FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Auburndale Central Elementary	District Name: Polk County Schools
Principal: Badonna M. Dardis	Superintendent: Dr. Sherrie Nickell
SAC Chair: Mr. Henson	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Badonna Dardis	Master's Educational Leadership, Principal Certification K-12 BA in Varying Exceptionalities/Gifted	3	8	2011-2012: School Grade D, 31% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 36% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 26% scoring at or above grade level in science, 54% are meeting state standards in writing, 54% making learning gains in reading, 49% making learning gains in math, 73% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading, 70% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math. 2010 – 2011: School Grade C, 43% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 53% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 33% scoring at or above grade level in science, 87% are meeting state standards in writing, 55% making learning gains in reading, 57% making learning gains in math, 60% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading , 53% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math, and 79% of AYP criteria met. 2009-2010: School Grade C, 47% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 60% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 29% scoring at or above grade level in science, 63% are meeting state standards in writing, 62% making learning gains in reading, 72% making learning gains in math, 67% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading , 70% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math, and 82% of AYP criteria met. 2008-2009: School Grade A, 64% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 59% of students scoring at or above grade level in math. 47% of students scoring at or above grade level in science, 89% of students meeting state standards in writing, 87% of AYP criteria met. 2007-2008: School Grade B, 62% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 57% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 44% of students scoring at or above grade level in science, 87% of students meeting state standards in writing, 87%of AYP criteria met. 2006-2007: School Grade C, 61% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 54% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 35% of students scoring at or above

					grade level in math, 85% of students meeting state standards in writing.
Assistant Principal	Antionette Kirby Smith	Master's Early Childhood Education/, Certifications in Primary Education, Elementary Education, Educational Leadership K-12, ESOL	3	3	2011-2012: School Grade D, 31% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 36% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 26% scoring at or above grade level in science, 54% are meeting state standards in writing, 54% making learning gains in reading, 49% making learning gains in math, 73% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading, 70% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math. 2010 – 2011: School Grade C, 43% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 53% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 33% scoring at or above grade level in science, 87% are meeting state standards in writing, 55% making learning gains in reading, 57% making learning gains in math, 60% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading , 53% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math, and 79% of AYP criteria met. 2009-2010: School Grade C, 47% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 60% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 29% scoring at or above grade level in science, 63% are meeting state standards in writing, 62% making learning gains in reading, 72% making learning gains in math, 67% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading , 70% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math, and 82% of AYP criteria met. 2008-2009: School Grade A, 64% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 59% of students scoring at or above grade level in math. 47% of students scoring at or above grade level in science, 89% of students meeting state standards in writing, 87% of AYP criteria met. 2007-2008: School Grade B, 62% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 57% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 44% of students scoring at or above grade level in science, 87% of students meeting state standards in writing, 87% of AYP criteria met. 2006-2007: School Grade C, 61% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 54% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 35% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 85% of students meeting state standards in writing.

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Teacher Trainer	Shelley Reinacher	BA Elementary Education, National Board Certification – MC-Generalist, ESOL Endorsement	3	3	2011-2012: School Grade D, 31% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 36% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 26% scoring at or above grade level in science, 54% are meeting state standards in writing, 54% making learning gains in reading, 49% making learning gains in math, 70% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading, 73% of the lowest 70% making learning gains in math. 2010 – 2011: School Grade C, 43% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 53% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 33% scoring at or above grade level in science, 87% are meeting state standards in writing, 55% making learning gains in reading, 57% making learning gains in math, 60% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading , 53% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math, and 79% of AYP criteria met. 2009-2010: School Grade C, 47% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 60% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 29% scoring at or above grade level in science, 63% are meeting state standards in writing, 62% making learning gains in reading, 72% making learning gains in math, 67% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading , 70% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math, and 82% of AYP criteria met. 2008-2009: School Grade A, 64% of students scoring at or

					above grade level in reading, 59% of students scoring at or above grade level in math. 47% of students scoring at or above grade level in science, 89% of students meeting state standards in writing, 87% of AYP criteria met. 2007-2008: School Grade B, 62% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 57% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 44% of students scoring at or above grade level in science, 87% of students meeting state standards in writing, 87%of AYP criteria met. 2006-2007: School Grade C, 61% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 54% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 35% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 85% of students meeting state standards in writing.
Reading	Torsha Baker-Cunningham	Bachelor's Degree Elementary Education Master's Degree Reading Education Master's Degree Ed. Leadership Certification Elem. Ed. K-6 ESOL K-12 Reading K-12 Leadership –All Levels	0	0	2011-2012: School Grade B, 48% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 53% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 52% scoring at or above grade level in science, 65% are meeting state standards in writing, 68% making learning gains in reading, 73% making learning gains in math, 67% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading, 73% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math. 2010-2011: School Grade A, 71% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 73% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 53% scoring at or above grade level in science, 87% are meeting state standards in writing, 67% making learning gains in reading, 49% making learning gains in math, 64% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading, 61% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math. 2009-2010: School Grade A, 78% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 80% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 47% scoring at or above grade level in science, 90% are meeting state standards in writing, 64% making learning gains in reading, 63% making learning gains in math, 53% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading, 53% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math.

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

Math	Victoria Pellegrino	BS Elementary Education; Certification in Early Childhood Education; ESOL Endorsement	0	0	Lake Alfred Elementary 2011-2012: School Grade B, 48% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 53% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 48% of students scoring at or above grade level in science, 81% of students met state standards in writing. 2010-2011: School Grade A, 63% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 81% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 41% of students scoring at or above grade level in science, 92% met state standards in writing. 2009-2010: School Grade A, 70% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 80% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 42% of the students scoring at or above grade level in science, 85% met state standards in writing. 2008-2009: School Grade A, 70% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 79% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 46% of students scoring at or above grade level in science, 98% met state standard in writing.

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Regular meeting of new teachers with Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal	On-going
2. Partnering new teacher with mentor (veteran staff)	Principal/Assistant Principal	On-going
3. Work with College Campus Job Fairs and recruiting at Universities, work with District personnel to higher highly qualified staff	Principal/Assistant Principal	June 2013
4. Soliciting referrals from current employees and recruiting interns for campus and then hiring highly qualified interns when course completion/graduation when appropriate.	Principal	N/A

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/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 paraprofessional 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
None	

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
37	5%	41%	43%	11%	41%	100%	11%	3%	57%

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Mrs. Pellegrino	Mrs. McCain	Mrs. McCain is a first year teacher.	Monthly new teacher meetings, as well as modeling and coaching of effective instructional strategies by Mrs. Pellegrino.

Mrs. Cunningham	Mrs. McGriff-Jackson	Mrs. McGriff-Jackson is not familiar with LFS and high yield strategies implemented at Auburndale Central Elementary.	Monthly new teacher meetings, as well as modeling and coaching of effective instructional strategies by Mrs. Cunningham.
Mrs. Morris-Freeman	Mrs. Henry	Mrs. Henry is coming back into education after being out for several years. She is going into a self-contained unit.	Monthly new teacher meetings, as well as modeling and coaching of effective instructional strategies and ESE Access implementation by Mrs. Freeman.
Mrs. Reinacher	Mrs. Snyder	Mrs. Snyder has not been a classroom teacher at the elementary level. She is coming from a middle coach position.	Monthly new teacher meetings, as well as modeling and coaching of effective instructional strategies by Mrs. Reinacher.
Mrs. Acevedo	Mr. Burks	Mr. Burks is a first year teacher.	Monthly new teacher meetings, as well as modeling and coaching of effective instructional strategies by Mrs. Acevedo.

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

Additional Requirements

*Coordination and Integration-*Title I Schools Only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school programs. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development.
Title I, Part C- Migrant Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure student needs are met.
Title I, Part D District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention programs.
Title II District receives supplemental funds for improving basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. New technology in classrooms.
Title III Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.
Title X- Homeless District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for Level 1 readers. SAI funds will be used to expand the summer program to all Level 2 students.
Violence Prevention Programs The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporate field trips, community service, drug tests, and counseling.
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training

Other

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

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Badonna M. Dardis: The Principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision–making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure for implementation of MTSS; ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS; conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; ensures and participates in adequate professional learning to support MTSS implementation; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff for the implementation of MTSS school wide; ensures resources are assigned to those areas in most need; and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. Develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data, provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and graphic display.

Antionette Kirby: Assists Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of MTSS, further assists the principal in the assessment of MTSS skills, implementation of intervention support and documentation, professional learning, and communication with parents concerning MTSS plans and activities. Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities.

Tonetta Morris-Freeman: Participate in student data collection, integrate core instructional activities/materials/instruction in tiered interventions; collaborate with administration and general education teachers.

Torsha Baker-Cunningham, Victoria Pellegrino and Shelley Reinacher: Develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/programs; they identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assisting with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk," assisting in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Model and coach teachers in areas that need development in order to better meet student educational needs.

Venus Acevedo – Provides consistent academic support, works with tier 2 and 3 students to meet academic and behavioral needs, keeps detailed data, assists with the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection and data analysis. Keeps in compliance with Title 1 mandates and organizes and maintains audit documentation while ensuring progress monitoring is completed effectively, as scheduled. Ensuring Parent involvement.

Laura Edmonds – Manages existing instructional software, reports and data collection to share with MTSS team. Organizes testing and progress monitoring schedules and accommodations for student needs. Coordinates and provides training of technology software to enhance learning in the classroom. Facilitates the use of existing and emerging technology by staff and students. Integration of technology to increase student engagement throughout the school. Assists with STEM integration.

Dawn Seefeldt: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical evaluation; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities.

Barbara Riley: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment, guiding and providing intervention with individual students, small group, and whole classroom settings. Communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The MTSS Team will focus meetings on how to improve school/teacher effectiveness and student achievement using the Problem Solving Model.

The MTSS Leadership Team will meet at least once per month (or more frequently as needed) to engage in the following activities:

o   Review school-wide, grade level, and teacher data to problem solve needed interventions on a systemic level and identify students meeting/exceeding benchmarks as well as those at moderate or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. This will be done at least three times per year or more frequently if new data is available.
o   Help referring teachers design feasible strategies and interventions for struggling students by collaborating regularly, problem solving, sharing effective practices, evaluating implementation, assist in making decisions for school, teacher, student improvement.
o   Facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.
o   Focus on improving student achievement outcomes with evidence based interventions implemented with fidelity and frequent progress monitoring.
Intervention teams also foster a sense of collegiality and mutual support among educators, promote the use of evidence-based interventions, and support teachers in carrying out intervention plans.

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

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The MTSS Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extended Thinking, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures. Each MTSS tier is described as follows:

Academic

Tier 1:
- o Harcourt (Reading, Social Studies)
- o Guided Reading
- o Leveled Readers (Reading, Science)
- o Thinking Maps (All Subjects)
- o FCRR Reading Centers
- o Learning Focused Strategies (All Subjects)
- o Accelerated Reader
- o Write From the Beginning (Writing)
- o Cooperative Learning (All Subjects)
- o Math Fluency
- o F.C.I.M. (reading, math and science $4^{th}/5^{th}$)
- o B.B.Y.
- o CRA in math
- o FCAT Explorer (Reading, Math, Science)
- o Ruby Payne Reading Strategy
- o FCAT 2.0 Stem Questions

Tier 2:
- o Triple I Small group (Reading, Math)
- o FCRR Reading Centers
- o Extended Learning (Reading, Math)
- o Daily Extended Reading Passages
- o Math Daily Wylie Warm-ups
- o SRA (Reading)
- o CISM
- o Reading Assistant (Reading)
- o Fast ForWord (Reading)

- o Team Conference with Student and Parent
- o Intensive Reading and Math Instruction

Tier 3:
- o Extended Learning Program
- o Fountas and Pinell LLI Reading
- o CISM
- o Voyager Math
- o Oral Reading Fluency
- o Mentoring
- o Triple I instruction in Reading and Math 1:1 or 1:2

Social/Emotional
Tier 1: School-wide
PBS:
School-wide programs
- o School-wide expectations and rules
- o School-wide reinforcement/Tickets
- o Bullying Program: Awareness
- o School Wide Positive Behavior Support System

Classroom Management
- o Universal signals
- o Social Skills Lessons
- o Classroom reinforcement system
- o Teacher classroom interventions
- o Parent phone calls/note home.

Tier 2: Small Group Targeted Instruction
Small Groups
- o Anger Management
- o Bullying

BEP: Check-In & Check-Out
- o Individual Contract
- o Behavior Report Card
- o Frequent Review

Tier 3: Individual

○   Functional Behavioral
       Assessment/Behavior Intervention Plan
   ○   Individual Contract/Reinforcement Systems
   ○   Individual Counseling

MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Baseline data is gathered through August and September. Discovery Progress Monitoring will be utilized. Kindergarten, First Grade and Second Grade data is gathered for the SBAR. First and Second Grade instructional data is gathered from the previous year SAT 10. Third through Fifth Grade instructional data is gathered from the previous year's FCAT scores. Progress Monitoring data is gathered mid-year and toward the end of the year. Discovery data is monitored during the year. Kindergarten, First Grade, and Second Grade data is gathered for the SBAR every nine weeks. Other Progress Monitoring data is collected as needed for classroom or student progress. This information may be obtained by probes, Quick Reads, Fluency checks, etc. Diagnostic Assessment data is gathered through the Discovery, ERDA, and DAR . End of Year data is gathered through Discovery, SAT 10, FCAT, and SBAR. Data is discussed and analyzed at least monthly at the MTSS Team Meetings and once a month during the grade level meetings scheduled each Wednesday during planning.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Professional learning communities will be provided during the teachers' common planning time and sessions will occur throughout the year. The MTSS Overview will be provided the first week the teachers return, prior to student's return. The District has five other mini-modules that will be provided throughout the year by Dawn Seefeldt. The MTSS Team will evaluate additional staff Professional Learning needs during the monthly MTSS Team meetings.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. Teachers were trained on MTSS at the beginning of the year and refreshers are continued throughout the year.   Weekly meetings to discuss Tier 2 students are conducted and follow up is conducted as well through our school psychologist and guidance counselor.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).   The school-based LLT includes Badonna Dardis (Principal), Antionette Kirby Smith (Assistant Principal), Tonetta Morris-Freeman (ESE Facilitator), Shelley Reinacher (Teacher Trainer), Torsha Baker-Cunningham (Reading AIF), Victoria Pellegrino(Math AIF) and a member from each grade level team .
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).   The LLT will meet every other month beginning in September to discuss professional development needs, examine student data, analyze lesson plans, observations, and to plan mentoring activities.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?   Major initiatives this year involve increasing student achievement by analyzing and improving reading unit plans, vocabulary development, building background knowledge, as well as reading in the content areas.

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**
  Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

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

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

- Parents of in-coming Kindergarten students are invited to participate in our annual Kindergarten round-up.
- Orientation is provided at round-up by a tour of the school and an opportunity for the child to participate in a Kindergarten classroom. We allocate funds each year in our operating budget and Title I to cover Auburndale Central Elementary 2012-2013 the expenses associated with Kindergarten Round-up.
- Literature and Scholastic books are given to the parents to promote the importance of reading and to share Kindergarten GLEs.
- Assessment portion of the Kindergarten round-up includes a Kindergarten readiness skills test that's administered to each student.
- A copy of the assessment is provided to the parent with specific instructions on activities to improve readiness skill.
- Auburndale Central has four Pre-Kindergarten Head Start classrooms housing 18 students each under the supervision of a certified teacher and CDAT.
- Once the preschool student completes the transition to a Kindergarten student, the FKLRS, F.A.I.R, and Discovery Learning are administered
- Data collected is used to differentiate instruction and design activities to fill gaps or provide enrichment in school readiness and socialization
- The Guidance Counselor dedicates time and materials to assist the Kindergarten students and parents to make a successful transition into Kindergarten
- Students from the on campus Head start program are given the opportunity to experience a day of kindergarten at Auburndale Central.
- Parents of both preschool and school-aged children are identified and encouraged to make use of the materials in the Parent Resource Room.
- If the percentage of students who are ready to start school according to the FKLRS data continue to increase, then our preschool plan will be effective
- The personnel involved in this program include: guidance counselor, AIF reading and math coaches, teacher trainer, Para-educators, principal, assistant principal, and kindergarten teachers.
- Pre-kindergarten students and their parents participate in school wide programs that provide them with literature and information to make the transition into kindergarten a smooth process.
- Parent feedback is another tool used in evaluating the effectiveness of the Round Up and other parent activities.

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

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

High Schools Only

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

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

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

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

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?

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. Lacking of student engagement.	1A.1.Collaborative Learning structures, Distributive Summarization, Distributive practice, Assessment Prompts, Graphic organizer utilization and C.I.S.M (grades 3-5). Accountability Talk evident throughout lesson plans and evident in student engagement activities.	1A.1.Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading AIF, Teacher Trainer.	1A.1.Targeted Observations	1A.1.Rubrics that focus on Instructional strategies. Teacher Evaluation Rubric.
Reading Goal #1A: By the Spring of 2013, 40% of students in grade 3 will be Achievement Level 3 on reading FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 41% of students in grade 4 will be Achievement Level 3 on reading FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 38% of students in grade 5 will be Achievement Level 3 on reading FCAT. .	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 3rd- 16% (12) 4th-15% (9) 5th-15% (8)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By the Spring of 2013, 40% of students in grade 3 will be Achievement Level 3 on reading FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 41% of students in grade 4 will be Achievement Level 3 on reading FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 38% of students in grade 4 will be Achievement Level 3 on reading FCAT.					
			1A.2.Minimal time spent with "eyes on text".	1A.2.Incorporate content area reading, Extended Reading Passages, Accelerated Reader.	1A.2. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading AIF, Teacher Trainer, Instructional Paraprofessional	1A.2.Observations, Tracking of Extended passage and AR data	1A.2. Rubrics, Extended Reading Passage Tracking Data Chart, Media Circulation and school-wide AR Quiz Data. Teacher Evaluation Rubric.

			1A.3. Lack of strategies that evoke Higher Order thinking and Discussion.	1A.3 Incorporate higher order questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1. N/A	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1.Lack of strategies that evoke Higher Order thinking and Discussion.	2A.1.Extended Thinking Lessons, Webb's Depth of Knowledge, F.C.A.T. 2.0 and Higher Order Questioning Techniques utilized during instruction. Incorporate higher order questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	2A.1. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading AIF, and Teacher Trainer.	2A.1. Targeted Observations and Data	2A.1.Progress Monitoring of higher complex question responses and % correct. Teacher Evaluation Rubric.
Reading Goal #2A: By the Spring of 2013, 25% of students in grade 3 will be Achievement Levels 4 or 5 on reading FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 23% of students in grade 4 will be Achievement Levels 4 or 5 on reading FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 26% of students in grade 5 will be Achievement Levels 4 or 5 on reading FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 3rd- 15% (11) 4th- 13% (8) 5th- 16% (9)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By the Spring of 2013, 25% of students in grade 3 will be Achievement Levels 4 or 5 on reading FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 23% of students in grade 4 will be Achievement Levels 4 or 5on reading FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 26% of students in grade 4 will be Achievement Levels 4 or 5 on reading FCAT.					
			2A.2.Lack of Instructional strategies in response to student learning needs.	2A.2. Differentiated assignments and strategies to enhance student learning needs.	2A.2. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading AIF, and Teacher Trainer.	2A.2. Targeted Observations, PLCs that focus on grade level assignment comparison and review. Lesson Plan monitoring and review.	2A.2.Progress Monitoring Data. Teacher Evaluation Rubric.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1. N/A	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.

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

Reading Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	*N/A*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Some students are not challenged and authentically engaged in activities that require students to reason and problem solve.	3A.1. Students are given extensive opportunities to demonstrate their learning by showing, telling, explaining, and proving through reasoning.	3A.1. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading AIF, and Teacher Trainer.	3A.1.Targeted Observations	3A.1. Teacher evaluation Rubric. Targeted Rubric.
Reading Goal #3A: By the Spring of 2013, 100% of students in grades 3 (retained third graders)-5 will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In grades 3-5, 54% of students made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By the Spring of 2013, 100% of students in grades 3 (retained third graders)-5 will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.					
			3A.2. Most students have limited background knowledge to allow teachers to provide instruction at the grade level.	3A.2. Connect to student's prior knowledge and build background prior to instruction. Build Vocabulary prior to instruction (Marzano's six step)	3A.2. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading AIF, and Teacher Trainer.	3A.2.Targeted Observations	3A.2. Teacher evaluation Rubric. Targeted Rubric.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.N/A	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Lack of student engagement.	4A.1. Collaborative Learning structures, Distributive Summarization, Distributive practice, Assessment Prompts, Graphic organizer utilization and C.I.S.M (grades 3-5). Accountability Talk evident throughout lesson plans and evident in student engagement activities.	4A.1. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading AIF, and Teacher Trainer.	4A.1. Targeted Observations	4A.1. Rubrics that focus on Instructional strategies. Teacher Evaluation Rubric.
Reading Goal #4A: By the Spring of 2013, 100% of students in the lowest 25% of students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on FCAT Reading Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In grades 3-5, 73% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By the Spring of 2013, 100% of students in the lowest 25% of students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on FCAT Reading Assessment.					
			4A.2. Students have limited incoming vocabulary and word attack skills.	4A.2. Increasingly complex text for extended and close reading activities and scaffolding strategies to meet student needs, Intensive remediation, Marzano's Six Step Vocabulary. CISM (3-5)	4A.2. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading AIF, Teacher Tutor, and Teacher Trainer.	4A.2. Targeted Observations	4A.2. Progress Monitoring, anecdotal records.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1. N/A	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Reading Goal #4B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 34%	40%	45%	51%	56%	62%	67%
Reading Goal #5A: By the spring of 2013, 40% of our 3-5 grade students will score at or above Level 3 on the Reading FCAT Assessment in order to meet our AMO target of decreasing our non-proficient students 50% by the Spring of 2016.							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**		5B.1. Students may not have opportunities to read silently in class.	5B.1. 40 minutes of silent sustained reading with accountability each day.	5B.1. Administration, teacher, reading AIF.	5B.1. Accelerated Reader Reports, Targeted Observations	5B.1.Accelerated Reader data	
Reading Goal #5B: By the Spring of 2013, 48% White, 38% Black, and 42% Hispanic students in grades 3-5, will score at or above Level 3 on the Reading FCAT Assessment in order to meet our subgroup AMO target of decreasing our non-proficient students 50% by the Spring of 2016.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:38% Black:26% Hispanic:30% Asian:N/A American Indian:N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:48% Black:38% Hispanic:42% Asian:N/A American Indian:N/A					
		5B.2. Students are not reading and engaging with long, complex texts across the content areas and writing about what they're reading.	5B.2. Implementation of CISM. Utilize justification of student responses through text.	5B.2.Administration, reading AIF, District Support	5B.2. Observations, benchmark assessments	5B.2.Teacher Evaluation, benchmark assessments	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Lack of accommodations	5C.1. ELL students will be provided with approved accommodations when participating in daily classroom instruction, district and statewide assessments	5C.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Area AIFs and ESOL Para-educators, District supports.	5C.1. Targeted Observations	5C.1.Teacher evaluation tool, lesson plans noting ELL strategies
Reading Goal #5C: By the Spring of 2013, 28% of English Language Learners in grades 3-5, will score at or above Level 3 on the Reading FCAT Assessment in order to meet our English Langauge Learner subgroup AMO target of decreasing our non-proficient students 50% by the Spring of 2016.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *13%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *28%*					
			5C.2. Lack of English language proficiency	5C.2. Visual aids, paraphrasing used during instruction for checking for understanding, consistent academic language used by all staff	5C.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Area AIFs and ESOL Para-educators, District supports	5C.2.Targeted Observations	5C.2.Teacher evaluation tool, lesson plans noting ELL strategies
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Reading Goal #5D: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Students have limited access to reading material.	5E.1. Encourage book checkout from the school library each week, Accelerated Reader tracked and implemented school-wide with student accountability.	5E.1. Reading AIF, Administration, Teachers	5E.1.Circulation Report and AR report	5E.1.Media Circulation data, AR data.
Reading Goal #5E: By the Spring of 2013, 43% Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-5, will score at or above Level 3 on the Reading FCAT Assessment in order to meet our Economically Disadvantaged subgroup AMO target of decreasing our non-proficient students 50% by the Spring of 2016.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *32%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *43%*					
			5E.2. Students enter school with limited expressive and receptive language	5E.2. Stimulate oral language skills through: conversations, use of descriptive words, interactive read-alouds and shared reading, use of wide variety of questioning techniques and levels of complexity	5E.2.Administration, Teachers, District supports	5E.2.Targeted Observations	5E.2.Teacher Evaluation Tool, Student Engagement rubric
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CISM	3-5	Kirby	3-5	September 2012	Observations	Administration, Reading AIF, Teacher Trainer
Marzano	School-wide	Dardis	School-wide	October 2012	Observations	Administration, Reading AIF, Teacher Trainer
LFS	School-wide	Dardis	School-wide	Ongoing	Observations	Administration, Reading AIF, Teacher Trainer
LLI	K-2	District	K-2	November 2012	Observations	Administration, Reading AIF, Teacher Trainer

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Fluency	Quick Read/ Six Minute Solution to Fluency	Operating Budget	500.00
Comprehension	Florida Ready/ Scoring High	Operating Budget	500.00
			Subtotal:1000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Instructional Paraprofessional	Salary	Title I	$16,079.50
Teacher Tutor	Salary	Title I	$27,047.75
			Subtotal:
			Total:44,127.25

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: By the Spring of 2013, 45% of students will score proficient on CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 39.8% (33)	1.1. Teachers may not be implementing ESOL strategies with fidelity.	1.1. Provide professional development in instructional strategies	1.1. Leadership Team and Teachers	1.1. Daily Classroom Walkthroughs, Informal Observations, Formal Observations	1.1. Common Assessments
		1.2. Students lack vocabulary	1.2.Marzano six step vocabulary	1.2. Leadership Team and Teachers	1.2. Daily Classroom Walkthroughs, Informal Observations, Formal Observations	1.2. Common Assessments
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2: By the Spring of 2013, 48% of students will score proficient on CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 42.6% (35).	2.1. Students are not able to read complex text fluently.	2.1. Incorporate oral reading fluency instruction and practice	2.1. Leadership Team and Teachers	2.1.Data Chats	2.1. Oral Reading Fluency Assessments
		2.2. Students may not be able to comprehend complex text.	2.2. Incorporate non-fiction, concept related reading.	2.2. Leadership Team and Teachers	2.2. Daily Classroom Walkthroughs, Informal Observations, Formal Observations	2.2. Discovery Assessments and Common Assessments
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: By the Spring of 2013, 39% of students will score proficient on CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 33.7% (28)	2.1. Most students have limited vocabulary.	2.1. Vocabulary taught in context along with the use of interactive word walls	2.1. Leadership Team and Teachers	2.1.Daily Classroom Walkthroughs, Informal Observations, Formal Observations	2.1. Discovery Assessments and Common Assessments
		2.2. Most students are not writing about their learning	2.2. Comprehensive Instructional Sequence Model. Students will follow a common writing process to produce essays and compositions including pre-writing/planning, writing/drafting, revising, editing/proofreading and publishing, with justification in response to grade level text.	2.2. Leadership Team and Teachers	2.2. Daily Classroom Walkthroughs, Informal Observations, Formal Observations	2.2. Common Assessments
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
CISM	Copies of Passages	Operating Budget	100.00
			Subtotal:100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:100.00

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. Lack of student engagement.	1A.1. Utilize the FCIM through Senteos (technology), Student discourse is facilitated through collaborative structures embedded in lessons. Use CRA for all mathematic instruction. Accountability Talk evident throughout lesson plans and evident in student engagement activities.	1A.1. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Math AIF, and Teacher Trainer.	1A.1. Review student grouping charts frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on assessment, examine data from math ongoing progress monitoring and form or readjust iii and enrichment groups based on that data	1A.1. Progress Monitoring, FCIM weekly assessments, and standards based unit assessments.
Mathematics Goal #1A: By the Spring of 2013, 52% of students in grade 3 will be Achievement Level 3 on math FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 49% of students in grade 4 will be Achievement Level 3 on math FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 44% of students in grade 5 will be Achievement Level 3 on math FCAT. .	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 3rd- 32% (24) 4th-30% (18) 5th-14% (08)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By the Spring of 2013, 52% of students in grade 3 will be Achievement Level 3 on math FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 49% of students in grade 4 will be Achievement Level 3 on math FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 44% of students in grade 4 will be Achievement Level 3 on math FCAT.					
			1A.2. Lack of explicit and pervasive math vocabulary instruction.	1A.2. Marzano's Six step, Vocabulary , vocabulary taught in context along with the use of interactive word walls	1A.2. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Math AIF, and Teacher Trainer.	1A.2. Targeted Observation, On-going Progress Monitoring Scores and Discovery Education	1A.2. Teacher Evaluation Rubric and On-going Progress Monitoring Tools
			1A.3. Lack of strategies that evoke Higher Order thinking and Discussion.	1A.3. Incorporate higher order questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.

			creative thinking.			
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1. N/A	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Teacher content/pedagogical knowledge in the area of math	2A.1. Professional development in math content knowledge and teaching strategies. CRA training. Learn 360 added in lessons. Lesson Study, and common planning will be implemented and facilitated by coaches in order to support targeted instructional practices.	2A.1.Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Math AIF, and Teacher Trainer.	2A.1. PD. 360, CRA school-wide training. Observations.	2A.1. Lesson plans, Teacher evaluation rubric.
Mathematics Goal #2A: By the Spring of 2013, 17% of students in grade 3 will be Achievement Levels 4 or 5 on math FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 22% of students in grade 4 will be Achievement Levels 4 or 5 on math FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 15 % of students in grade 5 will be Achievement Levels 4 or 5 on math FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 3rd- 7% (5) 4th- 12% (7) 5th- 5% (2)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By the Spring of 2013, 17% of students in grade 3 will be Achievement Levels 4 or 5 on math FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 22% of students in grade 4 will be Achievement Levels 4 or 5 on math FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 15% of students in grade 4 will be Achievement Levels 4 or 5 on math FCAT.					
			2A.2. Lacking of student engagement.	2A.2.Collaborative Learning structures, Distributive Summarization, Distributive practice, Assessment Prompts, Graphic organizer utilization and CRA. Accountability Talk evident throughout lesson plans and evident in student engagement activities.	2A.2.Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Math AIF, Teacher Trainer.	2A.2.Targeted Observations	2A.2.Rubrics that focus on Instructional strategies. Teacher Evaluation Rubric.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1. N/A				

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

| Mathematics Goal #2B:

N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*

NA | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

NA | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. |
| | | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #3A:

By the Spring of 2013, 100% of students in grades 3 (retained third graders)-5 will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Math Assessment. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*

In grades 3-5, 49% of students made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math Assessment. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

By the Spring of 2013, 100% of students in grades 3 (retained third graders)-5 will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Math Assessment. | 3A.1. Lack of Student Engagement | 3A.1.Collaborative Learning structures, Distributive Summarization, Distributive practice, BBY Calendar Math, Assessment Prompts, Graphic organizer utilization and CRA. Accountability Talk evident throughout lesson plans and evident in student engagement activities. | 3A.1.Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Math AIF, Teacher Trainer. | 3A.1.Targeted Observations | 3A.1.Rubrics that focus on Instructional strategies. Teacher Evaluation Rubric. |

		3A.2. Lack of writing to respond to new learning.	3A.2. Distributed summarizing, Explicit and pervasive vocabulary instruction of content area terms is evident in writing. Writing is used to respond to new learning. •Students will justify mathematical processes through writing.	3A.2. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Math AIF, Teacher Trainer.	3A.2. Targeted Observations. Evidence through math journals.	3A.2.Teacher Evaluations, Progress monitoring and unit assessments.
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.		3B.1. N/A	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.

Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	*N/A*	*N/A*					

		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Lack of explicit and pervasive math vocabulary instruction.	4A.1. Marzano's Six Step Vocabulary, vocabulary taught in context.	4A.1. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Math AIF, Teacher Trainer.	4A.1. Journals with Vocabulary, Observations.	4A.1. Progress Monitoring, Teacher Evaluation Rubric
Mathematics Goal #4A: By the Spring of 2013, 100% of students in the lowest 25% of students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on FCAT Math Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In grades 3-5, 70% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math Assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By the Spring of 2013, 100% of students in the lowest 25% of students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on FCAT Math Assessment.					
			4A.2.Lack of Instructional strategies in response to student learning needs.	4A.2. Differentiated assignments and strategies to enhance student learning needs.	4A.2. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading AIF, and Teacher Trainer.	4A.2. Targeted Observations	4A.2.Progress Monitoring Data. Teacher Evaluation Rubric.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1. N/A	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Mathematics Goal #4B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 28%	36%	40%	46%	52%	58%	64%
Mathematics Goal #5A: By the spring of 2013, 36% of our 3⁻5 grade students will score at or above Level 3 on the Reading FCAT Assessment in order to meet our AMO target of decreasing our non-proficient students 50% by the Spring of 2016.							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**		5B.1. Teacher needs to provide extensive opportunities for both application and integration of math learning and take into account the needs of all sub-groups	5B.1. Provide curriculum resources and professional development for teachers to promote rigor for all sub-groups. Lesson Study, and common planning will be implemented and facilitated by coaches in order to support targeted instructional practices.	5B.1.Administration, math AIF, District Support	5B.1.Targeted Observations	5B.1.Teacher Evaluation and math benchmark assessments	
Mathematics Goal #5B: By the Spring of 2013, 40% White, 30% Black, and 43% Hispanic students in grades 3-5, will score at or above Level 3 on the Math FCAT Assessment in order to meet our subgroup AMO target of decreasing our non-proficient students 50% by the Spring of 2016.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:35% Black:21% Hispanic:43% Asian:N/A American Indian:N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 40% Black: 30% Hispanic:43% Asian:N/A American Indian:N/A					
		5B.2. Teacher needs to refer to the math lesson essential question to check for student understanding at key points throughout each lesson and make sure all sub-groups have a clear understanding before moving on.	5B.2. Utilize LFS strategies such as posting and referring to the LEQ during instruction, connecting to prior knowledge, and embedded assessments (assessment prompts, distributed summarization) to provide a focus to the lesson.	5B.2.Administratio, math AIF, District Support	5B.2. Targeted Observations	5B.2. Teacher Evaluation and math benchmark assessments	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Lack of accommodations	5C.1. ELL students will be provided with approved accommodations when participating in daily classroom instruction, district and statewide assessments	5C.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Area AIFs and ESOL Para-educators, District supports.	5C.1. Targeted Observations	5C.1.Teacher evaluation tool, lesson plans noting ELL strategies
Mathematics Goal #5C: By the Spring of 2013, 37% English Language Learners in grades 3-5, will score at or above Level 3 on the Math FCAT Assessment in order to meet our English Language Learner subgroup AMO target of decreasing our non-proficient students 50% by the Spring of 2016.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *33%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *37% 2014 goal, already met 2013 goal.*					
			5C.2. Lack of English language proficiency	5C.2. Visual aids, paraphrasing used during instruction for checking for understanding, consistent academic language used by all staff	5C.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Area AIFs and ESOL Para-educators, District supports	5C.2.Targeted Observations	5C.2.Teacher evaluation tool, lesson plans noting ELL strategies
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Teacher needs to use technology and resources to enhance teacher knowledge as part of the instructional process, as well as for student productivity.	5E.1.Implementation of Smartboard activities for the representational piece of the CRA strategy. Senteo use for daily FCIMs. Lesson Study, and common planning will be implemented and facilitated by coaches in order to support targeted instructional practices.	5E.1.Administration, math AIF, Teachers	5E.1.Senteo data, Targeted observation	5E.1.Teacher evaluation, FCIM data.
Mathematics Goal #5E: By the Spring of 2013, 40% Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-5, will score at or above Level 3 on the Math FCAT Assessment in order to meet our subgroup AMO target of decreasing our non-proficient students 50% by the Spring of 2016.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *37%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *40%*					
			5E.2. Teacher needs to make intellectual student engagement in math pervasive through concrete, representational and abstract thought processes.	5E.2. Student discourse is facilitated through collaborative structures embedded in lessons. Increase the use of CRA structure when teaching math. Accountability Talk evident throughout lesson plans and evident in student engagement activities.	5E.2.Administartin, math AIF, District Support	5E.2.Targeted observations, lesson plans	5E.2.Teacher evaluations, benchmark assessments
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CRA Concrete, Representational, Abstract	K-5	Math AIF, Teacher Trainer	School-wide	Teacher Planning (August) PLC's as needed throughout the school year for review and sharing of effective examples from all grades levels	Lesson Plan Documentation	Administration, Math AIF, Teacher Trainer
Supporting Mathematical Practices Through Questioning	K-2	Math AIF, Teacher Trainer	Grade Levels K-2	Early Release, PLC's as needed throughout the school year for review	Lesson Plan Documentation	Administration, Math AIF, Teacher Trainer
BBY Calendar Math	K-5	Libby Pollett	K-5	September 26-27, 2012	Observations	Administration, Math AIF, Teacher Trainer

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Using manipulatives to teach mathematical concepts (Concrete)	Math Manipulatives	Title I	$400.00
BBY Calendar Math	Calendar Math Materials	Flex	$3,617
			Subtotal:4,017.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
BBY Training	Training and Substitutes	Title I	$4300.00
			Subtotal:4300.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Teacher Trainer	Salary	Title I	$58,562.14
			Subtotal:
			Total:$66,879.14

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1. Students have gaps in their background knowledge of essential science concepts.	1A.1. Adapt instructional strategies to address student misconceptions	1A.1. Teacher, principal, assistant principal, teacher trainer	1A.1. Progress Monitoring , Observations	1A.1. Progress Monitoring - Discovery Assessment
Science Goal #1A: By the Spring of 2013, 42% of students in grade 5 will at Level 3in Science as evident	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Based on 2012 FCAT Science data 21% (10) of students achieved a Level 3.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By the Spring of 2013, 42% of students in grade 5 will at Level 3 on FCAT Science.					
			1A. 2 Students struggle with science vocabulary.	1A.2. Vocabulary taught in context along with the use of interactive word walls. Marzano's six step utilized.	1A.2. Teacher, principal, assistant principal, teacher trainer	1A.2. Targeted Observation	1A.2.Teacher Evaluation Rubric
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Science Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Students cannot transfer knowledge	2A.1. Students will engage in challenging labs and use lab journals	2A.1. Administration, Teacher Trainer	2A.1. Targeted Observations	2A.1. Lab Journals
Science Goal #2A: By the Spring of 2013, 15% of students in grade 5 will at Level 4 or 5 %in Science as evident	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Based on 2012 FCAT Science data 5% (3) of students achieved a Level 4 or 5.	2013Expected Level of Performance:* By the Spring of 2013, 15% of students in grade 5 will at Level 4 or 5 %in Science as evident					
			2A.2. Lack of technology integration with science concepts	2A.2. Teacher will utilize technology during instruction	2A.2. Administration, Teacher Trainer, Title I Facilitator	2A.2. Targeted Observations	2A.2. Teacher Evaluation Rubric
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Integrating Writing into Science/Science Journals	K-5	Teacher Trainer	School-wide	October/November 2012	Monitoring student science journals, documentation in lesson plans	Administration, Teacher Trainer
Technology Integration	K-5	Teacher Traine	School-wide	November 2012	Monitoring student science journals, documentation in lesson plans	Administration, Teacher Trainer, Title I Facilitator

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Critical Thinking through hands-on science	Consumables for hands-on science lessons	Internal Accounts	$300.00
			Subtotal:300.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:300.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Formulaic writing is no longer sufficient to achieve a 4 or above on FL. Writes.	1A.1. Modeling, Review the 2012 Anchor Sets, Rubric, Calibration guide and Fl Writes Q and A released by FL DOE.	1A.1.Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Writing Coach and Teacher Trainer	1A.1.Targeted Observation, PD 360, Professional Development of Polk Writes	1A.1.Teacher Evaluation Rubric, Progress Monitoring three times a year
Writing Goal #1A: By the Spring of 2013, 86% of the 4th grade students will be at an Essay score of 3.5 or above on FCAT Writes.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In the Spring of 2012, 54% (33) of 4th grades students scored a level 3.0 on the Writing portion of the FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By the Spring of 2013, 86% of the 4th grade students will be at an Essay score of 3.5 or above on FCAT Writes.					
			1A.2. Lack of consistent writing expectations from grade to grade.	1A.2. Implement Write from the Beginning Program and Polk Writes. Create school wide writing expectations that are evident at all grade levels and stay consistent as a student matriculates from grade to grade.	1A.2. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Writing Coach and Teacher Trainer	1A.2. Both horizontal teaming across the grade levels from grade to grade is held on a regular basis to evaluate the rigor and expectations of student writing. Observations	1A.2.Teacher Evaluation Rubric, Writing rubric, progress monitoring
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1. Formulaic writing is no longer sufficient to achieve a 4 or above on FL. Writes.	1B.1. Modeling, Review the 2012 Anchor Sets, Rubric, Calibration guide and Fl Writes Q and A released by FL DOE.	1B.1. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Writing Coach and Teacher Trainer	1B.1. Targeted Observation, PD 360, Professional Development of Polk Writes	1B.1. Teacher Evaluation Rubric, Progress Monitoring three times a year
Writing Goal #1B: By the Spring of 2013, 35%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

of students in grade 4 will be Achievement Levels 4 or above on Writing Portion of the FCAT.	In the Spring of 2012,7% (4) of 4th grades students scored a level 4.0 on the Writing portion of the	By the Spring of 2013, 35% of students in grade 4 will be Achievement Levels 4 or above on Writing Portion of the FCAT.					
			1B.2. Lack of consistent writing expectations from grade to grade.	1B.2. Implement Write from the Beginning Program and Polk Writes. Create school wide writing expectations that are evident at all grade levels and stay consistent as a student matriculates from grade to grade.	1B.2. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Writing Coach and Teacher Trainer	1B.2. Both horizontal teaming across the grade levels from grade to grade is held on a regular basis to evaluate the rigor and expectations of student writing. Observations	1B.2. Teacher Evaluation Rubric, Writing rubric, progress monitoring.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Write From The Beginning	K-5	Pellegrino	K-5	October 2012	Observations	Leadership Team
Writing Rubrics	K-5	Pellegrino	K-5	November 2012	Observations	Leadership Team

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Process Writing	Instructional Aids	Title I	$250.00

	Subtotal:
	Total:250.00

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Parents bringing parents late to school	1.1. Parents will be called prior to students being tardy 5 times and data chats on Discovery Data will be conducted with parents that bring their children tardy	1.1. Administration and Teachers	1.1. Number of Tardies	1.1.Genesis Report
Attendance Goal #1: Based on 2012 attendance data, we will reduce the number of students with excessive absences by 20%(59)	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	92.82	95%					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	195	136					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	29.2%	15%					
			1.2. Parents not aware of the attendance policy	1.2. Parents will receive a written copy of the attendance policy, Connect Ed letters will be sent home prior to 5 absences , and phone calls will be made	1.2. PBS Team and Social Worker	1.2. Attendance Records	1.2. Genesis Report
			1.3. Breakfast is served until lunch time	1.3. Breakfast time is adjusted	1.3. Administration	1.3. Attendance Records	Genesis Report

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.
District Policies on Attendance	All	Tavira	All Teachers	PBS Monthly Meetings	Examine attendance data	PBS Team

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Letters Home	Paper	Operating Budget	25.00
			Subtotal:25.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:25.00

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: Based on 2012-2013 data, the number of Out-of-School Suspensions will be reduced by 50%(179)	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions	1.1.Some staff members not implementing PBS with fidelity	1.1. Revamp PBS system and implement PAW Chart system, classroom store, and monthly event, and provide incentives to staff members that implement PBS with fidelity	1.1. Leadership Team and Teachers	1.1. Monthly Discipline Referral	1.1. Genesis and Benchmarks of Quality
	0	*0*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	0	0					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	357	179					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	99	49					
			1.2.Lack of social skills	1.2.Skillsstreaming Training	1.2. Leadership Team and Teachers	1.2. Monthly Discipline Referral	1.2. Genesis and Benchmarks of Quality
			1.3. Lack of classroom systems	1.3.Implement classroom PBS systems	1.3. Administration	1.3. Monthly Discipline Referral	1.3. Genesis and Benchmarks of Quality

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Skilllstreaming	K-5	Seedfeldt	PLC	August 2012	Observations	Leadership Team

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
School-wide System	PAW Charts, Stamps, Reward Items	Internal Account	500.00
			Subtotal: 500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:500.00

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

End of Suspension Goals

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan	1.1. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan	1.1. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan	1.1. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan	1.1. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan
Parent Involvement Goal #1: *By the Spring of 2013, 85% of all parents will participate in parent involvement activities as indicated by activity sign-in sheets and conference logs.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* *71% (130)*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* *85%*					
			1.2. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan	1.2. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan	1.2. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan	1.2. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan	1.2. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan
			1.3. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan	1.3. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan	1.3. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan	1.3. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan	1.3. Refer to Parent Involvement Plan

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Knowledge about parent involvement strategies	For Families	Teachers	All	Sep 18, 27 Second Tuesday of Oct, Jan, March, and May	Parent workshop List of what parents learned and are doing at home.	Title One Facilitator
Effective ways for teachers to communicate with parents	K-5	Title One Facilitator	PLC	Sep-May	Parent/Teacher data chats, conference logs	Title One Facilitator, Administration

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Knowledge about parent involvement strategies	Make and Take Materials	Title I	$1000.00
			Subtotal:1000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Title I Facilitator	Salary	Title I	$27, 047.75
Teachers will be conducting 3 data chats with parents and students during parent teacher conferences, daily agenda communication, communication of behavior systems, school procedures, and monthly newsletters	Student Agendas	Title I	2, 287.78
Teachers will be conducting 3 data chats with parents and students during parent teacher conferences, daily agenda communication, communication of behavior systems, school procedures, and	Newsletter Printed – 9 editions	Title 1	1084.50

monthly newsletters			
Teachers will be conducting 3 data chats with parents and students during parent teacher conferences, daily agenda communication, communication of behavior systems, school procedures, and monthly newsletters	Parent/Student Behavior Handbook	Title 1	256.00
Teachers will be conducting 3 data chats with parents and students during parent teacher conferences, daily agenda communication, communication of behavior systems, school procedures, and monthly newsletters	Parent Compacts	Title 1	146.00
Teachers will be conducting 3 data chats with parents and students during parent teacher conferences, daily agenda communication, communication of behavior systems, school procedures, and monthly newsletters	Title 1 Brochure	Title 1	153.00
Teachers will be conducting 3 data chats with parents and students during parent teacher conferences, daily agenda communication, communication of behavior systems, school procedures, and monthly newsletters	Home to School Connection	Title 1	319.00
			Subtotal: $4, 246.25
			Total: $32,294

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1 By the Spring of 2013, 86% of students in grade 3-5 will be at achievement level 3 or above as evident on math FCAT. By the Spring of 2013, 57% of students in grade 5 will at Level 3or above in Science as evident on science FCAT.	1.1. Most teaching tasks do not include inquiry (hands-on) discover skills across curriculum areas	1.1.Integrate inquiry skills across curriculum. Manipulatives in math through CRA for all lessons. Implement instructional strategies through PD 360	1.1.Teachers and Administration	1.1. Observation of inquiry skills being used throughout curriculum. Lesson plans.	1.1. Common Assessments
	1.2. Lack of background knowledge	1.2. Science Leveled Readers implemented during small group reading instruction	1.2. Teachers and Administration	1.2. Targeted Observations	1.2. Common Assessments
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity					
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CRA Concrete, Representational, Abstract	K-5	Math AIF, Teacher Trainer	School-wide	Teacher Planning (August) PLC's as needed throughout the school year for review and sharing of effective examples from all grades levels	Lesson Plan Documentation	Administration, Math AIF, Teacher Trainer

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Using manipulatives to teach mathematical concepts (Concrete)	Math Manipulatives	Mentioned Above	Mentioned Above
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level :* *Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.*	2013 Expected Level :* *Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total: 44,127,25
CELLA Budget
Total:100.00
Mathematics Budget
Total:66,879.14
Science Budget
Total:300.00
Writing Budget
Total:250.00
Civics Budget
Total:
U.S. History Budget
Total:
Attendance Budget
Total:25.00
Suspension Budget
Total:500.00
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:
Parent Involvement Budget
Total:32,295
STEM Budget
Total:
CTE Budget
Total:
Additional Goals
Total:

Grand Total:144,475.39

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance
Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2.When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK,* this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☒Focus	☐Prevent

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance
The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community members who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting *Yes* or *No* below.

☒ Yes   ☐ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount