necessarily have higher expectations. They are often not targeted for small group and/or explicit instruction.**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>**1. Using formative assessment (B.E.S.T.) to differentiate instruction**<br>**2. Collaborative learning groups**<br>**3. Assist students in goal setting** | 36%<br>153 students | 38%<br>162 students |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>**Strategy(s):**<br>**1.** | 22%<br>4 students | 27%<br>5 students |
| **FCAT 2.0**<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics<br>**Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>**1.** | 38%<br>163 students | 41%<br>174 students |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics<br>**Barrier(s):**<br><br>**Strategy(s):** | 22%<br>4 students | 27%<br>5 students |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>**Strategy(s): 1.** | 44%<br>8 students | 55%<br>10 students |
| **FCAT 2.0**<br>Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>**Students do not believe in their ability to learn Math.**<br>**Students often cannot memorize Math facts**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>**1. Using formative assessment (B.E.S.T.) to differentiate instruction**<br>**2. Collaborative learning groups**<br>**3. Teaching problem solving skills such as using skip counting to help solve multiplication/division problems, drawing number lines for add/subtraction.** | 72%<br>75 students | 78%<br>81 students |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics<br>**Barrier(s):**<br>**Strategy(s): 1.** | 0 | |

**Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:**

**Baseline Data 2010-11:**

| Name | Subgroup | School Grade | % Tested Math | Math % Scoring Satisfactory 2011 | Math % Scoring Satisfactory 2012 | High Perf Qualifying in Math | Target AMO Math | Met Target Math | Safe Harbor, Math | Improving, Math | Maintaining or Declining, Math | Declining, Math | Lrn Gns pts for L25% Math | Target AMO Math, 2013 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LOCKMAR | ALL STUDENTS | A | 100 | 70 | 74 | N | 73 | Y | NA | NA | NA | NA | 72 | 75 |
| LOCKMAR | AM INDIAN | | | | | NA | | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | | |
| LOCKMAR | ASIAN | | | | | NA | | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | | |
| LOCKMAR | BLACK/AF AM | | 100 | 49 | 52 | N | 53 | N | N | Y | N | N | | 58 |
| LOCKMAR | HISPANIC | | 100 | 61 | 64 | N | 64 | Y | NA | NA | NA | NA | | 68 |
| LOCKMAR | WHITE | | 100 | 75 | 80 | N | 77 | Y | NA | NA | NA | NA | | 79 |
| LOCKMAR | ELL | | 100 | 33 | 45 | N | 39 | Y | NA | NA | NA | NA | | 44 |
| LOCKMAR | SWD | | 100 | 50 | 41 | N | 54 | N | N | N | Y | Y | | 58 |
| LOCKMAR | ECON DISADV | | 100 | 58 | 63 | N | 62 | Y | NA | NA | NA | NA | | 65 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Student subgroups by ethnicity :**<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | 25% 48 students<br>38% 13 students<br>28% 12 students<br>NA<br>NA | |
| **English Language Learners** (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics | 53% 5 students | |
| **Students with Disabilities** (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics | 26% 13 students | |
| **Economically Disadvantaged** Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics | 23% 39 students | |

## Mathematics Professional Development

| PD Content/Topic/Focus | Target Dates/Schedule | Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring |
|---|---|---|
| Ruby Payne | Spring 2013 | Teacher Survey |
| Common Core Training | Spring 2013 | Action Plan |

| Writing | 2012 Current Level of Performance | 2013 Expected Level of |
|---|---|---|
| **Barrier(s):**<br>**Strategy(s): 1.** | | |
| **FCAT:** Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing | 87%<br>92 students | 92%<br>98 students |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing | 0 | 0 |

| **Science Goal(s)**<br>***1. (Elementary and Middle)*** | 2012 Current Level of Performance | 2013 Expected Level of Performance<br>) |
|---|---|---|
| **Barrier(s):**<br>**Teachers are having difficulty preparing and executing science labs within their scheduled block.**<br><br>**Strategy(s):**<br>1. **Students will use Marzano Note Taking strategies to keep science notebooks based upon their work in the science lab.** | | |
| Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science**:** | 40%<br>38 students | 48%<br>45 students |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science | 33%<br>1 student | 33%<br>1 student |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science: | 31%<br>29 students | 35 %<br>33 students |
| **Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading | | |

# APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

| Algebra 1 EOC Goal | 2012 Current Level of Performance | 2013 Expected Level of Performance |
|---|---|---|
| **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 2010-1** | | |
| Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br>→ **White:**<br>→ **Black:**<br>→ **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( | 2013 Expected Level of Performance |
|---|---|---|
| **Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.** | | |
| Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry**:** | | |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry: | | |
| **Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11** | | |
| Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br>→ **White:**<br>→ **Black:**<br>→ **Hispanic:** | | |
| **English Language Learners (ELL)** not making satisfactory progress in Geometry | | |
| **Students with Disabilities (SWD)** not making satisfactory progress in Geometry | | |
| **Economically Disadvantaged Students** not making satisfactory progress in Geometry | | |

| Biology EOC Goal | 2012 Current Level of Performance | 2013 Expected Level of Performance |
|---|---|---|
| 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 | 2013 Expected Level of Performance |
|---|---|---|
| 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** | **2013 Expected Level of Performance** |
| Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in U. S. History**:** | | |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History: | | |

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

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

# APPENDIX C

## (TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

**Highly Effective Teachers**

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

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

**Non-Highly Effective Instructors**

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

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

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

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

Our MTSS team consists of Lockmar's Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselors, Staffing Specialist, School Psychologist, and one ESE Teacher. Several members of the MTSS team are also members of School Advisory Council (SAC). This dual membership allows those individuals to ensure alignment of professional development efforts. Staff members who serve on the SAC will utilize staff meetings and PLC meetings to ensure that progress is continually being made throughout the school year.

The MTSS Leadership Team meets to review school-wide data and to discuss how to build upon the school's strengths and overcome its weaknesses. Team members take leadership roles in assisting grade level teams when targeting groups of students who are at risk or deficient in a core subject area. Grade level meetings for MTSS issues are held once each week. Data Team meeting with members of the MTSS Leadership team and members of each grade level are held monthly. This is a new addition for 2012-2013. Teachers, staff members, and school administrators utilize the A3 program, weekly assessments, benchmark tests, district-wide writing prompt results, the Student Desktop Data System, Data Dashboard, PMRN, PASI, Decision Trees, and Scholastic Achievement Manager to obtain curriculum-based measures in reading, math, science and writing. Administrators also utilize the Differentiated Accountability report for additional information. Behavior and attendance are monitored by the classroom teacher and assistant principal using AS400.

An MTSS overview and update are given for all faculty members at Data Team meetings. Guides, tips and updates are provided for the faculty on the staff SharePoint site. Information on MTSS implementation is also available on the district website.

**PARENT INVOLVEMENT:**

Parents are involved in Lockmar in a variety of ways. Parents provide weekly enrichment activities in grades 2-6 through conducting Math Superstars lessons in classrooms, attending fourth grade writing workshops, mentor students, collaborate to recognize and reward student efforts displayed through the use of the Reading Counts program, participate in Career Day, t-shirts design and sales for Lockmar Armor spirit days, organize and conduct annual Book Fair, Fundraisers and Spring Fling. In the fall of 2012, we will be offering a Science Night encouraging student and parent participation in science research based on the Marzano Strategy of Generating and Testing Hypothesis. In the spring of 2013, we will work in conjunction with a local business partner to offer a Math Night where parents and students work on a real world math FCAT formatted project together.

Lockmar's Parent Surveys rate satisfaction with classroom instruction as follows: Excellent 54.9% (79 responses) Good 30.6% (44 responses) Fair 10.4% (15 responses) Poor 4.2% (6 responses). The same survey indicates satisfaction with technology as follows: Excellent 25.7% (37 responses), Good 48.6%, (70 responses), Fair 18.8% (27 responses) Poor 3.5% (5 responses). Parents rated how well their child is learning Reading/Language Arts as follows: Excellent 46.2% (66 responses), Good 36.4% (52 responses), Fair 11.2% (16 responses), and Poor 6.3 (9 responses) and how well your child is learning Mathematics Excellent 40.1% (66 responses) ,Good 41.5% (59 responses), Fair 12.0% (17 responses), and Poor 6.3 (9 responses). In the area of technology, we are ever growing and improving. To increase parental awareness of technology use at Lockmar:

- This year Sixth graders will benefit from using a mobile computer lab in their Science classroom 3 days per week for classroom instruction. This lab can also be used in other classrooms for enrichment or remediation.
- Additional *SuccessMaker* licenses have also been purchased to allow for more remediation.
- Parents will also be encouraged to have their students enhance their skills at home through the use of websites such as *FCAT Explorer, Scootpad, Kidblog*, *Starfall*, *Planet Turtle* and others. This will allow parents the opportunity to be even more involved in their child's education.

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

The goal of the attendance team is to reduce the number of unexcused absences and total number of tardiness for each grade level. Using the 2011-12 grade level data as a reference point, 77% of absences are unexcused. In an effort to reduce tardiness by 5% and the unexcused absences to below 70% for the 2012-2013 school year, individual students will be reviewed each month for excessive unexcused absences and tardiness. Parent conferences and letters will be used to communicate the importance of attendance and timeliness to school for student success.

**SUSPENSION:**

In order to reduce the number of office referrals, as gateway behaviors, leading to suspension, Lockmar implemented staff created school-wide expectations for the 2011-12 school year. The implementation process included posters, classroom discussions and student made videos. Misconduct referrals were reduced in the second half of the school year preventing repetitive referrals leading to suspension. In 2012-13 we will continue to support and implement these school-wide expectations using the previous methods and creating new incentives and awards for students at each grade level to enhance positive behavior.

**DROP-OUT (High Schools only):**

**POSTSECONDARY READINESS**: