

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

Name of School:

Area:

Area 1

Christa McAuliffe

Principal:

Area Superintendent:

Dr. Mark Mullins

Carol Roddenberry

SAC Chairperson:

Michelle Braun

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

The Christa McAuliffe Elementary Community will empower students by challenging them to achieve their personal best in all areas of education and to utilize McAuliffe Life Skills to become life long learners. Each morning our students recite the Christa McAuliffe Pledge: "I believe in me, I will do my best each day. I believe that if I work hard I will succeed. I can learn. I will learn. I am worth it."

Vision Statement:

Our vision for the Christa McAuliffe Elementary community is to attain excellence by encouraging responsible, independent, life long learners.

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

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

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

Christa McAuliffe Elementary School has earned an A for the past 10 years until this year when it dropped to a B. However, with the changing of the percentage of students needing to earn a level three or above increasing each year we have not earned AYP status. Last year the subgroups (Total, Blacks, Hispanic, Economic Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities) did not meet the learning gains needed to earn a yes in these cells for reading or math. This year, due to the changes in calculating school grades and measuring performance on the FCAT, our student FCAT scores and school grade have decreased.

In analyzing the INDV report, possible factors contributing to this fact could be the large group of students new to our school due to the boundary changes and Charter school closings, the changes in the FCAT test scoring, and the increase in the percent of students who need to earn a level 3 or above to earn a “yes” in the cells for AYP.

Our school’s demographics have changed considerably in the past 3 years. Our minority rate and free and reduced rates have increased. After attending Dr. Max Thompson’s training this summer our team has realized that we need to reevaluate our instructional strategies to ensure we are meeting the needs of all of our student s on a consistent and pervasive basis. Dr. Thompson’s research shows that the higher the percentage of free and reduced students the fewer instructional options we have to reach maximum student achievement levels.

FCAT, FAIR, and District assessment data for the past three years indicates that we need to change our instructional strategies to those that are proven to be most effective through research. Over the past three years we have provided professional development for B.E.S.T., differentiated instruction and Thinking Maps. Last year we began our book studies on Marzano’s “Classroom Strategies That Work” and Doug Lemov’s, “Teach Like a Champion”. Last year’s walk though data indicated that not all teachers were using these strategies across all content areas. During preplanning our teachers took a survey indicating their level of comfort/knowledge of these strategies. The qualitative data from our teachers’ survey indicates that 64% of our teachers are comfortable with summarizing and 67% are comfortable with Thinking Maps. This year our goal is to insure that these strategies are being used with fidelity in every classroom and across all the curriculum content areas. These strategies will be “look fors” during classroom walk throughs and classroom observations. With the change from NGSSS to CCSS now is the optimal time for implementation. Our expectation is that the use of these strategies as we move into the implementation of the Common Core State Standards will raise our student achievement levels in all curriculum areas. Teachers will follow the District and state timeline and administer assessments for reading, math, science, writing and social studies. Weekly formative assessments will also be given to all students to accurately monitor student progress. Data from all assessments will indicate achievement toward our goal of student achievement.

Grade 3 increased in math on the 2010-11 math test by 3% from 85% to 88%. On the 2009-10 math test they went up by 12%. They went from 74% to 86%. However, in 2008 - 09 they went down 10% from 84% – 74%. 4th grade has remained steady at 74% for the past three years until 2010-11 when the percentage increased to 78%. Fifth grade is our concern overall in math. They remain our lowest grade level. Their math FCAT scores this year were 56% down from 60% in 2009 – 2010, 65% in 2008-2009, 64% in 2007 – 2008 and 53% in 2006 – 2007. 6th grade had a 6% increase in 2009-2010 but declined 2% in 2010-11. They went from a 72% to 70%. In 2008-2009 they had 66%, in 2007-2008 they had 64% and in 2006-2007 they had 57%. It is difficult to compare this year’s FCAT scores to past years due to the changes in the scoring process. However, there was a decline in the 2011-12 scores:

Grade level data		2010 – 2011 (FCAT)	2011 – 2012 (FCAT)
Third grade	Reading	74%	71%

4 th grade	Math	88%	69%
	Reading	74%	55%
	Math	78%	61%
5 th grade	Writing	95% (school grade)	67%
		88% (AYP%)	
	Reading	70%	55%
	Math	56%	48%
	Science	71% (School grade)	57%
6 th grade		58% (AYP)	
	Reading	73%	64%
	Math	70%	64%

Grade %)	2010 – 2011 (AYP%)	2010-11 (School Grade %)	2011- 2012 (School
% meeting High Standards in Reading	74%	84%	63%
% meeting High Standards Math	73%	83%	61%
S% meeting High Standards Writing	88%	95%	67%
% meeting High Standards Science	58%	71%	57%
% % making Reading Gains	66%	66%	67%
% making Math Gains	70%	70%	70%
% of lowest 25% Making Learning gains in Reading	58%	61%	65%
% of lowest 25% Making Learning gains in Math	57%	62%	65%

As part of our implementation plan for CCSS, we will incorporate the nine research-based strategies from Classroom Instruction that Works by Robert Marzano. Through Marzano training, the work of William Sanders is cited as establishing the clear implication of the critical difference an effective classroom teacher can make with any level student. With this research in mind, Christa McAuliffe will be focusing on ensuring that our teachers are including those effective strategies during planning for student achievements as well as executing the strategies within the classroom. Using these strategies set out by Marzano will guide classroom practice and maximize the possibility of enhancing student achievement. Following the 49 techniques presented in Doug Lemov's Teach Like a Champion will ensure that teachers are using the most effective teaching strategies for the delivery of curriculum.

5th grade science scores have remained about the same for the past three years. This year 57% of our students scored a level 3 or above (school Grade) Last year Students scoring level 3 or higher was 58% (AYP) 71% (school grade) on the 2010-11 FCAT and 59% in 2009-10. In 2008-2009 the score was 54%. In 2007 – 2008, 56% met high standards, and in 2006-2007 45% of our students met high standards. Our main areas of concern are Life and Environmental Sciences and Scientific Thinking.

Only 67% of our students scored level 3 and above on the 2011 – 2012 FCAT Writing test due to the changes in the scoring. 95% of our students scored level 4 or higher on the 2010-11 FCAT Writing test up 7% from the year before. 67% scored a 4 or higher in 2009-2010 compared to 79% in 2008-2009 and 73% in 2007-2008.

Reading had been our strongest area over the past three years however the test data from 2010-11 shows a decline across all subgroups and grade levels. This year's FCAT data shows 63% of all curriculum students scored level 3 or above. The data last year indicated 84% of our students met high standards in reading down from 91 % in 2009-10 and in 2008-2009. It was below 86% in 2007-2008. The scores from the other School Grades data were based on only the standard curriculum students and did not include the scores of ESE and ELL students.

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

We currently teach the district core curriculum. We individualize instruction in reading groups by providing small group strategy-based instruction. We individualize instruction in reading, math, and other subject areas as identified by the needs of students in each grade level by providing evidence-based intervention, enrichment or additional practice as needed during SMART Time. SMART Time is a 30-40 minute block of instructional time outside of the 90-minute reading block. Each grade level is assigned a designated SMART Time.

The teachers at McAuliffe work collaboratively using teacher editions, pacing guides and other support materials to plan for daily instruction. Grade level PLC meetings allow teachers time to collaborate. McAuliffe started RTI meetings three years ago and teachers have learned to compare students' data from their classrooms to those of their peers at school, within district, or state-wide. Through the RTI meetings teachers have learned to differentiate instruction, locate applicable resources, implement appropriate strategies and progress monitor at appropriate intervals. Our goal is to have teachers implement research and evidence based instructional strategies consistently and pervasively across all content areas:, Summarization strategies and graphic organizers across all grade levels in all curriculum areas. Having weekly PLC meetings, additional planning on shortened days once a month and having vertical team planning after school once a week will provide necessary time for professional discourse and collaboration.

Continued discussions on Marzano's "Classroom Strategies that Work" and Lemov's "Teach Like a Champion" will be ongoing . Information from Dr. Max Thompson's book "Moving Schools: Lessons From Exemplary Leaders", will be discussed during PLCs and tied in with the other strategies. Classroom observations and walkthroughs will ensure that these strategies are being used throughout all grade levels to implement the CCSS in grade K-2 and to transition from NGSSS to CCSS in 3rd – 6th.

Administrators will actively be involved in working with teachers to develop and implement their PGPs which will be based on data from FCAT,FAIR, and district tests that is available in A3. They will study the data from the Instructor reports and Student reports to determine their area of focus. Teachers will then reflect on their personal/professional understanding of the above mentioned strategies to determine which practices/strategies will be their focus for the goal of improving student achievement. This will be reflected in the PGP.

Our focus is to move our student achievement forward using research based teaching strategies. This year our school administrator's and teacher leader's "look fors" will be the consistent and pervasive use of those strategies across all content areas in the classrooms. These strategies are: Summarizing and Advance Organizers, including Thinking Maps. The use of these teaching strategies will also help teachers and students bridge the gap as we move from the NGSSS to CCSS.

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

One of the most significant factors that impacts student achievement is that teachers commit to implementing a guaranteed and viable curriculum to ensure no matter who teaches a given class, the curriculum will address certain essential content. For learning to be effective, clear targets in terms of information and skills must be established. (Marzano, 2003).

Research has shown (McREL study) that there are nine categories of instructional strategies that affect student achievement. These categories are identifying similarities and differences; summarizing and note taking; reinforcing effort and providing recognition; homework and practice; nonlinguistic representations; cooperative learning; setting objectives and providing feedback; generating and testing hypotheses; and questions, cues, and advance organizers (Marzano, 1998). “The use of formative assessments, or other diagnostic efforts within classrooms, provides information that should help facilitate improved pedagogical practices and instructional outcomes” (Karee E. Dunn & Sean W. Mulvenon, 2009). By utilizing formative assessments and higher level questioning, students will gain the foundation knowledge to be successful in the 21st century workplace.

Marzano has organized academic goals into one single category “challenging goals and effective feedback”. Our goal is to assist teachers in utilizing teaching methods, providing learning experiences and materials that will facilitate enduring understanding. Research proves that designing and using "good" questions should be part of the instructional repertoire.

Max Thompson’s Learning Concepts, Inc. is dedicated to promoting comprehensive, continual school improvement and increasing achievement for all students (Thompson & Thompson, 2000). The acceptance of this statement by school leaders has created a groundswell of support of the strategies that appear to have an extended life past what might be termed an educational fad. His research shows that the evidence based strategies promote student achievement. These include: Extended Thinking Strategies, Summarizing, Vocabulary in Context, Advance Organizers and Non-Verbal Representations.

For the past several years we have provided professional development on differentiated instruction, and Thinking Maps. Last year we did book studies on Marzano’s, “ Classroom Instruction that Works” , Doug Lemov’s, “Teach Like a Champion”, B.E.S.T. and provided professional development on differentiated instruction. This summer the leadership team and I attended Max Thompson’s overview of focus learning schools. Max Thompson ‘s implementation of these research based strategies provided based strategies for increasing student achievement. This year our focus will be insuring teachers are implementing these best practices, especially summarizing and Thinking Maps, in the classroom across all curriculum content areas.

The new Instructional Appraisal System will be discussed and analyzed to align with teachers’ growth and overall student achievement. After teachers have been given the opportunity to reflect on past and current instructional practices, individual teacher conferences for PGP’s will be held with administrators and teacher leaders to discuss what they see as instructional strengths and weaknesses through the analysis of data (A3, FAIR, FCAT, district assessments, etc.). The PGPs will be aligned with our School Improvement Plan.

CONTENT AREA:

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

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

All teachers at Christa McAuliffe Elementary will use Summarizing and Advance Organizers, including Thinking Maps, to improve student achievement in all content areas.

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

<i>Barrier</i>	<i>Action Steps</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Timetable</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>In-Process Measure</i>
1. Teacher buy in	1. Build team relationships by continuing PLCs to promote collaboration among team members as we focus on implementing summarization and Thinking Maps across all content areas.	Principal Literacy Coach Math Coach AP	August – May 2012-2013		Administrative observations Administrative walk-throughs Peer observations

2. Lack of full implementation	2. Implement with fidelity strategies from <u>Classroom Instruction that Works</u> by Robert Marzano, <u>Teach Like a Champion</u> by Doug Lemov, and <u>Moving School: Lessons from Exemplary Leaders</u> , by Max Thompson, and BEST trainings, which tie into the highly effective teaching practices needed to implement CCSS and NGSSS. Our main focus will be on Thinking Maps and summarization Throughout the school and curriculum areas this year.	All instructional staff	August 2012 – May 2013		Administrative observations Administrative walk- throughs Peer observations
3. Lack of consistency	3. Provide SMART Time instruction, including the use of summarization and Thinking Maps, with fidelity to provide differentiated enrichment and intervention instruction for all students K-6th	All instructional staff	August 2012 – May 2013		Teacher observations and classroom walk throughs
4. Lack of knowledge of Response to Intervention resources/ strategies.	4. Conduct bi-monthly K-6 th MTSS meetings to discuss and document student progress and response to interventions.	Guidance counselor Classroom teachers Principal Reading and Math Coaches AP	August 2012 – May 2013		Meeting notes

5. Lack of knowledge of Response Intervention resources/strategies.	5. Conduct K-6 th Individual Problem Solving Team (IPST) meetings as needed to refer students who have received interventions but are not making adequate progress for further evaluation.	IPST Team	August 2012 – May 2013		Meeting notes Referral paperwork SMART time data IPST and MTSS notes
6. Lack of consistency	6. Discuss grade level formative assessments in grade level PLCs to ensure consistency across each grade level and to modify assessments to test higher order thinking skills as required by CCSS.	All teachers Principal Leadership team Launch teams AP Literacy coach Title 1 math and science teacher	August 2012 – May 2013		Classroom walk throughs Teacher observations PLC meeting notes

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

Teacher surveys will be developed and distributed assessing teacher’ working knowledge of the Evidence Based Strategies. (pre, midyear and post surveys).

B.E.S.T. strategies as well as strategies from Robert Marzano’s Classroom Instruction That Works, Doug Lemov’s Teach Like a Champion and Dr. Max Thompson’s Moving Schools: Lessons from Exemplary Leaders will be the “Look Fors” during administrative walk throughs. By May it is expected that all teachers will be using these strategies consistently and pervasively across the curriculum. Thinking Maps and summarization will be specific look fors during classroom walk throughs, and in teachers’ PGP’s.

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

Scores on all state and district tests: FAIR, FCAT 2.0, District tests for math, science and social, DA math, reading, science and social studies data, district Writing assessments, social studies district tests, DRLA, grade level's formative tests, will improve due to teachers consistently and pervasively using our evidence based strategies, Thinking Maps and Summarization, across the curriculum.

Students who score level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 will increase by at least 8% in reading and 6% in math. Students who make learning gains will also increase by 8% in all areas and in all subgroups.

Walk through data will indicate that teachers are using evidence based strategies based on student work displayed and greater student engagement.

Teachers will bring student work samples to PLC meetings as proof that evidence based strategies are being used.

PGP outcomes measures will indicate an increase in student achievement due to evidence based strategies being used across the curriculum.

Will have Model Classrooms for Thinking Maps.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

1.	Reading Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)
	Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. Assuring that all teachers are using Thinking Maps and Summarization strategies across all content areas (Marzano and Max Thompson)		
	Strategy(s): 1. Summarizing and Advanced organizers (Thinking Maps) will be used across all curriculum areas (Marzano and Max Thompson)		

<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3</p> <p>Barrier(s): lack of implementation of these strategies in all grade levels</p> <p>Strategy(s): Insure that all teachers are using Thinking Maps and Summarization strategies across all content areas (Marzano and Max Thompson) by requesting teachers to bring student work samples, lesson plans and through observing these actions during classroom walk throughs.</p>	29% (127)	34% (148)
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): We have not tested any students with FAA</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>	NA	NA
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): Lack of consistency in teachers' use of Summarizing and Thinking Maps across all content areas (Marzano and Max Thompson)</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1. Insure that all teachers are using the research and evidence based strategies across all content areas (Marzano and Max Thompson) by requesting teachers to bring student work samples, lesson plans and through observing these actions during classroom walk throughs.</p>	31% (135)	36% (157)
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>	NA	NA
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>	NA	NA

<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): . Lack of consistency in teachers' use of Summarizing and Thinking Maps across all content areas (Marzano and Max Thompson)</p> <p>Strategy(s): Insure that all teachers are using the research and evidence based strategies across all content areas (Marzano and Max Thompson) by requesting teachers to bring student work samples, lesson plans and through observing these actions during classroom walk throughs.</p> <p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>65% (53)</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>70% (57)</p> <p>NA</p>
<p>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</p> <p>Baseline data 2010-11:</p>		
<p>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :</p> <p style="text-align: right;">White:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Black:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Hispanic:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Asian:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">American Indian:</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for current level of performance</p> <p>Total 217 35% (76)</p> <p>Total 93 56% (52)</p> <p>Total 90 36% (32)</p> <p>Total 5 20% (1)</p> <p>Total 2 50% (1)</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance</p> <p>25% (54)</p> <p>46% (43)</p> <p>26% (23)</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): Lack of language acquisition</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Teach students to use language dictionaries Attend SIT lab Small group instruction by the ESOL teacher and ESOL Assistants</p>	<p>33 students 45% (15)</p>	<p>35% (12)</p>

Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Effective teaching strategies not being practiced with fidelity in the classrooms Strategy(s): 1 Insure all teachers are using the evidenced based teaching strategies	102 students 63% (64)	53% (54)
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): . Lack of consistency in teachers' use of Summarizing and Thinking Maps across all content areas (Marzano and Max Thompson) Strategy(s): 1. Insure all teachers are using the evidence based teaching strategies with students	298 students 48% (143)	38% (113)

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Review of the Reading Strategies (Marzano, Lemov, Thompson) How to raise student learning across the curriculum Writing, Reading, Math Social Studies and Science	8/3/12 Overview	PLC meetings 8/14/12 Year long plans 8/21/12 PGP – Focus on the evidence based strategies Graphic Organizers and Summarization 9/4/12 – Sharing samples of students work using the strategies on going once a month
Focus Learning Schools (Max Thompson)	November 8 and 9 th , 2012	Our Leadership team will attend the two day training on Learning Focus schools as a follow up to last summers training. The information we learn will be shared with all McAuliffe teachers during PLC meetings
A primary and intermediate teacher will be sent to Thinking Maps training	November 3, 2012	Our school has Thinking Map trainers who will train our staff on the information they learn.

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/ Speaking: Kindergarten- 43% 68% 1 st – 56% 2 nd – 100% 3 rd - 0% 4 th – 50% 5 th – 80% 6 th – 60%	Difficulty with Scheduling	Schedule students to work with an ESOL assistant or ESOL teacher during the school day SIT Lab	ESOL Assistants, ESOL teacher SIT lab teacher

<p>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: kindergarten – 14% 57%</p> <p>1st – 56% 2nd – 92% 3rd – 0% 4th – 50% 5th – 80% 6th – 20%</p>	<p>Difficulty with scheduling</p>	<p>Have students work on the “Learning Today” Computer program Work in small groups with ESOL teacher and assistants SIT Lab</p>	<p>ESOL Assistants ESOL teacher Classroom teachers Sit lab teacher</p>
<p>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing: Kindergarten – 0% 45%</p> <p>1st – 44% 2nd – 58% 3rd – 0% 4th – 50% 5th - 60% 6th – 60%</p>	<p>Difficulty with Scheduling</p>	<p>Have students attend the SIT reading lab to learn English and to help learn reading, listening, writing and speaking skills Small group instruction with ESOL teacher and assistants</p>	<p>SIT lab teacher ESOL Teacher and assistants</p>

<p>1. Mathematics Goal(s):</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</p>
<p>Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. Lack of consistency in teachers’ use of Summarizing and Thinking Maps across all content areas (Marzano and Max Thompson)</p>		
<p>Strategy(s): 1. Insure that all teachers are using the research and evidence based strategies across all content areas (Marzano and Max Thompson) by requesting teachers to bring student work samples, lesson plans and through observing these actions during classroom walk throughs.</p>		

<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s): lack of implementation of these strategies in all grade levels</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Insure that all teachers are using the research and evidence based strategies across all content areas (Marzano and Max Thompson) by requesting teachers to bring student work samples, lesson plans and through observing these actions during classroom walk throughs.</p>	<p>31% (135)</p>	<p>41% (178)</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics Barrier(s): We did not have anyone tested with FAA</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics Barrier(s): lack of implementation of these strategies in all grade levels</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Insure that all teachers are using the research and evidence based strategies across all content areas (Marzano and Max Thompson) by requesting teachers to bring student work samples, lesson plans and through observing these actions during classroom walk throughs.</p>	<p>29% (128)</p>	<p>34% (149)</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics Barrier(s): We did not test any students with the FAA</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>

<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): lack of implementation of these strategies in all grade levels</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. . Insure that all teachers are using the research and evidence based strategies across all content areas (Marzano and Max Thompson) by requesting teachers to bring student work samples, lesson plans and through observing these actions during classroom walk throughs.</p>	<p>65% (55)</p>	<p>70%(60)</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Currently we do not any students being tested using the FAA test</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</p> <p>Baseline Data 2010-11:</p>	<p>10%</p>	<p>10%</p>
<p>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in math:</p>	<p>White: Total 219 35% (76)</p> <p>Black: Total 93 63% (59)</p> <p>Hispanic: Total 91 30% (27)</p> <p>Asian: Total 5 20% (1)</p> <p>American Indian: Total 2 50% (1)</p>	<p>25% (55)</p> <p>53% (49)</p> <p>20% (18)</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics</p>	<p>Total 33 42% (14)</p>	<p>32% (11)</p>
<p>Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics</p>	<p>Total 104 68% (72)</p>	<p>59% (61)</p>
<p>Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics</p>	<p>Total 301 46% (138)</p>	<p>36% (108)</p>

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Review of the Evidence Based Strategies (Marzano, Lemov, Thompson) How to raise student learning across the curriculum Writing, Reading, Math Social Studies and Science	8/3/12 Overview	PLC meetings 8/14/12 Year long plans 8/21/12 PGP – Focus on the evidence based strategies (Graphic Organizers and Summarization) 9/4/12 – Sharing samples of students work using the strategies on going once a month for the school year
A primary and intermediate teacher will be sent to Thinking Maps training	November 3,2012	Our school has Thinking Map trainers who will train our staff on the information they learn.

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
<p>Barrier(s): lack of teachers' implementation of these strategies in all grade levels</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. . Insure that all teachers are using the research and evidence based strategies across all content areas (Marzano and Max Thompson) by requesting teachers to bring student work samples, lesson plans and through observing these actions during classroom walk throughs.</p> <p>Schedule training on Writing during the October Professional Development Day.</p>		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	67% (69)	77% (79)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	NA	NA

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): lack of teachers' implementation of these strategies in all grade levels Strategy(s): Insure that all teachers are using the research and evidence based strategies across all content areas (Marzano and Max Thompson) by requesting teachers to bring student work samples, lesson plans and through observing these actions during classroom walk throughs.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:	57% (64)	62% (69)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	NA	NA
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	15% (17)	20% (22)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading	NA	NA

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Regular meetings of new teachers with principal	Principal	Ongoing
2. Partner new teachers with veteran mentor teachers	Principal and Assistant Principal	Ongoing

3. Place junior and senior UCF interns in classrooms with teachers who are CET certified	Principal, UCF coordinator	Ongoing
4. Provide quality professional development	Principal, Reading Coach, Math/ Science Coach, Assistant Principal	Ongoing

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are not highly effective.

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

Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly effective	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
none	

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

<p>MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and its role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)</p> <p>The MTSS leadership team consists of the principal, guidance counselors, school psychologist, staffing specialist, reading coach, and classroom teachers. The MTSS Leadership Team meets one time per month, with additional meetings added as necessary. The primary focus of the meetings: How do we develop and maintain a problem solving system to bring out the best in our school, our teachers, and ultimately our students? The team reviews data to help make instructional decisions and identifies professional development needs based on commonalities in data. The team works collaboratively to problem solve, share best practices, evaluate implementation, and make decisions. The team shares information with other staff members during faculty and/or professional learning communities.</p>
<p>PARENT INVOLVEMENT:</p> <p>396 parents responded to the District Title 1 Parent Survey in 2011-12 compared to 133 the previous year. We will continue to increase the number of responses by doing the following Distribute paper copies of the District title 1 Parent Survey to all parents. Have a copy of our school’s Parent Involvement Plan in the office. See uploaded PIP on our school web site.</p>

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

Our attendance rate for the 2011-2012 school year was 96.19%, up from the 2010-2011 school year which was 95.91% (an increase of almost 1%). Our office clerk monitors attendance reports on AS400 every 20 days, focusing on students with 5 or more unexcused absences so we can send letters to parents. The Synervoice program is used to call parents of students who are absent to ensure parents are aware of the absence. The district's attendance policy is reviewed at the beginning of the school year, during open house, and is posted on our school website to inform parents. The truancy officer is notified when students are absent more than 7 days. The principal holds an attendance hearing with parents of students who have missed more than 9 days to complete the attendance appeal packet. Perfect attendance certificates are awarded each semester to promote the importance of school attendance.

SUSPENSION:

There were 20 Students who received out of school suspensions (not including bus suspensions). Four of those students were suspended 5 times or less. During the 2011-12 school year one 6th grade student was sent to the Alternative site. The number of school and bus suspensions has increased this year. Last year we had 10 out of school suspensions. Our student population has changed over the past 3 years due to boundary changes and charter school closings. We are implementing the following changes to reduce our suspensions:

Reward students with Bucket Filler Awards to increase positive behaviors.

Provide students with additional guidance lessons during specials in K-2nd grade and 6th grade to promote good decision making

Continue peer mediation to teach students how to resolve conflicts

Teachers will utilize Love and Logic strategies to reduce student misbehaviors

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

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