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: Sun 'n Lake Elementary	District Name: Highlands
Principal: Dr. Linda Laye	Superintendent: Wally Cox
SAC Chair: David Allen/Lynn Douglass	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.

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	Dr. Linda Laye	Bachelors Degree, Primary Education; Elementary Education; Masters Degree, Educational Leadership; Doctorate Degree, School Leadership and Supervision; School Principal	10	10	SUN 'N LAKE 2012=B 2011=A, 97% 2010=C, 85% 2009=B, 97% 2008=B, 87%; 2007=A, 95% 2006=C, 85% 2005=A, 100% 2004=A, 93%
Assistant Principal	Margie Rhoades	Bachelors Degree, Elementary Education; Masters Degree, Educational Leadership; Certifications: School Principal; Educational Leadership; Reading Endorsement; Elementary Education.	2	4	Sun 'n Lake 2012= B Hill-Gustat Middle School 2011-A, 95% 2010-A, 85% 2009-A, 79%

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Dr. Marsha Manley	Primary K-3; Elementary 1-6; Gifted Endorsement; ESOL; Reading	7	7	SUN 'N LAKE 2012=B 2011=A, 97% 2010=C, 85% 2009=B, 97%; 2008=B, 87%; 2007=A, 95% 2006=C, 85% 2005=A, 100% CRACKER TRAIL 2003=A, no 2002=B 2001=B 2000=C

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Partner with USF Teacher preparation program	Dr. Linda Laye	May 2013
2. Assign mentors to all new teachers.	Dr. Linda Laye	May 2013

3. Provide "help" sessions for new teachers.	Dr. Linda Laye	May 2013

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0	n/a

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers

					or higher			
43	7% (3)	32 %(13)	37 %(15)	28 %(12)	35 %(15)	73 % (33)	19 %(8)	2% (1)	81 % (35)

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
Marsha Manley	Kristin Salinder, Jara Corson	Second Year Teacher, First Year Teacher	PD, Support and Coaching
Marcia Levin-Cohen	Danielle Lehman	First Year Teacher	PD, Support and Coaching
Margie Rhoades	Audra Sperry	New Teacher to District	PD, Support and Coaching
Lisa Johnson	Brittany Murphy	First Year Teacher	PD, Support and Coaching
Tara Hughes	Jana Sharp	New Teacher to District	PD, Support and Coaching

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 :   Will provide funds to all district elementary schools and one middle school, in a school wide project format, to target academic assistance to all students, professional development for teachers and parent involvement activities. Monies also provide resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. This grant is also the funding source for implementing the requirements of NCLB.
Title I, Part C- Migrant: Provides services to migrant students (PreK-12th grade) and their families. The primary goal of the Migrant program is to improve academic performance of migrant students, and provide health and guidance services to them. The Migrant Early Childhood Program serves 4 year old children in a full time preschool program, focusing on readiness activities. Parent involvement and education is an integral part of the Migrant Program.
Title I, Part D: Provides services to children who are delinquent or neglected.

Title II
Title II, Part A: Provides for teacher professional development and supports all teachers and paraprofessionals to be highly qualified.
Title III :
Supports activities to assist students to become proficient in English, supports teacher professional development in E.L.L. strategies and parent involvement and education.
Title X- Homeless:
Student Services coordinates with Title I, Part A to provide resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for Level 1 readers.

Violence Prevention Programs: The district offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporate field trips, community service, drug tests, and counseling.
Nutrition Programs: District food service department facilitates grant funding to provide fresh fruit and vegetables in the elementary schools. In addition, they provide services in summer for breakfast and lunches at various school and community locations. Sun 'n Lake Elementary participates in the federal FREE/REDUCED lunch program and the free breakfast program for all students. Snacks are provided for the after-school care program.
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

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 school based team meets twice each quarter to review student performance data and to identify areas of needed improvement in core curriculum or instruction. Pre-school training to review Response to Instruction/Intervention, Tier I and Tier II, and Effective Instruction/Best Practices is conducted annually. Additional training will be provided on using SOS program, intervention documentation and differentiated instruction.

Roles/functions of members are as follows:

•Administrators: The instructional leader; committed to the use of data-based decision making and on-going progress monitoring. Conduct assessments and ensure that the school based team is implementing MTSS/RtI process. Implementation of intervention supports and documentation. Responsible for allocation of resources, monitor staff support/climate; facilitate review of fidelity of implementation.

•General Education Teachers (primary and intermediate) Provide information and expertise about core instructional program participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction/interventions. Identify, implement, document and analyze evidence-based academic and behavioral interventions. Collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions.

•Exceptional Student Education (ESE) teachers: Provide expertise on appropriate interventions for identified needs. Serve as a resource and support for the classroom teacher. Assist with push-in and/ or pull-out intervention for students. Participate in student data collection as well as observations of students in the instructional environment. Observations will assist us to help identify appropriate intervention strategies, to identify barriers to intervention and to collect response to intervention data. Coordinate functional behavior assessments and assist in the development of individual behavior plans.

•Reading Coach: Implements and interprets whole school screening programs and assessments. Participate in the design and delivery of professional development. Mentors and collaborates with staff to provide support and consistency in reinforcing skills. Provides expertise on appropriate interventions for identified needs. Works with team to develop standard protocol interventions for Tier 1 and Tier 2 services and to ensure integrity and fidelity of intervention.

•Guidance Counselor: Assist administration and staff to understand the core principals of the RtII/PSM change process. Participate in the design and delivery of professional development. Provides expertise on appropriate interventions for identified needs. Serves as a resource and support for the classroom teacher. Provide support and information to staff and administration on the familial, cultural and community components of students' response to instruction, learning and academic success. Collaborates with teachers to track documentation and schedules students for PST meetings.

•Speech Language Pathologists: Expertise in the role that language plays in curriculum, assessment and instruction. Expertise in language, its disorders and treatment. Helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills. Provides appropriate interventions for identified needs.

•School Social Worker: Provide assistance in the development of interventions. Observe students in the instructional environment in order to help identify appropriate intervention strategies, to identify barriers to intervention and to collect response to intervention data. Links child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral and social success.

•School Psychologists: Participate in collection, interpretation and analysis of data; facilitates the development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; facilitates data based decision making.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team meets with the SAC chair(s) and administration to help develop and refine the SIP. They assist in the needs assessment process as well as in designing the professional development required to build consensus and to explain the need for RtII/PS process and infrastructure.

Using data for decision-making and allocation of resources to improve student learning is the primary role of the school-based RtI team. SIP goals and strategies are based upon the data collected through assessments and discipline/attendance reports. The data collected during progress monitoring meetings will determine the effectiveness of the instruction and interventions students are receiving.

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.

Accurate data for decision making at each level and step of the MTSS/RTI process means that schools must have ways of collecting, maintaining and accessing their data. It must be easy to use, relevant, and accessible to decision makers and easily summarized so that it is understandable to teachers and parents. Currently this is an area that requires much improvement.

Baseline, mid-year, and end of year data will be collected for all Tier I students. In addition, data will be collected monthly, bi-weekly, or weekly depending on the needs of the Tier II and Tier III students. Data sources can include, but are not limited to:

Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), AIMSweb probes, Florida Comprehensive Assessment System (FCAT), Florida Assessments for Instruction Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA), Harcourt Reading Assessments, STAR Math, STAR Reading, District Writing Prompt, Math Assessments, Science Assessments, Pinnacle Grade Book, SWIS, Grade Level Indicators, Genesis Data Base.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

•Overview of - A general understanding of MTSS concepts, principles and goals. Identification of previous year's students receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 services.

Monthly grade level meetings:

•Identification of core curriculum – differentiated instruction within Tier 1 for both struggling as well as enrichment students; strategic, or supplemental (Tier 2) and intensive (Tier 3) curriculum. Review data collected on all students receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 services and as a team make recommendations for changes in intensity or interventions to the leadership team.

Professional development will be provided during early release professional develop/collaboration days throughout the year. The MTSS Leadership team will also evaluate any additional staff development needs during the monthly MTSS Leadership Team meeting. Professional development for the 12-13 school year will include:

•Differentiating instruction

•Understanding and using assessment data

•Understanding and using formative assessments in the classroom

•Working in RtI problem solving teams

Weekly data review meetings for Tier III students

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Marsha Manley (Reading Coach),Linda Laye (Principal), Margie Rhoades (Assistant Principal), Marcia Levy-Cohen(Kindergarten), Christina Chavis(Grade 1), Tara Hughes (Grade 2), Lisa Johnson (Grade 3), Elizabeth Abell (Grade 4), LaNita Roth (Grade 5), Lynn Douglass (Resource/ESE).
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The school-based LLT meets a minimum of once a month to determine needs of the school and plan for improvements. A representative from each grade level and the resource team are members of this group. They review student performance data and focus on needed improvement in core curriculum, instruction, and student behavior. Members of this team meet at least once per month with their own team to facilitate information sharing and the execution of the action plans.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The focus for the 2012-2013 school year will be to empower the LLT members to assist their team in collecting, analyzing, and utilizing data to improve instruction and learning. Professional development will focus on differentiated instruction with an emphasis on 80% of the students mastering grade level assessments at 70% or higher.

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

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK) programs are provided and facilitated throughout the district. Each summer, VPK programs are location in each district community for families of all eligible incoming kindergarten student not previously served in a private sector.

Open registration and classroom visits begin in early May of each year for new Kindergarten students and their families.

IEP reviews and staffing are scheduled on Pre-K students enrolled in a SWD Pre-K classroom.

*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?

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.

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	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
	Core curriculum/ instruction does not provide the level of direct explicit instruction necessary to improve reading proficiency for all students.	Harcourt Reading- core curriculum, leveled readers, center activities, FCAT Explorer 3-5, Harcourt online e-books, test preparation program 3-5, computer assisted instruction. Identify core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction/ interventions within the 90 minute reading block Daily 5 Literacy Block	Classroom Teacher, Team Leader, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI Team	Student progress monitored using FAIR OPM every 20 days to students identified by FAIR. FAIR and TDI data results reviewed by grade level team, Reading Coach, and MTSS/RTI team. Item analysis of Harcourt weekly and theme test. Target deficit skills/ strategies for additional instruction. Results reviewed by classroom teacher, team leaders, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team. Review of student folders with progress towards goals charted.	Fair Data and TDI data, Harcourt weekly tests, Harcourt Theme assessments, STAR assessment, and Student folders.		

		Structure to be implemented during reading block. Accelerated Reading Program Individual student learning goals will be developed and implemented for reading in all classrooms.					
Reading Goal #1A: The percentage of students scoring Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 27% to 28%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	27% (89) students)	28% (92 students)					

		1A.2. Students have skill deficits in one or more areas of reading instruction. PA, P, V, F, C	1A.2. Harcourt leveled readers, small group differentiated instruction to focus on skills and strategies, Computer Assisted Instruction i.e.: Ticket to Read, SME, FCAT Explorer (3 times a week for 15 minutes), Harcourt Strategic Intervention, Additional 30 minutes will include explicit small group instruction, skill/strategy remediation.	1A.2. Classroom teacher, Reading Coach, MTSS team	1A.2. FAIR OPM tasks from TDI-skill specific measures. Student progress monitored using AIMSweb probes (bi-weekly/ weekly) for all students receiving Tier 2 supplemental instruction. Instruction is determined by a review of AIMSweb graphed data and item analysis of Harcourt weekly and theme tests. Results reviewed monthly by grade level team, Reading Coach, and MTSS/RTI Team.	1A.2 Fair Data and graphed AIMSweb data, Harcourt weekly test and Harcourt Theme assessments, CAI Reports.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Reading Goal #1B: The percent of students scoring Level 4, 5 or 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in reading was 0%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	100%(6)	*100% (6)*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3. Students have skill deficits in one or more of the areas of reading instruction. PA,P,V,F,C	1B.3. Edmark Reading Program; Harcourt Strategic/Intervention, Small group differentiated instruction to focus on skills and strategies, Computer assisted instruction. Small group and individual instruction based on student's IEP	1B.3. ESE teacher, Reading Coach, IEP Staffing team	1B.3. Student progress monitored using AIMSweb probes weekly for all students receiving Tier 3 services	1B.3. AIMSweb graphed data, CAI reports	

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. Core curriculum/ instruction does not provide adequate instruction of higher level thinking skills or questioning strategies. | 2A.1. Use of trade books, project based activities/ challenge materials. Small group targeted instruction on higher order skills. Provide opportunities for real world problem solving activities. Individual student learning goals will be developed and implemented for reading in all classrooms | 2A.1. Classroom teacher, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team | 2A.1. Review of FCAT & Fair data, Harcourt assessments by grade level teams. Review of student folders with progress towards goals charted. | 2A.1. FCAT and FAIR data, Harcourt assessments, Student folder | | |

Reading Goal #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of students scoring Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading assessment will increase from 32% to 33%.						
	32% (104)	33% (110)				
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
		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.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	
Reading Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of students scoring Level 7 or above in reading was 100%.						
	100% (6)	100% (7)				

		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	
		Students have skill deficits in one or more of the areas of reading instruction. PA,P,V,F,C	Edmark Reading Program; Harcourt Strategic/Intervention, Small group differentiated instruction to focus on skills and strategies, Computer assisted instruction. Small group and individual instruction based on student's IEP	ESE teacher, Reading Coach, IEP Staffing team	Student progress monitored using AIMSweb probes weekly for all students receiving Tier 3 services	AIMSweb graphed data, CAI reports	

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. Core Curriculum/instruction does not provide the level of direct explicit instruction necessary to improve reading proficiency for all students.	3A.1. Harcourt Reading-core curriculum, leveled readers, center activities, FCAT Explorer 3-5, Harcourt online e-books, test preparation program 3-5, computer assisted instruction. Identify core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction/ interventions within the reading block. Daily 5 Literacy Block Structure to be	3A.1. Reading teacher, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team	3A.1. FAIR/TDI data, Harcourt weekly test, Harcourt Theme test	3A.1.		

		implemented during reading block.				
		Accelerated Reading Program				
Reading Goal #3A: The percentage of students demonstrating learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading assessment will increase from 72% to 73%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	72% (166)	73% (168)				

		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		Students have skill deficits in one or more of the areas of reading instruction. PA,P,V,F,C	Harcourt Leveled Readers, Small group differentiated instruction to focus on skills and strategies, Computer assisted instruction i.e.: Ticket to Read, SME, FCAT Explorer (3 times a week for 15 minutes), Harcourt Strategic Intervention Additional 30 minutes for intervention will include explicit small group instruction, skill/ strategy remediation	Reading teacher, grade level team, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team	FAIR OPM tasks from TDI-skill specific measures. Student progress monitored using AIMSweb probes (weekly/bi-monthly) for all students receiving Tier 2 supplemental instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of AIMSweb graphed data and item analysis of Harcourt tests. Results reviewed by grade level team, Reading Coach and MTSS/RTI team.	Fair Data and AIMSweb graphed data, Harcourt weekly test, Harcourt Theme assessments CAI reports	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Reading Goal #3B: The percentage of students making learning gains in reading was 100%,	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	100% (2)	*100% (4)*					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	

		3B.3. Students have skill deficits in one or more of the areas of reading instruction. PA,P,V,F,C	3B.3.Edmark Reading Program; Harcourt Strategic/Intervention, Small group differentiated instruction to focus on skills and strategies, Computer assisted instruction. Small group and individual instruction based on student's IEP	3B.3. ESE teacher, Reading Coach, IEP Staffing team	3B.3. Student progress monitored using AIMSweb probes weekly for all students receiving Tier 3 services.	3B.3. AIMSweb graphed data, CAI reports

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. Many of the students scoring in the lowest 25% have skill deficits in all areas of reading instruction. PA, P, V, F, C	4A.1. Identification of students who comprise the lowest 25% at all grade levels Provide appropriate instruction/ intervention and more frequent progress monitoring (Tier 2 & 3) in selected areas of reading. Additional time added to the 90 minute reading block.	4A.1. Classroom teacher, grade level team, MTSS /RTI team	4A.1. AIMSweb probes administered bi-monthly or weekly depending upon level of services; Monitor fidelity and integrity of interventions being provided. Results reviewed by classroom teacher, Grade level team, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team	4A.1. AIMSweb graphed data; CAI reports, Intervention Documentation.		

Reading Goal #4:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of lowest quartile students demonstrating learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading assessment will increase from 63% to 65%.						
	63% (37)	65% (38)				
		4A.2. Students reading significantly below grade level expectations .	4A.2. RTI/PS team to identify Tier 3 services/intervention for identified students. Voyager Reading, My Reading Coach, Small group instruction - 1:3	4A.2. Classroom teacher, grade level team, MTSS /RTI team	4A.2. AIMSweb probes administered weekly; Monitor fidelity and integrity of interventions being provided. Voyager reports, MRC reports Classroom teacher, Grade level team, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team	4A.2. AIMSweb graphed data; CAI reports, Voyager reports, Intervention Documentation	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.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** 65%	66%	71%	74%	77%	80%	83%
Reading Goal #5A: In six years we will reduce the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 or 2 to 18%.We will increase the percentage of students making satisfactory progress in reading to 83%.							
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. Many students are lacking in background knowledge and their language development and language skills are weak. Many of the students have skill deficits in areas of reading instruction. PA, P, V, F, C	5B.1. Identify core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction/ interventions within the 90 minute reading block. Provide multiple opportunities to build background knowledge and basic language meaning. Daily 5 Literacy Block Structure to be implemented during reading block. Accelerated Reading Program	5B.1. Classroom teacher, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team	5B.1. FAIR/TDI assessment. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR and TDI data and item analysis of Harcourt weekly and theme test. Results reviewed by grade level team, Reading Coach, and MTSS/RTI team.	5B.1. FAIR and TDI data, Harcourt assessments.		
Reading Goal #5B: The percent of students making satisfactory progress in reading will increase for each subgroup.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	Asian 86% Black 46% Hispanic 63% White 72%	Asian 96% Black 59% Hispanic 65% White 76%			
	5B.2. A student's level of skill mastery may require additional time for instruction and intervention.	5B.2. Provide appropriate instruction/intervention and more frequent progress monitoring (Tier 2 & 3) in selected areas of reading. Additional time added to 90 minute reading block.	5B.2. Classroom teacher, grade level team, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team	5B.2. FAIR OPM tasks from TDI-skill specific measures. AIMSweb probes to be administered bi-monthly to identified students. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR/AIMSweb data and item analysis of Harcourt weekly and theme test. Results reviewed by grade level team, Reading Coach, and MTSS/RTI team.	5B.2 Student progress monitored bi-monthly with AIMSweb graphed data, and Harcourt assessments.
	5B.3. Students reading significantly below grade level expectations.	5B.3. MTSS/RTI to identify Tier 3 services/ intervention for selected students. Voyager Reading, My Reading Coach, Small group instruction 1:3.	5B.3. Classroom teacher, MTSS/RTI team	5B.3. Intervention Documentation, My Reading Coach reports, Voyager reports, AIMSweb weekly probes to be graphed. Classroom teacher, MTSS/RTI review data collected	5B.3. Student progress using AIMSweb graphed data, CIA reports.
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. Many students are lacking in background knowledge and their language development and language skills are weak. Many of the students have skill deficits in areas of reading instruction. PA, P, V, F, C	5C.1. Identify core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction/ interventions within the 90 minute reading block. Provide multiple opportunities to build background knowledge and basic language meaning. Daily 5 Literacy Block Structure to be implemented during reading block. Accelerated Reading Program	5C.1. Classroom teacher, Reading Coach, Ell Para MTSS/RTI team	5C.1. FAIR/TDI assessment. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR and TDI data and item analysis of Harcourt weekly and theme test. Results reviewed by grade level team, Reading Coach, and MTSS/RTI team.	5C.1. FAIR and TDI data, Harcourt assessments		
Reading Goal #5C: **The percent of English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 7%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	50% (7)	*43%(6)*					

		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		A student's level of skill mastery may require additional time for instruction and	Provide appropriate instruction/intervention and more frequent progress monitoring (Tier 2 & 3) in selected areas of reading. Additional time added to 90 minute reading block.	Classroom teacher, grade level team, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team	FAIR OPM tasks from TDI-skill specific measures. AIMSweb probes to be administered bi-monthly to identified students. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR/AIMSweb data and item analysis of Harcourt weekly and theme test. Results reviewed by grade level team, Reading Coach, and MTSS/RTI team.	Student progress monitored bi-monthly with AIMSweb graphed data, and Harcourt assessments.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
		Students reading significantly below grade level expectations.	MTSS/RTI to identify Tier 3 services/ intervention for selected students. Voyager Reading, My Reading Coach, Small group instruction 1:3.	Classroom teacher, grade level team, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team	Intervention Documentation, My Reading Coach reports, Voyager reports, AIMSweb weekly probes to be graphed. Classroom teacher, MTSS/RTI review data collected	Student progress using AIMSweb graphed data, CIA reports.	
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. Many students are lacking in background knowledge and their language development and language skills are weak. Many of the students have skill deficits in areas of reading instruction. PA, P, V, F, C	5D.1. Identify core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction/ interventions within the 90 minute reading block. Provide multiple opportunities to build background knowledge and basic language meaning. Daily 5 Literacy Block Structure to be implemented during reading block. Accelerated Reading Program	5D.1.V Classroom teacher, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team	5D.1. FAIR/TDI assessment. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR and TDI data and item analysis of Harcourt weekly and theme test. Results reviewed by grade level team, Reading Coach, and MTSS/RTI team.	5D.1. FAIR and TDI data, Harcourt assessments		
Reading Goal #5D: The percent of Students with Disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 13%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	74%(16)	*61%(13)*				
	—	5D.2. A student's level of skill mastery may require additional time for instruction and	5D.2. Provide appropriate instruction/intervention and more frequent progress monitoring (Tier 2 & 3) in selected areas of reading. Additional time added to 90 minute reading block.	5D.2. Classroom teacher, grade level team, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team	5D.2. FAIR OPM tasks from TDI-skill specific measures. AIMSweb probes to be administered bi-monthly to identified students. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR/AIMSweb data and item analysis of Harcourt weekly and theme test. Results reviewed by grade level team, Reading Coach, and MTSS/RTI team.	5D.2. Student progress monitored bi-monthly with AIMSweb graphed data, and Harcourt assessments.
		5D.3. Students reading significantly below grade level expectations.	5D.3. MTSS/RTI to identify Tier 3 services/ intervention for selected students. Voyager Reading, My Reading Coach, Small group instruction 1:3.	5D.3. Classroom teacher, grade level team, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team	5D.3. Intervention Documentation, My Reading Coach reports, Voyager reports, AIMSweb weekly probes to be graphed. Classroom teacher, MTSS/RTI review data collected	5D.3. Student progress using AIMSweb graphed data, CIA reports.

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		

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

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. | 5E.1.

Many students are lacking in background knowledge and their language development and language skills are weak. Many of the students have skill deficits in areas of reading instruction. PA, P, V, F, C | 5E.1.

Identify core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction/ interventions within the 90 minute reading block. Provide multiple opportunities to build background knowledge and basic language meaning.

Daily 5 Literacy Block Structure to be implemented during reading block.

Accelerated Reading Program | 5E.1.

Classroom teacher, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team | 5E.1.

FAIR/TDI assessment. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR and TDI data and item analysis of Harcourt weekly and theme test. Results reviewed by grade level team, Reading Coach, and MTSS/RTI team. | 5E.1.

FAIR and TDI data, Harcourt assessments. | | |

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

Reading Goal #5E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percent of economically disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in reading will increase by 9%.						
	55%(118)	64%(137)				
		5E.2. A student's level of skill mastery may require additional time for instruction and intervention.	5E.2. Provide appropriate instruction/intervention and more frequent progress monitoring (Tier 2 & 3) in selected areas of reading. Additional time added to 90 minute reading block.	5E.2. Classroom teacher, grade level team, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team	5E.2. FAIR OPM tasks from TDI-skill specific measures. AIMSweb probes to be administered bi-monthly to identified students. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR/AIMSweb data and item analysis of Harcourt weekly and theme test. Results reviewed by grade level team, Reading Coach, and MTSS/RTI team.	5E.2. Student progress monitored bi-monthly with AIMSweb graphed data, and Harcourt assessments.

		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	
		Students reading skills are significantly below grade level expectations.	MTSS/RTI to identify Tier 3 services/ intervention for selected students. Voyager Reading, My Reading Coach, Small group instruction 1:3.	Classroom teacher, grade level team, Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI team	Intervention Documentation, My Reading Coach reports, Voyager reports, AIMSweb weekly probes to be graphed. Classroom teacher, MTSS/RTI review data collected	Student progress using AIMSweb graphed data, CIA reports.	

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
Daily 5	K-5	Assistant Principal	All Teachers in Grades K-5	Pre-School/Month PLC	Classroom Observations/Curriculum Mapping	Administration/Reading Coach
Curriculum Mapping	K-5	Assistant Principal/ Team Leaders	All Teacher in Grades K-5	Pre-School/Weekly	Weekly Administrative Review	Administration/Reading Coach
Unwrapping Common Core State Standards	K-5	Reading Coach	All Teachers in Grades K-5	ER/Sept-Oct	Curriculum Maps/Classroom Observations	Administration/Reading Coach

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
Daily 5	Charts, Books, Listening Centers, etc	PTO	$2500
Super Kids	Program Materials	School Budget	$3000
$5500.00 Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Daily 5	Teacher Guides	School Budget	$500
Common Core State Standards	Teacher Guides	School Budget	$500
$1000.00 Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Shout Out Program/Feedback	Student Rewards	School Budget	$1000
$1000.00 Subtotal:			
$7500.00 Total:			

End of Reading Goals

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. Implementation of core curriculum and the NGSSS.	1A.1. Grades 3-5 will implement and correlate NGSSS and McGraw-Hill series. Grades 1-5 will administer diagnostic placement, 3 times a year to identify core instructional needs. Performance Matters data and McGraw Hill assessments will be used to plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction/ intervention within the 60 minute math block. Computer assisted instruction will be provided to all students 3 times a week for 15	1A.1. Math instructors, grade level team, Team leaders	1A.1. Item analysis of McGraw-Hill assessments, Performance Matters and grade level indicators. Results reviewed by teacher, grade level and MTSS/RTI team. Review of student folders with progress towards goals charted.	1A.1. McGraw Hill diagnostic and chapter assessments, Performance Matters data; CAI reports, Percent of students mastering grade level indicators. Student folders		

		minutes. Individual student learning goals will be developed and implemented for mathematics in all classrooms.				
Mathematics Goal #1A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics assessment will increase from 30% to 32%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	30%(98)	32% (105)				

		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		Core math curriculum/ instruction does not provide the level of direct explicit instruction to improve math proficiency for all students.	Small group differentiated instruction to focus on skills and strategies. Computer Assisted instruction. Remediation will include explicit small group instruction, skill/strategy remediation.	Math instructors, Team Leader, MTSS/RTI team	Focus of instruction/ intervention to be determined by a review of diagnostic assessment, Performance Matters, and McGraw Hill assessments. CBM probes given bi-weekly to monitor students' progress on identified skills. Results reviewed by grade level team, Team Leaders, MTSS/RTI team	Performance Matters data McGraw Hill assessments Percent of students mastering grade level indicators. CBM measures	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: The percent of students scoring at Level 4, 5 or 6 on the FAA mathematics will increase from 17% to 25%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 17% (1)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 25%(2)					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	

		1B.3.	1B.3	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
		Many students performance in math is significantly below grade level expectations.	Explicit individual, small group instruction using appropriate curriculum access points. Measure student progress using CBM probes in identified deficit area weekly.	ESE Teacher, MTSS/RTI Team.	Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by teacher. CBM probes to be administered weekly.	IEP progress report. CAI reports, Intervention Documentation, CBM data	

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. Providing instruction to cover the depth of knowledge necessary to achieve above level mastery of skills.	2A.1. Grades 3-5 will implement and correlate NGSSS and the McGraw-Hill core curriculum. Use of manipulative, exploration and increased focus on problem solving strategies to increase depth of knowledge of math skills. Provide project based activities/ challenge materials. Small group targeted instruction on higher order skills. Provide opportunities for real world problem solving strategies.	2A.1. Math instructors, Team Leaders, MTSS/RTI team.	2A.1. Analysis and review of McGraw-Hill assessments, Performance Matters data to determine student proficiency	2A.1. McGraw-Hill assessments, Performance Matters data, CAI reports. Student folders		

		Use of computer assisted instruction- 15 minutes 3 times a week. Individual student learning goals will be developed and implemented for mathematics in all classrooms.		Review of student folders with progress towards goals charted.			
Mathematics Goal #2A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics assessment will increase from 30% to 32%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	30%(98)	32%(105))					

		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.**	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2B: The percentage of students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics will remain above 50 %.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	83% (5)	50% (4)					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3. Many students performance in math is significantly below grade level expectations .	2B.3 Explicit individual, small group instruction using appropriate curriculum access points. Measure student progress using CBM probes in identified deficit area weekly.	2B.3. ESE Teacher, MTSS/RTI Team.	2B.3. Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by teacher. CBM probes to be administered weekly.	2B.3. McGraw-Hill assessments. CAI reports, Intervention Documentation, CBM data	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

| 3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. | 3A.1. Core math curriculum/ instruction does not provide the level of direct explicit instruction to improve math proficiency for all students. | 3A.1. Use of manipulatives, exploration and an increased focus on problem solving will increase the depth of knowledge of math skills.

Use of computer assisted programs; Each student will use for 15 minutes 3 times a week.

Grades 3-5 will use The McGraw-Hill series and correlate to NGSSS.

Identify core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction | 3A.1. Math Teacher, grade level team, Team Leaders, MTSS/ RTI team | 3A.1. Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by grade level team, team leader and MTSS Team | 3A.1. McGraw-Hill assessments, Performance Matters data

Percent of students meeting grade level indicators. | | |

		and intervention within the 60 minute block.				
Mathematics Goal #3A: The percentage of students making learning gains in Mathematics on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics assessment will increase from 43% to 50%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	43%(99)	50%(115)				
		3A.2. Many students have skill deficits in one or more areas of math instruction.	3A.2. Remediation to include explicit small group instruction, skill/strategy remediation. Measure student progress using CBM probes in identified deficit area bi-monthly	3A.2. Math teacher Team Leader, MTSS/RTI team	3A.2. Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by teacher and grade level team. CBM probes to be administered bi-weekly for targeted skills. Monitor fidelity and integrity of interventions being provided.	3A.2. McGraw-Hill assessments. CAI reports, Intervention Documentation, CBM Probes

		3A.3. Many students performance in math is significantly below grade level expectations.	3A.3 RTI/PS to develop Tier 3 intervention plan. Measure student progress using CBM probes weekly.	3A.3. Math Teacher, Team Leader, MTSS/RTI Team.	3A.3. Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by teacher and grade level team. CBM probes to be administered weekly.	3A.3. McGraw-Hill assessments. CAI reports, Intervention Documentation, CBM data	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3B: The percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics will remain at 50% or higher.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *50% (1)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *50% (2)*						
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	

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

		3B.3. Many students performance in math is significantly below grade level expectations.	3B.3 Explicit individual, small group instruction using appropriate curriculum access points. Measure student progress using CBM probes in identified deficit area weekly.	3B.3. ESE Teacher, MTSS/RTI Team.	3B.3. Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by teacher. CBM probes to be administered weekly.	3B.3. McGraw-Hill assessments. CAI reports, Intervention Documentation, CBM data	

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		

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

4. FCAT 2.0: **Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**	4A.1. Core math curriculum/ instruction does not provide the level of direct explicit instruction to improve math proficiency for all students.	4A.1. Identification of students who comprise the lowest 25% at all grade levels. Analysis of diagnostic and Performance Matters assessment results to identify deficit areas. Provide appropriate instruction/ intervention and more frequent progress monitoring (Tier 2 &3). Additional time added to math block for skill/ strategy remediation. Use of manipulative s, exploration and an increased focus on	4A.1. Teacher, Grade Level Team , MTSS/RTI team	4A.1. Monitor fidelity and integrity of interventions being provided. Analysis of CBM probes/McGraw Hill assessments and Performance Matters to measure individual student growth.	4A.1. CBM Measures, Intervention Documentation, Performance Matters reports, McGraw Hill assessments		

		problem solving will increase the depth of knowledge of math skills. Use of computer assisted programs. Each student will use for 15 minutes 3 times a week. Identify core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction and intervention within the 60 minute block.				

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

Mathematics Goal #4:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of lowest quartile students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics assessment will increase from 31% to 50%.						
	31%(18)	50%(24)				
		4A.2. Many students have skill deficits in one or more areas of math instruction. .	4A.2. Remediation to include explicit small group instruction, skill/strategy remediation. Measure student progress using CBM probes in identified deficit area weekly.	4A.2. Math Teacher, Team Leader, MTSS/RTI Team.	4A.2. Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by teacher and grade level team. CBM probes to be administered weekly.	4A.2. McGraw-Hill assessments. CAI reports, Intervention Documentation, CBM data
		4A.3 Many students performance in math is significantly below grade level expectations .	4A.3 RTI/PS to develop Tier 3 intervention plan. Measure student progress using CBM probes weekly.	4A.3. Math Teacher, Team Leader, MTSS/RTI Team.	4A.3. Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by teacher, grade level team and MTSS/RTI team. CBM probes to be administered weekly.	4A.3. McGraw-Hill assessments. CAI reports, Intervention Documentation, CBM data

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** 66%	58%	71%	74%	77%	80%	83%
Mathematics Goal #5A: In six years we will reduce the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 or 2 to 18%. We will increase the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency in mathematics to 83%							

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. Core math curriculum/ instruction does not provide the level of direct explicit instruction to improve math proficiency for all students.	5B.1. Analysis of diagnostic and Performance Matters assessment results to identify deficit areas. Provide appropriate instruction/intervention and more frequent progress monitoring (Tier 2 &3). Additional time added to math block for skill/ strategy remediation. Use of manipulatives, exploration and an increased focus on problem solving will increase the depth of knowledge of math skills. Use of computer assisted programs. Each student will use for 15 minutes 3 times a week. Identify core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction and intervention within the 60 minute block	5B.1. Math Teacher, grade level team, Team Leaders, MTSS/ RTI team	5B.1. Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by grade level team, team leader and MTSS Team	5B.1. McGraw-Hill assessments, Performance Matters data Percent of students meeting grade level indicators.		

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

Mathematics Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percent of students making satisfactory progress in mathematics will increase by for each subgroup.						
	Asian 90% Black 21% Hispanic 56% White 68%	Asian 90% Black 44% Hispanic 71% White 78%				
		5B.2. Core math curriculum/ instruction does not provide the level of direct explicit instruction to improve math proficiency for all students.	5B.2. Small group differentiated instruction to focus on skills and strategies. Computer Assisted instruction. Remediation will include explicit small group instruction, skill/strategy remediation.	5B.2. Math instructors, Team Leader, MTSS/RTI team	5B.2. Focus of instruction/ intervention to be determined by a review of diagnostic assessment, Performance Matters, and McGraw Hill assessments. CBM probes given bi-weekly to monitor students' progress on identified skills. Results reviewed by grade level team, Team Leaders, MTSS/RTI team	5B.2. CBM Measures, Intervention Documentati on, Performance Matters reports, McGraw Hill assessments

| | | 5B.3. Many students performance in math is significantly below grade level expectations. | 5B.3

RTI/PS to develop Tier 3 intervention plan.

Measure student progress using CBM probes weekly. | 5B.3.

Math Teacher, Team Leader, MTSS/RTI Team. | 5B.3.

Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by teacher and grade level team. CBM probes to be administered weekly. | 5B.3.

McGraw-Hill assessments. CAI reports, Intervention Documentation, CBM data | |

| 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. Core math curriculum/ instruction does not provide the level of direct explicit instruction to improve math proficiency for all students	5C.1. Analysis of diagnostic and Performance Matters assessment results to identify deficit areas. Provide appropriate instruction/ intervention and more frequent progress monitoring (Tier 2 &3). Additional time added to math block for skill/ strategy remediation. Use of manipulatives, exploration and an increased focus on problem solving will increase the depth of knowledge of math skills. Use of	5C.1. Math instructors, Team Leader, MTSS/RTI team	5C.1. Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by grade level team, team leader and MTSS Team	5C.1. McGraw-Hill assessments, Performance Matters data Percent of students meeting grade level indicators.		

		computer assisted programs. Each student will use for 15 minutes 3 times a week. Identify core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction and intervention within the 60 minute block				
Mathematics Goal #5C: English Language Learners not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	41%(6)	*34%(5)*				

		5C.2. Core math curriculum/ instruction does not provide the level of direct explicit instruction to improve math proficiency for all students	5C.2. Small group differentiated instruction to focus on skills and strategies. Computer Assisted instruction. Remediation will include explicit small group instruction, skill/strategy remediation.	5C.2. Math instructors, Team Leader, MTSS/RTI team	5C.2. Focus of instruction/ intervention to be determined by a review of diagnostic assessment, Performance Matters, and McGraw Hill assessments. CBM probes given bi-weekly to monitor students' progress on identified skills. Results reviewed by grade level team, Team Leaders, MTSS/RTI team	5C.2. CBM Measures, Intervention Documentation, Performance Matters reports, McGraw Hill assessments
		5C.3. Many students performance in math is significantly below grade level expectations.	5C.3. RTI/PS to develop Tier 3 intervention plan. Measure student progress using CBM probes weekly	5C.3. Math instructors, Team Leader, MTSS/RTI team	5C.3. Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by teacher and grade level team. CBM probes to be administered weekly.	5C.3. McGraw-Hill assessments. CAI reports, Intervention Documentation, CBM data
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.

Core math curriculum/ instruction does not provide the level of direct explicit instruction to improve math proficiency for all students | 5D.1.

Analysis of diagnostic and Performance Matters assessment results to identify deficit areas.

Provide appropriate instruction/ intervention and more frequent progress monitoring (Tier 2 &3).

Additional time added to math block for skill/ strategy remediation.

Use of manipulatives, exploration and an increased focus on problem solving will increase the depth of knowledge of math skills.

Use of | 5D.1.

Math instructors,

Team Leader, MTSS/RTI team | 5D.1.

Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by grade level team, team leader and MTSS Team | 5D.1.

McGraw-Hill assessments, Performance Matters data

Percent of students meeting grade level indicators. | | |

	computer assisted programs. Each student will use for 15 minutes 3 times a week. Identify core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction and intervention within the 60 minute block					
Mathematics Goal #5D: Students with Disabilities not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 14%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	68%(15)	54%(12)				

		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2. Focus of instruction/ intervention to be determined by a review of diagnostic assessment, Performance Matters, and McGraw Hill assessments. CBM probes given bi-weekly to monitor students' progress on identified skills. Results reviewed by grade level team, Team Leaders, MTSS/RTI team	5D.2 Intervention Documentation, Performance Matters reports, McGraw Hill assessments	
		Core math curriculum/ instruction does not provide the level of direct explicit instruction to improve math proficiency for all students	Small group differentiated instruction to focus on skills and strategies. Computer Assisted instruction. Remediation will include explicit small group instruction, skill/strategy remediation.	Math instructors, Team Leader, MTSS/RTI team			
		5D.3. Many students performance in math is significantly below grade level expectations.	5D.3. RTI/PS to develop Tier 3 intervention plan. Measure student progress using CBM probes weekly	5D.3. Math instructors, Team Leader, MTSS/RTI team	5D.3. Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by teacher and grade level team. CBM probes to be administered weekly.	5D.3. McGraw-Hill assessments. CAI reports, Intervention Documentation, CBM data CBM Measures,	

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. Core math curriculum/ instruction does not provide the level of direct explicit instruction to improve math proficiency for all students.	5E.1. Use of manipulatives, exploration and an increased focus on problem solving will increase the depth of knowledge of math skills. Use of computer assisted programs; Each student will use for 15 minutes 3 times a week. Grades 3-5 will use The McGraw-Hill series and correlate to NGSSS. Identify core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction and intervention within the 60 minute block.	5E.1. Math Teacher, grade level team, Team Leaders, MTSS/RTI team	5E.1. Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by grade level team, team leader and MTSS Team	5E.1. McGraw-Hill assessments, Performance Matters data Percent of students meeting grade level indicators.		

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

Mathematics Goal #5E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percent of SES students making satisfactory progress in mathematics will increase by 5%.							
	45%(96)	50%(107)					

		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		Many students have skill deficits in one or more areas of math instruction.	Remediation to include explicit small group instruction, skill/strategy remediation. Analysis of diagnostic and Performance Matters assessment results to identify deficit areas. Provide appropriate instruction/intervention and more frequent progress monitoring (Tier 2 &3). Additional time added to math block for skill/ strategy remediation. Use of computer assisted programs. Each student will use for 15 minutes 5 times a week.	Math teacher Team Leader, MTSS/RTI team	Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by teacher and grade level team. CBM probes to be administered bi-weekly for targeted skills. Monitor fidelity and integrity of interventions being provided.	McGraw-Hill assessments. CAI reports, Intervention Documentation, CBM Probes	
		5E.3.	5E.3	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	
		Many students performance in math is significantly below grade level expectations.	RTI/PS to develop Tier 3 intervention plan. Measure student progress using CBM probes in identified deficit area weekly.	Math Teacher, Team Leader, MTSS/RTI Team.	Analysis of assessments to be reviewed by teacher and grade level team. CBM probes to be administered weekly.	McGraw-Hill assessments. CAI reports, Intervention Documentation, CBM data	

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
Common Core State Standards-Math	K-5	LCRT	All Teachers	Early Release Day	Classroom Observations, Progress Monitoring	Administration. LCRT

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
Singapore Math	Teacher Guides	School Budget	500.00
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

IXL	On-Line Tutorial	School Budget	2800.00
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
$3400.00 **Subtotal:**			
$3400.00 **Total:**			

End of Mathematics Goals

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		

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

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
	1 Continuity of instruction at all grade levels.	Review common assessment data to determine core instructional needs. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction/ interventions within the science block. Include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Provide opportunities for "hands-on" activities and science labs. Science PLC and grade-level teams will review results of common	Classroom Teacher, Team Leaders, MTSS/RTI team.	Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every six weeks to determine progress toward benchmarks. Common assessments tied to Florida Science Standards will be administered.	Performance Matters data Core Science assessment data		

		assessment data every six weeks to determine progress toward benchmarks. Common assessments tied to Florida Science Standards administered will be administered.				
Science Goal #1A: Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science will increase from 24% to 30%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	24% (27)	*30% (34)*				
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.

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

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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.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		

| **2A. FCAT 2.0:** **Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.** | 2A.1. Continuity of instruction at all grade levels. | 2A.1. Review common assessment data to determine core instructional needs. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction/ interventions within the science block. Include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Provide opportunities for "hands-on" activities and science labs. Science PLC and grade-level teams will review results of common | 2A.1. Classroom Teacher, Team Leaders, MTSS/RTI team. | 2A.1. Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every six weeks to determine progress toward benchmarks. Common assessments tied to Florida Science Standards will be administered. | 2A.1. Performance Matters data Core Science assessment data | | |

		assessment data every six weeks to determine progress toward benchmarks. Common assessments tied to Florida Science Standards administered will be administered.				
Science Goal #2A: Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science will increase from 16% to 20%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*				

	16% (18)	*20%(22)*					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percent of students scoring above a Level 7 in Science will remain above 50 NP.						
	100% (1)	67%(2)				
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
		3B.3. Student performance in Science is significantly below expected levels.	3B.3 Explicit individual, small group instruction using appropriate curriculum access points. Include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Provide opportunities for "hands-on" activities and science labs.	3B.3. ESE Teacher, IEP Team, MTSS/RTI Team.	3B.3. Teacher assessments/ observation .	3B.3. Assessments and observation of student performance.

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
Implementing Science into the Real World	K-5	LCRT, Science Teacher	All Teachers K-5	Early Release Day	Classroom observation, Collaboration Notes	Administration, LCRT, TL
Review Science Textbook Materials	K-5	District Science Teacher	All Teachers K-5	Pre-School	Classroom observation, Collaboration Notes	Administration, LCRT, TL

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
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
STEM Strategies	Consumable Materials	School Budget	500.00
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
$500.00 **Subtotal:**			
$500.00 **Total:**			

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1. Continuity of writing instruction at all grade levels.	1A.1. Students will use the writing process daily; district wide prompts administered 3 x a year. Writing resource teacher provides instruction/ modeling on a weekly basis in all fourth grade classrooms. Explicit small group instruction in area of identified need. Grade level teams will double score district wide prompts and discuss results.(K-5) Students (Gr. 4) complete prompts weekly and samples will be scored and reviewed	1A.1. . Writing Resource teacher/ grade level teams, MTSS/RTI Team	1A.1. Progress between the pre-test prompt, mid -year prompt and end of the year prompt. Writing prompts bi-weekly to be scored and reviewed with the student. Percent of students making adequate progress will be determined. Writing prompts monthly to be scored and reviewed with the student. Percent of students making adequate progress will be determined	1A.1. Scored writing samples will be used to determine progress in specific writing skills.		

		during student conference. Percent of students making adequate progress will be determined. Students (Gr.K, 1, 2, 3 & 5) complete monthly prompts to be scored and reviewed with the student. Percent of students making adequate progress will be determined. Students will work on identified writing processes and using process in completing writing prompt.					

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

Writing Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance					
Ninety percent (90%) or more of the fourth grade students will score a 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing assessment							

	95% (111)	90% (105)					

		1A.2. Many students have skill deficits in writing instruction.	1A.2. Explicit small group instruction in area of skill deficit. Small pull out-groups in addition to core services.	1A.2. Writing resource teacher/ grade level team.	1A.2. Writing prompts bi-weekly to be scored and reviewed with the student. Percent of students making adequate progress will be determined.	1A.2. Scored writing samples will be used to determine progress in specific writing skills.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.**							
Writing Goal #1B: The percent of students scoring at a 4 or higher in writing will remain 100%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	100% (4)	*100% (1)*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	

		1B.3. Student performance in writing is significantly below grade level expectations	1B.3. Explicit individual, small group instruction using appropriate curriculum access points. Include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.	1B.3. ESE Teacher, IEP Team, MTSS/RTI Team.	1B.3. Writing exercises/teacher observation	1B.3. Graded writing exercises/ teacher rubric	

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
Grading FCAT Writing	K-5	Reading Coach	All teachers in K-5	September	Individual Teacher Coaching	LCRT
Components of Writing	K-5	Writing Resource Teacher	All teachers in K-5	Pre-School/ER	Review of Writing Prompts/ Classroom Observations	LCRT/Writing Resource Teacher
Opinion Writing	K &1	Reading Coach	All teachers in K & 1	September/October	Review of Writing Prompts/ Classroom Observations	LCRT

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
Grading FCAT Writing	Rubrics-DVD	School	100.00
The Tererros Trick	Teacher Guide	School	200.00
$300.00 **Subtotal:**			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
$300.00 **Subtotal:**			
$300.00 **Total:**			

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance					

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

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		

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

1. Attendance	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	Students who have to rely on parents to bring them to school.	Students with excessive absences/ tardies will be identified by SARC. Parents/ guardians will be provided letters outlining attendance policies. Attendance policy shared with parents through newsletters, and posted on the school web page.	Classroom teachers, School Attendance Review Committee, Administration, PBIS Team.	Monthly review of attendance data. Monitor attendance of individual students with excessive tardies or absences.	Attendance data		

		Implement strategies to reinforce student attendance and punctuality.(PBIS Team)					
Attendance Goal #1: **Maintain or** **increase average student attendance of 95%.**	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	95%	*96%*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	194	*175*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					

	137	*123*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attending School and Learning	K-5	AP	Teachers k-5	Pre-school	Review Attendance Record	SARC, Registrar

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
Attendance Meeting with Parent	Alarm Clocks	School Budget	100.00
Subtotal:			
Technology			

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

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:			
$100.00 **Total:**			

End of Attendance Goals

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		

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

1. Suspension	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	Students who have not developed appropriate social skills for school success.	Identification of critical social skills to be taught to students. Development of social skill instructional calendar. PBIS team members will provide assistance to teachers in the implementation of social skills instruction and incentives for students meeting expectations. Implementation of school wide colored behavioral chart and daily report to parents.	Classroom teacher, PBIS Team, Administration	Observation, Review of behavioral data, RTI-B and Genesis reports	Infraction/Discipline reports. RTI-B / Genesis reports		

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

Suspension Goal #1: Decrease rate of out of school suspensions by 10%	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions 2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	0	0				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School				
	0	0				
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
	72	65				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School				
	29	26				

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		Students who have repeated behavioral difficulties.	PBS Team will use RTI/PST strategies to develop interventions for students with repeated behavioral difficulties. Provide training for staff on appropriate classroom management strategies Problem-solving to determine strategies to improve student behavior. Implementation of Tier 2 interventions.	Classroom teacher, PBIS Team, Administration, Guidance	Observation, Review of behavioral data, RTI-B and Genesis reports, Daily point notes, Intervention Documentation	Infraction/Discipline reports. RTI-B /Genesis reports, Intervention Documentation	
		1.3. Students who exhibit severe behavioral difficulties	1.3. RTI/PST to identify Tier 3 interventions for selected students.	1.3 MTSS/RTI Team	1.3. Intervention documentation weekly. Effectiveness of intervention to be determined by plan developed by RTI/ PST team.	1.3. RTI/PST develops evaluation criteria on an individual basis	

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
Code of Student Conduct	K-5	Principal/AP	School Staff	Pre-School	Referrals	Assistant Principal/PBiS 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
Daily 5	Classroom materials	School Budget	$500.00
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PBiS	Teacher Guides	School Budget	$100.00
Social Skills	Textbook	School Budget	$500.00
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Quarterly Events	Rewards	School Budget	$1000.00
$2100.00 Subtotal:			
$2100.00 Total:			

End of Suspension Goals

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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	Time of function and availability of parents	Schedule programs/ functions at flexible dates and times. Provide information of parent activities in newsletters, school website, automated phone system, and social networking site. Teachers or staff will contact parents to invite/ encourage involvement in their child's education.	Administration, Parent Involvement Committee	Parent attendance review	Parent Attendance Logs, Volunteer lists, Volunteer hours Parent attendance review		

Parent Involvement Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*				
Provide opportunities for all Sun 'n Lake parents to attend and participate in school functions and activities.						
	93%	94%				
		1.2. Parents have a language barrier.	1.2. Provide translators at school functions. Provide flyers, newsletter and information in native language of student.	1.2. ESOL Para Assistant Principal	1.2. Parent attendance log review	1.2. Parent Attendance Logs
		1.3. SES students/ parents are not aware of parent involvement opportunities.	1.3. Send home flyers; include information in monthly newsletters Teachers or staff will contact parents to invite/encourage involvement in their child's education.	1.3. Parent Involvement Committee	1.3 Parent attendance log review	1.3. Parent Attendance Logs

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

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
Curriculum Night	Materials	School Budget	$100.00
School Plays	Copyright materials	School Budget	$500.00
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
IXL	Math Practice	School Budget	$2800.00
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
$3400.00 Total:			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	$7500.00 Total:
CELLA Budget	
	Total:
Mathematics Budget	
	$3400.00 Total:
Science Budget	
	$500.00 Total:
Writing Budget	
	$300.00 Total:
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	$100.00 Total:
Suspension Budget	
	$2100.00 Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	

$3400.00	**Total:**
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:
$17300.00	**Grand Total:**

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
Priority	Focus	Prevent

Are you reward school? Yes   □No
(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

□ Yes   No

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

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

The SAC will develop a school wide needs assessment, analyze the results and offer input to meet stakeholder needs. SAC members assist will the development and approval of the SIP and PIP. In addition, they help identify the goals of the school to maintain the school Vision. They monitor school and student progress and evaluate appropriate strategies to measure student performance.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount

[Type a quote from the document or the summary of an interesting point. You can position the text box anywhere in the document. Use the Text Box Tools tab to change the formatting of the pull quote text box.]