

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

Name of School:

DeLaura Middle School

Area:

North

Principal:

Claudia L. Shirley

Area Superintendent:

Dr. Ronald Bobay

SAC Chairperson:

Marc Rocque

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

DeLaura's mission is to provide a positive school environment where every student may develop their individual skills and talents and prepare for their future endeavors in high school and beyond. Our school culture will foster security, responsibility, respect, and achievement for all.

Vision Statement:

DeLaura's vision is to provide a quality education in a friendly and supportive environment.

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 reviewing FCAT data from 2009-2011, DeLaura maintained Reading, Math, and Writing scores within the 90th percentile Science scores fluctuated between the 70th and 80th percentile, as did the percent of students making reading and math gains. The lowest 25% group experienced steady gains in Reading, from 69% to 72% but significantly decreased in Math from 87% to 72%. During this time period, DeLaura's total points decreased from 666 points (2009) to 633 points (2011).

In 2012, our point totals increased to 677 points but achievement percentages decreased in the FCAT areas of Reading, Math, Writing and Science: 77% of students in grades 7 and 8 achieved a level 3 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test; 82% achieved a level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Math; 87% achieved a level 3 or above on the FCAT Writes; and 77% achieved a level 3 or above on the FCAT Science. Students making gains in reading increased (2%) from 63% to 65%, but in Math a decreased from 74% to 70% (4%) from the previous year. It is important to note the realignment of the scoring system – cut scores and the implementation of rubric changes impacted student achievement levels in all FCAT assessment areas, however, we did experience an increase in reading levels among our high-achieving students. The bottom 25% data was reviewed, analyzing student performance relating to reading and mathematics improvement. The resulting data clearly showed a decrease in student performance in reading and math, with a decline of 13% in reading and 12% in math. In addition, reading strand data (literacy analysis, informational text and research process) proved to be areas of concern for both grade levels. The 12% and 13% decline draws our attention to the need for implementing additional literacy strategies that will reach all levels of students in all areas.

All students enrolled in Algebra I took the 2012 EOC Assessment. Of the 269 students tested, 39 were 7th grade students and 230 were 8th grade students. One hundred percent of the 7th grade students tested scored at Level 3 and above and 85% of the 8th grade students tested scored at Level 3 and above. Placement in this high school course will continue to be determined by Reading and Math FCAT achievement levels, Pre-Algebra screening test, and parental consent.

Data from FAIR, Common formative and summative assessments will continue to assist teachers in diagnosing deficiencies and modify as necessary instructional lesson/unit designs. For the 2012-2013 school year, DeLaura will use FAIR (Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading) testing data as one measure to gauge student progress throughout the year. As the FCRR (Florida's Center for Reading Research) has aligned FAIR with FCAT 2.0, the FPS (FCAT Probability of Success) will continue to be utilized as a progress monitoring measure. The FCRR's decision to no longer report Lexile scores and the reappearance of the FPS necessitates this change. At the close of the third FAIR assessment period for the 2011-2012 school year, the median RC score for DeLaura's seventh graders was 70 and the median RC score for eighth graders was 66.

DeLaura utilizes the Renaissance Learning's Accelerated Reader program to enhance independent reading opportunities for students. Last year, 332 seventh grade students tested on 4,303 independent reading books with a 78% pass percentage, and 342 eighth grade students tested on 2,962 independent reading books with an 83% pass percentage. Of the 7th grade tests taken, 10.1% were nonfiction titles, and of the eighth grade tests taken 14.7% were from nonfiction titles; this data indicates a need to promote nonfiction reading in all subject areas as well as support informational text and the research process.

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

DeLaura Middle School is recognized as a National Model School of Professional Learning Communities at Work and is referenced on Dufour's website, www.allthingsplc.org 2011-2014. This practice has been firmly embedded into

DeLaura's culture. As a PLC model school, our implementation process has strengthened our faculty's resolve to be the best. This is evidenced by our mission and this school year's School Improvement Plan as we hone in on literacy training and skills development. We will continue our implementation of Marzano's research on student achievement and Dr. Max Thompson's action-oriented research.

Our 2011-12 School Improvement Plan, supported by 31 action strategies, provided two goals: increase student achievement and parental involvement. Of the 31 strategies, four were completed with positive results, and 27 are sustaining; we consider these now to be a "best practice" and will maintain the way we conduct PLT business fostering a collaborative culture. DeLaura has become a more dedicated community of lifelong-learners. This can be attributed to providing additional professional development opportunities expanding on B.E.S.T. strategies. Additionally we will maintain our school- focus on book studies: *Classroom Instruction that Works* (2010-2011); *The Art and Science of Teaching* (2011-12); and *The Practice of Authentic PLCs* and *Thinking Maps* (2012-2013). We will continue our practice of discussing student work, administrative walk-throughs, and teachers will present best practices at faculty meetings throughout the school year. Furthermore, DeLaura will continue with PLCs in Interdisciplinary grade level, Department, and Collaborative Mutual Accountability Teams (focusing on bottom 25% of their team's students). During the summer, our Data Team (PLT) analyzed the 2011-2012 FCAT assessment results, as well as selected common MESH (Math, English, Science, History, i.e., Civics and US History) summative assessments. Writing, vocabulary and reference/research skills were identified as critical reading focus areas as a result of the initial data review. Geometry will also continue as a critical math focus area. Interdisciplinary teams are continuing common formative/summative assessment, and recording results as PLT teams, individually as the teacher, departments, and within CMAT meetings. This analysis was presented to the faculty during preplanning and distributed to the core academic areas for the utilization and expansion of DeLaura's current instructional practices. Additionally, during preplanning, we facilitated a presentation on the performance appraisal system which will be further enhanced by our PLCs, connecting directly to the national/state "Race to the Top" program. DeLaura teachers and staff continue to promote transparency through a variety of methodology, andragogy, and pedagogy; therefore, they feel comfortable creating an "Exemplary Practices" teaching culture which ultimately will improve student achievement. Through our established relationships within PLTs, we continue to implement technology for the Individual Performance Appraisal System. Further enhancements are accomplished through building-level trainings addressing the research design and implementation of teachers' PGPs.

The Language Arts department implemented a school-wide mock writing assessment scored using anchor papers and writing rubrics. To assist the Language Arts teachers, the district's writing resource teacher provided scoring training, adhering to the latest rubric guidelines provided by the FLDOE. Teachers were trained using sample 2012 essays and scoring was calibrated referencing the rubric. Teachers recently scored the September essays and recorded the results in the A3 data system providing student feedback and assistance when needed. The preliminary result will be introduced at an upcoming faculty meeting. Overall, the school-wide average essay scored in the 2.9-3.2 range. These results will drive instruction and progress will be monitored when a second school-wide writing assessment is administered in January 2013.

In reviewing past data, we will enhance our advisory programs and interdisciplinary teams will continue to monitor our Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students. Also, we will require that each guidance counselor conduct periodic follow-ups to assist teams with progress monitoring to ensure an overall performance improvement within the FRL group and our at-risk students.

In 2011-2012, we provided services for at-risk ESE and gifted students through our many comprehensive programs. We used the academic support program funding to implement the "NO ZERO ZONE" (NZZ) strategy and provide opportunities to remediate for FCAT achievement level one and two students. The NZZ strategy serviced 475 students with an overall 75% completing missing assignment. Homerooms provided a system for the ancillary curriculum (i.e., Cyber Safety, Depression, Suicide Prevention, Bully Prevention, and more). Additionally, Gifted homerooms used an expanded set of lessons that concentrated on topics such as careers, PSAT, college and creativity/critical thinking and service learning. Enrichment programs and offerings increased as did student achievement outcomes in these areas: Service Learning, Science, Science Research, Lego Robotics, Math Counts, Art, Creative Writing, OM, FPS, and FEA.

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

In Dr. Max Thompson's workshop on "Moving Schools: Lessons from Exemplary Leaders" (June 2012) he states, "To raise the standards for students, you raise the standards for teachers." He further emphasized the importance of teachers utilizing research-based exemplary practices essentials: extended thinking strategies, summarizing, content vocabulary, advanced organizers, and content area non-verbal representation. Dr. Robert Marzano's research, along with the 2006 USDOE studies, supports Dr. Thompson's *Learning-Focused* balanced achievement program for schools with this balanced approach to student achievement maintains guidance and support for research-based instruction, integrates literacy in all studies, provides assistance for all student achievement levels and utilizes assessments throughout the learning process with standard-based curriculum. Additionally, the balanced approach advocates a culture of continuous improvement supported by leaders and teachers willing to learn and facilitate programs with consistency and fidelity. Thinking Maps encourage extended thinking skills as students work collaboratively to use higher level thinking strategies to build connections and deepen understanding of new concepts and skills. Thinking Maps support interactive learning, promote reflective thinking, and provide a common language for teachers and students across all content areas. Teachers can use Thinking Maps to assess prior knowledge as well as determine what was learned. Students are able to construct knowledge by forming informational patterns, transferring thinking processes to content learning, and creating final products. Most importantly, Thinking Maps promote metacognition (*Thinking Maps: Tools for Learning*, David Hyerlo, Ed.D, 1995).

Dufour's workshop (June, 2010), "Professional Learning Communities at Work: Bringing the Big Ideas to Life" demonstrated that PLCs can increase achievement. As evidenced in DeLaura's instructional program, we will continue our school-wide PLCs, focusing on researched based instruction, enhanced collaboration, common assessment, data analysis, communication, and team generated SMART objectives to enhance student achievement. Administration will continue to support teachers through professional development opportunities, B.E.S.T., DOE workshops, 21st Century skill trainings, feedback from classroom-walk-throughs related to IPPAS and best practices "Look Fors". Also, leadership roles will be defined through the implementation of practices discussed in the book by Daniel R. Venables, "The Practice of Authentic PLCs." DeLaura has been rated an 'All things PLC' school for the past seven years and is continuing to hone its implementation practice. DeLaura's highly visible parent organization (DPO) solicits parent participation with the organization and operates as a great partner for the school. Dr. Dufour, states, "We cultivate a collaborative culture through development of high-performing teams." DeLaura's PLTs are linked to the DPO community, which provides various service learning events, activities and classroom support. This group was established seven years ago and has continued to flourish and foster volunteerism. We will continue to support the best practices surrounding this school /community PLT.

CONTENT AREA:

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

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

All teachers at DeLaura Middle School will implement Thinking Maps within lessons as appropriate to increase literacy and student achievement across the curriculum.

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

Barrier	Action Steps	Person Responsible	Timetable	Budget	In-Process Measure
1. Time for Professional development training.	1. Utilize school professional development days to create a training calendar.	Administration District	October 2012 February 2013	N/A	Sign In sheets for the In-services. Agenda for the PDD
2. Buy in for faculty.	2. Present research and evidence to support increase student achievement.	Principal, Reading Coach and Reading Teacher	September 2012	N/A	Faculty meeting agenda; Exit slips for the meeting
3. Funds for trainings and materials.	3. Solicit funds from SAC, school, and district to support trainings and materials.	Principal	September 2012	40 notebooks at \$125.00. (20 from SAC 10 from District 15 from other schools)	Funding and support requests approved by SAC, District and other schools. Notebooks checked out to teachers through Media Center
4. Lack of awareness of CCSS	4. a. Implement the school CCSS action plan to meet district/state timeline. 4. b. Provide Thinking Maps literature to reinforce CCSS connections.	CCSS school team -Principal, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Reading Teacher, and Reading Coach	August 2012 – May 2013	N/A	Action plan submitted to district September 2012, shared with staff members; – faculty meeting minutes and placed on school SharePoint and share. Shared handout during October PLT meeting; documented in minutes

5. Follow up of implementation.	5. Address SIP action steps in PGP through observation to support implementation of the IPPAS.	Peer Review Team Administration Teachers	August 2012- May 2013	N/A	PLT leadership meeting agenda and minutes; PLT SMART objectives/goals
6. Outcome Measurement	6. a. Observe implementation during formal and informal classroom (CWT) visits to evaluate instructional practices b. Review lesson/unit plans utilizing BEST format documenting Thinking Maps to reinforce BEST practices. c. Examine student achievements utilizing a variety of assessments to define instructional /program needs.	Administration Teachers	August 2012 - May 2013	N/A	Instructional leaders share BEST lesson/unit plans with colleagues at PLT meetings. Monitor formative assessment results PLT meeting minutes address data and review to evaluate SMART objectives/goals
7.	7.				
8.	8.				

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

In the 2012-2013 school year, 100% of DeLaura teachers will implement “Thinking Maps” after having received training and materials. Quantitative measures will be pre/post exit slips to monitor implementation practices throughout the school year and number of PGPs stating Thinking Maps as a strategy for achieving gains in literacy across the curriculum. Surveys, PLT minutes, CWT, student work samples, colleague observation slips, and teacher lesson plans will provide qualitative data.

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

In the 2012-2013 school year, 100% of DeLaura students across the curriculum will demonstrate appropriate use of Thinking Maps. Quantitative measures will be an increase of: the average FAIR Reading Comprehension percentage from 57% to 62%; the average school-wide Mock Writes scores from 2.9-3.2 range to 3.2 or higher; and FCAT 2.0 reading gains from 77% to 80% or higher. Observation of student work as evidenced by application of the maps as infused into lessons/units will provide qualitative data.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

1.	Reading Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance <small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)</small>	2013 Expected Level of Performance <small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)</small>
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1.			
Strategy(s): 1.			
	FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	29.5% = 199 students (672)	31% = 256 students (800)
	Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	100% = 1 student	100% = 1 student
	FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	46.5% = 313 students (672)	49% = 392 students (800)
	Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
	Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
	FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading	59% = 99 students	62% = 95 students

Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading Barrier(s):0 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:		
Student subgroups by ethnicity <u>NOT</u> making satisfactory progress in reading : <div style="text-align: right; margin-right: 20px;"> <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 22% = 113 Students 55% = 15 Students 24% = 10 Students 18% = 3 Students NA	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance 20% = 64 students 53% = 11 students 21% = 5 students 15% = 2 students NA
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Thinking Map Training	October 12, 2012 February 2013	Monthly

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/ Speaking: <input type="text"/>			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: <input type="text"/>			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing: <input type="text"/>			

1. 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)
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1.		
Strategy(s): 1.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	34% = 228 Students (672)	34% = 272 students (800)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	100% = 1 Student	100% = 1 student
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	45.5% = 306 Students (672)	47% = 376 students (800)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		

Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	60% = 100 Students	63% =93 Students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	NA	
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 <u>NOT</u> making satisfactory progress in math: <div style="text-align: right; padding-right: 20px;"> <u>White:</u> → <u>Black:</u> → <u>Hispanic:</u> → <u>Asian:</u> → <u>American Indian:</u> → </div>	16% = 82 Students 55% = 15 Students 13% = 5 Students 18% = 3 Students	13% = 42 Students 52% = 11 Students 10% = 3 Students 15% = 2 Students
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring

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)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	86% = 294 Students	89% = 346 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing		

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) 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)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	NA	
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:	44% = 149 Students	42% = 163 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	32% = 108 Students	37% = 144 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading		

1. Science Goal(s) (High School)	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. <p style="text-align: center;"> <u>White:</u> → <u>Black:</u> → <u>Hispanic:</u> → <u>Asian:</u> → <u>American Indian:</u> → </p>		
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 1. If the implementation of "Thinking Maps" is done with fidelity then the Algebra I EOC barriers will be addressed for all sub groups.	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 Algebra:	49% = 132 Students	51% = 139 students
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:	38% = 102 Students	39% = 107 students
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11 <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 50px; height: 20px; display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle; margin-left: 10px;"></div>		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. <div style="text-align: right;"> White: → Black: → Hispanic: → </div>		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	0	
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	0	

Geometry EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students)

	that percentage reflects)	that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry:	NA	
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:	NA	
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. White: → Black: → Hispanic: →	NA	
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:	NA	
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology:	NA	

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:	NA	
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics:	NA	

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:	NA	
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History:	NA	

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 its role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

A school administrator, reading teacher, reading coach, school counselor, and IPST member participate as members of our schools MTSS Leadership team. A focus of the team will be to communicate and facilitate a problem/decision-making system to ensure assistance for struggling students. The team will plan, implement, and monitor progress to improve student achievement through data collection. In the summer months, team members reviewed common assessment and FCAT results to identifying trends and focus areas. During pre-planning, the team members presented to the faculty the school intervention plan. By incrementally improving our strengths and reducing our weaknesses, we improve our core instruction. The team is actively involved in the developing of intervention strategies as well as analyzing student assessment data. In addition they analyzed data from our common summative assessments to determine the focus for the school year. Team members provide monthly data analysis to the faculty and staff and monitor student progress. The team is a key conduit for communications within the school for at risk students. Assessment and Information Management system(AIMS), FCAT, summative assessments, FCAT/EOC practice simulations, formative assessments, Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment for Reading, Math and Science (DAR) and grade reporting will be used to track and monitor student learning. In 2012, the school's MTSS resource teacher will regularly present to the faculty current data and best practice strategies to promote student achievement. Regular cross talks and updates on our response to intervention with the school's Data team and Literacy Team will continue. New personnel will be trained on the software specifics of the MTSS by their team leaders, counselors, and the technology specialist.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

DeLaura Middle School has achieved the Gold School/Five Star Award for the past 12 years with recorded volunteer hours for the past three school years of 11,232 hours, 5454 hours and 5,775.5 hours, respectively. Parental involvement is encouraged throughout the year through the school's website, EDLINE, Kibbles and Bits (school e-mail), electronic newsletter, and our active DeLaura Parent Organization (DPO). Parents also serve on the School Advisory Council to assist in decision-making for school improvement initiatives and / or volunteer assist with athletics, clubs, activities and special events. In addition, we have parents from SAC and DPO attending the district's scheduled Parent Leadership Team meetings. During the registration process, the DPO recruits new parent members and provide information on upcoming meetings and school events. The DPO coordinates and assists with parent volunteers for school events, awards programs, and community events. In addition to monthly board and general meetings, DPO Board members meet monthly with administration to discuss campus activities and related school business. Many opportunities within the school year exist to inform parents of expectations, and student study skills and academic progress.

DeLaura Middle School had 321 (46%) parent/guardian responses to the 2012 online parent survey, which is a 3% increase from 2011's (43%) participation. As with last year, parents maintained that Email (94%), and Edline (74%) are the best tools for communication. Eighty-two percent of parents responded that they have attended DeLaura's informational meetings or academic events. Of those parent responses, 87% felt that the information they received was useful. As in 2011, parents not attending informational or academic events noted their lack of participation due to inconvenient meeting times, or that the topics were not relevant to their child. Overall, parents have been pleased with the quality and quantity of information they received. Progress reports, grade reports, assessment information, and Edline communication received 'good to excellent' remarks, while student academic support received fair remarks.

Parents cited extreme satisfaction regarding classroom instruction, instructional materials, technology, the school website, and providing a safe school environment (57% good, and 26% rated excellent). However, parents responded with only a 34% satisfaction rate regarding enrichment activities which was down from 2011's 47% satisfaction rate. This may have resulted from a lack of consistent communication updating parents regarding the scheduled enrichment activities and events. For the coming school year, effective communication practices in this area will be utilized to increase satisfaction results.

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

DeLaura's attendance rate was 96.89% during the 2011-2012 school year, 97.68% during the 2010-2011 school year, and 96.11% and during the 2009-2010 school year. Despite the fact that the percent values seemingly remain consistent, DeLaura has fallen from 8th ranked in the district to 32nd. During the 2012-2013 school year, DeLaura Middle School will focus on addressing the importance of attendance through the use of the school newsletter, Kibbles and Bits messages, and through other available venues as necessary. Raising awareness for the importance of daily attendance and attendance policies should have a positive impact on the attendance rates in 2012-2013.

SUSPENSIONS:

DeLaura Middle School had 89 (13%) suspensions in 2011-12, 62 (9.5%) suspensions in 2010-2011 and 85 (12.8%) suspensions in the year 2009-2010. Mostly, these rates are consistent from year to year, but as a whole DeLaura Middle School is working toward reduced suspension time through the use of alternative methods of discipline (Lunch Detentions, Dean's Detentions, Administrative Time-Outs, etc) in an effort to keep students in the classroom thus positively affecting student achievement.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

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.)