FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

DRAFT 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: Round Lake Elementary	District Name: Lake County
Principal: Mrs. Linda Bartberger	Superintendent: Dr. Susan Moxley
SAC Chair: Mrs. Angela Bundz	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Mrs. Linda Bartberger	Masters Degree in Educational Leadership from UCF	8	8	2011-2012 Round Lake Elementary Grade: A; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 68%; Math Mastery: 58%; Writing Mastery: 82% AMO target *met* in Reading by Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. AMO target *met* in Math by Hispanic and English Language Learner subgroups. 2010-2011 Round Lake Elementary Grade: A; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 67%; Math Mastery: 57%; Writing Mastery: 78% (updated cut scores) AYP not made in Reading by Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. 2009-2010 Round Lake Elementary Grade: B; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 78%; Math Mastery: 77%; Writing Mastery: 82% AYP not made in Reading and Math by the Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. 2008-2009 Round Lake Elementary Grade: A; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 82%; Math Mastery: 81%; Writing Mastery: 93% AYP not made in Math in the Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. 2007-2008 Round Lake Elementary Grade: A; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 84%; Math Mastery: 82%; Writing Mastery: 83% AYP not made in Writing 2006-2007 Round Lake Elementary Grade: A; AYP: Yes; Reading Mastery: 81%; Math Mastery: 78%; Writing Mastery: 95% 2005-2006 Round Lake Elementary Grade: A; AYP: Yes; Reading Mastery: 82%; Math Mastery: 77%; Writing Mastery: 96%

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

Assistant Principal	Mr. Todd Roman	Masters in Educational Leadership from National Louis University	5	4	2011-2012 Round Lake Elementary Grade: A; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 68%; Math Mastery: 58%; Writing Mastery: 82% AMO target *met* in Reading by Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. AMO target *met* in Math by Hispanic and English Language Learner subgroups. 2010-2011 Round Lake Elementary Grade: A; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 67%; Math Mastery: 57%; Writing Mastery: 78% (updated cut scores) AYP not made in Reading by Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. 2009-2010 Round Lake Elementary Grade: B; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 78%; Math Mastery: 77%; Writing Mastery: 82% AYP not made in Reading and Math by the Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. 2008-2009 Round Lake Elementary Grade: A; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 82%; Math Mastery: 81%; Writing Mastery: 93% AYP not made in Math in the Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. 2007-2008 Round Lake Elementary Grade: A; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 84%; Math Mastery: 82%; Writing Mastery: 83% AYP not made in Writing

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Literacy	Dr. Leslie Rivers	Doctorate in Educational Leadership from Nova Masters in Reading from UCF	8	5	2011-2012 Round Lake Elementary Grade: A; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 68%; Math Mastery: 58%; Writing Mastery: 82% AMO target *met* in Reading by Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. AMO target *met* in Math by Hispanic and English Language Learner subgroups. 2010-2011 Round Lake Elementary Grade: A; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 67%; Math Mastery: 57%; Writing Mastery: 78% (updated cut scores) AYP not made in Reading by Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. 2009-2010 Round Lake Elementary Grade: B; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 78%; Math Mastery: 77%; Writing Mastery: 82% AYP not made in Reading and Math by the Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. 2008-2009 Round Lake Elementary Grade: A; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 82%; Math Mastery: 81%; Writing Mastery: 93% AYP not made in Math in the Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. 2007-2008 Round Lake Elementary Grade: A; AYP: No; Reading Mastery: 84%; Math Mastery: 82%; Writing Mastery: 83% AYP not made in Writing

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. We utilize a team interview approach by the grade level in which the opening exists.	Assistant Principal, Grade Chairs, Team Members	ongoing
2. New teachers are partnered with an on-campus veteran mentor.	Assistant Principal	ongoing
3.		
4.		

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
3	They are working towards becoming ESOL certified by taking the appropriate coursework.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
61	1%	18%	49%	32%	34%	95%	8%	3%	95%

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
Naomi Roman	Tiffany Carter	Naomi is the K classroom teacher working with Tiffany as the inclusion teacher	Regular and impromptu meeting dates
Amy Raczkowski	Emily Hall-Judkins	Amy is the Team Leader for first grade	Regular and impromptu meeting dates

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Administration – Todd Roman, AP: Provides a clear understanding of and support for the RtI process and its implementation to the staff. Ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation.

Classroom Teachers: Provide information about core instruction, deliver all Tiers of instruction/intervention, collaborate with fellow teachers and members of the RtI team to implement Tier 2 and 3 interventions, and collect student data.

Literacy Coach and CRT – Leslie Rivers and Michelle Chevalier: Assist with school screening programs that identify children who may be considered "at risk." Meet with teachers to plan instruction and interventions in the areas of reading, math, and language arts. Assist in the design and implementation of progress monitoring data collection and data analysis. Participate in the design and delivery of professional development, as needed.

Guidance counselors – Cathy Hatcher and Carol Timmons: Meet with teachers to plan instruction and interventions for behavior. Facilitate development of intervention plans. Provide support for intervention fidelity and documentation. Schedule all meetings.

Student Services Personnel: Advises and provides expertise on all RTI issues.

ESE Specialist – Shannon Cilio: Facilitates placement of students qualified for ESE.

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 RtI Team meets at the beginning of the school year to revisit the status of those students already in the RtI process. When teachers would like to refer students to the RtI process, they fill out an RtI request form. The RtI team then meets at a scheduled time to discuss the student's needs, review data to determine if instruction adaptations or interventions are needed, plan the intervention(s), and set up electronic data collection tool(s). RtI meetings are scheduled weekly. Following at least six-twelve weeks of intervention, if student improvement has not been demonstrated, guidance counselors will schedule a follow-up meeting and the process will continue.

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

Members of the RtI Leadership Team provide input into the academic and anti-bullying goals and interventions described in the School Improvement Plan. The team will also work together to implement any needed changes as indicated by ongoing progress monitoring, to ensure that the aligned tiered processes are in place.

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.

Once a teacher has referred a student for RtI with the guidance office, he/she meets with the RtI team at a scheduled time and date. At this meeting, the student's needs, academic and/or behavioral, are discussed, as well as his/her educational history and baseline data. Data sources include results from: classroom tests and observations, benchmark test, FCAT, and Literacy First. The RtI team members assist the classroom teacher in planning intervention and progress monitoring activities and setting up the electronic forms to gather data. After baseline data has been examined, an aligned intervention is implemented and observed for no less than six weeks. Should the intervention not be successful, the team will reconvene to develop a more tailored and intensive intervention. These meetings will continue, and interventions integrated until one is found to best meet the child's needs.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The RtI team will meet with grade levels during the first two weeks of school to review the policies and procedures of RtI. During subsequent RtI meetings regarding specific students, the RtI team members will be able to answer questions and provide more specific information to the teachers. In the past year, we have been able to assist some teachers with multiple RtI students. These teachers have been a great assistance to their team members who may have additional questions or concerns about the RtI process. Training and support will also be provided by district staff.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.
The structure of the MTSS system at RLE is designed to provide support to teachers and students throughout the intervention process. The Guidance Counselors, Literacy Coach, and ELL Contact/CRT also bring students to the attention of the team based on the additional data to which they have access. Because the team meets weekly, there is a constant conversation about the needs of students/teachers in MTSS.

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
Leslie Rivers, Literacy Coach ; Michelle Chevalier, Curriculum Resource Teacher; Cindy Coldren, Media Specialist; Jennifer Parker, Fifth Grade Teacher;
Nicole Nichols, Fourth Grade Teacher; Jamie Hedger, Third Grade Teacher; Sharon Nester, Second Grade Teacher;
MacDonald, First Grade Teacher; Denisse Ennis, Kindergarten Teacher; Kayla Dees, ESE Teacher
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).   The LLT will meet every other month to analyze data, address concerns related to reading instruction, and spearhead new strategies and ideas.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
Continue to implement the teaching of Reading Strategies, including a school-wide Book and Strategy of the Month, to meet the needs of our students in the lowest quartile. The
group will review Literacy First data to guide instruction and reinforce the necessity of differentiated instruction, including flexible small groups at all grade levels.

Public School Choice

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

<table>
<tr>
<th colspan="3">Reading Goals</th>
<th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="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:</td>
<td>Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</td>
<td>1A.1.
Teachers providing equitable small group time to all groups (scheduling more frequent flexible group time with on level and above level readers).</td>
<td>1A.1.
Teacher training, including Common Core/Text Complexity and Edusoft Coaching
Collaborative planning
Smaller class sizes
Lending library of leveled readers
Literacy First
FINS – Focused Instruction for the Needs of every Student</td>
<td>1A.1.
Teachers
Administrators
Literacy Coach
CRT</td>
<td>1A.1.
Classroom Walk Throughs
Monthly data meetings</td>
<td>1A.1.
FCAT results
Edusoft results
Classroom data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Goal #1A:

Increase the percentage of students achieving a Level 3 by at least 3 percentage points.</td>
<td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*

26% (95) of students earned a Level 3 on the 2012 Reading FCAT.</td>
<td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

At least 29% of students will score a Level 3 on the 2013 Reading FCAT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1A.2.
More specific monitoring of the progress of on and above level readers, drilling down to determine their specific needs.</td>
<td>1A.2.
Analyzing data provided by FCAT Star, Edusoft, Literacy First, and other assessments

Teacher training/coaching</td>
<td>1A.2.
Teachers
Administrators
Literacy Coach
CRT</td>
<td>1A.2.
Monthly data meetings</td>
<td>1A.2.
FCAT results
Edusoft results
Classroom data</td>
</tr>
</table>

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Teachers scheduling more frequent flexible group time with above level readers.	2A.1. Make equitable time for all groups of readers in class Teacher training, including Reaching the Upper Quartile/Early Finishers and Edusoft Coaching Collaborative planning Smaller class sizes Lending library of leveled readers Literacy First FINS – Focused Instruction for the Needs of every Student	2A.1. Teachers Administrators Literacy Coach CRT	22A.1. Classroom Walk Throughs Monthly data meetings	2A.1. FCAT results Edusoft results Classroom data
Reading Goal #2A: Increase the percentage of students achieving above proficiency by at least 3 percentage points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 29% (109) of students scored a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 Reading FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 32% of students will score a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 Reading FCAT.					
			2A.2. More specific monitoring of the progress of on and above level readers, drilling down to determine their specific needs.	2A.2. Analyzing data provided by FCAT Star, Edusoft, Literacy First, and other assessments Teacher training/coaching	2A.2. Teachers Administrators Literacy Coach CRT	2A.2. Monthly data meetings	2A.2. FCAT results Edusoft results Classroom 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 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.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
Reading Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Students have not mastered all of the skills on the Literacy First continuum.	4A.1. More regular assessment of Literacy First skills FINS – Focused Instruction for the Needs of every Student Teacher training re: using Literacy First data to form flexible groups and drive instruction High School Mentors	4A.1. Literacy Coach Literacy Leadership Team Teachers	4A.1. Data Meetings Grade level meetings	4A.1. Literacy First assessments Classroom Assessments
Reading Goal #4A: Increase the percentage of students in the lowest quartile who make learning gains by at least 10 percentage points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 71% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains based on the 2012 Reading FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* At least 78% of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains based on the 2013 Reading FCAT.					
			4A.2. Adequately servicing the number of ESE students we have with 2 inclusion teachers and one self-contained/pull out unit.	4A.2. We have two inclusion teachers who service most of the ESE students in their classrooms (one class at each grade level). There is still a self-contained class for those who need it. The inclusion teachers' help also benefits non-ESE students in the same class who are also struggling.	4A.2. ESE Specialist Inclusion Teachers Administration	4A.2. ESE Team meetings Parent/Teacher conferences Data Meetings	4A.2. Classroom Assessments FCAT Edusoft Literacy First

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** 67%	70%	73%	75%	78%	81%	84%
Reading Goal #5A: Increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by at least 5 percentage points (from 68% at Level 3 and above to 73% at Level 3 and above).							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**			5B.1. Students have not mastered all of the skills on the Literacy First continuum. White: Black: Hispanic:	5B.1 Teacher training, including Common Core/Text Complexity and Higher Order Thinking Coaching Collaborative planning Smaller class sizes Lending library of leveled readers Literacy First FINS – Focused Instruction for the Needs of every Students Concentrated ESOL units with Teacher Assistants	5B.1 Literacy Coach CRT Literacy Leadership Team Classroom teacher	5B.1 Classroom walk throughs Monthly data meeting Literacy Leadership meetings	5B.1 Classroom Assessments FCAT Edusoft Literacy First
Reading Goal #5B: Increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency to meet their AMO targets in Reading. White: increase at least 6 percentage points Black: increase at least 6 percentage points Hispanic: at least maintain, but aim to increase by 2 percentage points	2012 Current Level of Performance:* % of students making satisfactory progress in each subgroup: White: 75 Black: 50 Hispanic: 59	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* % of students making satisfactory progress in each subgroup: White: 81 Black: 56 Hispanic: 59					
			5B.2 Students do not have the background knowledge and vocabulary to achieve higher levels of comprehension.	5B.2. Teacher training in specific vocabulary instruction skills. Collaborative planning	5B.2. Literacy Coach CRT Literacy Leadership Team Classroom teacher	5B.2. Classroom walk throughs Monthly data meeting Literacy Leadership meetings	5B.2. Classroom Assessments FCAT Edusoft Literacy First
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Students have not mastered all of the skills on the Literacy First continuum.	5C.1 Teacher training, including Common Core/Text Complexity and Higher Order Thinking Coaching Collaborative planning Smaller class sizes Lending library of leveled readers Literacy First FINS – Focused Instruction for the Needs of every Students Concentrated ESOL units with Teacher Assistants	5C.1 Literacy Coach CRT Literacy Leadership Team Classroom teacher	5C.1 Classroom walk throughs Monthly data meeting Literacy Leadership meetings	5C.1 Classroom Assessments FCAT Edusoft Literacy First
Reading Goal #5C: Increase the percentage of ELL students achieving proficiency by 7 percentage points to meet their AMO targets in Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 38% of ELL students made satisfactory progress in Reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 45% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in Reading.					
			5C.2 Students do not have the background knowledge and vocabulary to achieve higher levels of comprehension.	5C.2. Teacher training in specific vocabulary instruction skills. Collaborative planning	5C.2. Literacy Coach CRT Literacy Leadership Team Classroom teacher	5C.2. Classroom walk throughs Monthly data meeting Literacy Leadership meetings	5C.2. Classroom Assessments FCAT Edusoft Literacy First
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. Students have not mastered all of the skills on the Literacy First continuum.	5D.1 Teacher training, including Common Core/Text Complexity and Higher Order Thinking Coaching Collaborative planning Smaller class sizes Lending library of leveled readers Literacy First FINS – Focused Instruction for the Needs of every Students Concentrated ESOL units with Teacher Assistants	5D.1 Literacy Coach CRT Literacy Leadership Team Classroom teacher	5D.1 Classroom walk throughs Monthly data meeting Literacy Leadership meetings	5D.1 Classroom Assessments FCAT Edusoft Literacy First
Reading Goal #5D: Increase the percentage of SWDs achieving proficiency by 29 percentage points to meet their AMO targets in Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 17% of SWDs made satisfactory progress in Reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 46% of SWDs will make satisfactory progress in Reading.					
			5D.2 Students do not have the background knowledge and vocabulary to achieve higher levels of comprehension.	5D.2. Teacher training in specific vocabulary instruction skills. Collaborative planning	5D.2. Literacy Coach CRT Literacy Leadership Team Classroom teacher	5D.2. Classroom walk throughs Monthly data meeting Literacy Leadership meetings	5D.2. Classroom Assessments FCAT Edusoft Literacy First
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Students have not mastered all of the skills on the Literacy First continuum.	5E.1. Teacher training, including Common Core/Text Complexity and Higher Order Thinking Teacher training Coaching Collaborative planning Smaller class sizes Lending library of leveled readers Literacy First FINS – Focused Instruction for the Needs of every Students	5E.1. Literacy Coach CRT Literacy Leadership Team Classroom teacher	5E.1. Classroom walk throughs Monthly data meeting Literacy Leadership meetings	5E.1. Classroom Assessments FCAT Edusoft Literacy First
Reading Goal #5E: Increase the percentage of ED students achieving proficiency by 4 percentage points to meet their AMO targets in Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 57% of ED students made satisfactory progress in Reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 61% of ED students will make satisfactory progress in Reading.					
			5E.2. Students do not have the background knowledge and vocabulary to achieve higher levels of comprehension.	5E.2. Teacher training in specific vocabulary instruction skills Collaborative planning	5E.2. Literacy Coach CRT Literacy Leadership Team Classroom teacher	5E.2. Classroom walk throughs Monthly data meeting Literacy Leadership meetings	5E.2. Classroom Assessments FCAT Edusoft Literacy First
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Data Meetings	All	Admin. team	School-wide, by grade levels	monthly	Disaggregation of classroom data	Leadership team
Comprehension Strategies	All	Literacy Coach /CRT	School-wide	Monthly meeting to introduce skills	Classroom walk throughs, student work	Leadership team
Book Clubs concentrating on Shift to CCSS	All	Literacy Coach/CRT	PLC	Weekly meetings	Student work, walk throughs	Literacy Coach

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Literacy First	Program materials and leadership training	None (purchased in a previous year)	
Harcourt reading series (4th year of implementation)	Books, manipulatives, etc.	Textbook budget	
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
My Data First (from Literacy First)	Web-based data collection	School budget	
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Book Clubs	Teacher copies of selected books	School Budget	
Data Meetings		None	
Comprehension Strategies	Strategy resources compiled by Literacy Coach and CRT, teacher copies of selected books (monthly)	School Budget	
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1. Students do not have the background knowledge and vocabulary to achieve at higher levels.	1.1. Teacher training ELL TAs work with small groups of ELL students Collaborative planning (classroom teacher and ELL TA) iPad apps selected by the Teaching and Learning Dept. Literacy First FINS – Focused Instruction for the Needs of every Students	1.1. ELL Contact/CRT Classroom Teacher Literacy Coach	1.1. Classroom walk throughs Teacher Observation	1.1. CELLA
CELLA Goal #1: Increase the percentage of ELL students achieving proficiency by 10% (at least 39% of ELL students scoring proficient on the Listening/Speaking portion of the CELLA).	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 35%					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1. Students do not have the background knowledge and vocabulary to achieve at higher levels.	2.1. Teacher training ELL TAs work with small groups of ELL students Collaborative planning (classroom teacher and ELL TA) iPad apps selected by the Teaching and Learning Dept. Literacy First FINS – Focused Instruction for the Needs of every Students	2.1. ELL Contact/CRT Classroom Teacher Literacy Coach	2.1. Classroom walk throughs Teacher Observation	2.1. CELLA
CELLA Goal #2: Increase the percentage of ELL students achieving proficiency by 10% (at least 34% of ELL students scoring proficient on the Reading portion of the CELLA).	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 31%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: Increase the percentage of ELL students achieving proficiency by 10% (at least 37% of ELL students scoring proficient on the Writing portion of the CELLA).	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 34%	3.1. Students do not have the background knowledge and vocabulary to achieve at higher levels.	3.1. Teacher training ELL TAs work with small groups of ELL students Collaborative planning (classroom teacher and ELL TA) iPad apps selected by the Teaching and Learning Dept. Literacy First FINS – Focused Instruction for the Needs of every Students	3.1. ELL Contact/CRT Classroom Teacher Literacy Coach	3.1. Classroom walk throughs Teacher Observation	3.1. CELLA
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. Teachers providing equitable small group time to all groups (scheduling more frequent flexible group time with on level and above level students).	1A.1. Teacher training, including Reaching the Upper Quartile/Early Finishers and Edusoft Coaching Collaborative planning Smaller class sizes	1A.1. Classroom teachers CRT Administrative Team	1A.1. Classroom Walk Throughs Monthly data meetings	1A.1. FCAT results Edusoft results Classroom data
Mathematics Goal #1A:____ Increase the percentage of students achieving a Level 3 by at least 3 percentage points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 23% (85) of students earned a Level 3 on the 2012 Math FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* At least 26% of students will score a Level 3 on the 2013 Math FCAT.					
			1A.2. More specific monitoring of the progress of on and above level students, drilling down to determine their specific needs.	1A.2. Analyzing data provided by FCAT Star, Edusoft, STAR Math, and other assessments Teacher training/coaching	1A.2. Classroom teachers CRT Administrative Team	1A.2. Monthly data meetings	1A.2. FCAT results Edusoft results Classroom 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 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. Teachers scheduling more frequent flexible group time with above level math students.	2A.1. Make equitable time for all levels of students in class Teacher training, including Reaching the Upper Quartile/Early Finishers and Edusoft Coaching Collaborative planning Smaller class sizes	2A.1. Classroom teachers CRT Administrative Team	2A.1. Classroom Walk Throughs Monthly data meetings	2A.1. FCAT results Edusoft results Classroom data
Mathematics Goal #2A:____ Increase the percentage of students achieving a Level 4 or 5 by at least 3 percentage points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 23% (86) of students earned a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 Math FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* At least 26% of students will score a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 Math FCAT.					
			2A.2. More specific monitoring of the progress of on and above level students, drilling down to determine their specific needs.	2A.2. Analyzing data provided by FCAT Star, Edusoft, and other assessments Teacher training/coaching	2A.2. Classroom teachers CRT Administrative Team	2A.2. Monthly data meetings	2A.2. FCAT results Edusoft results Classroom 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.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
Mathematics Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Students may struggle with prerequisite skills, word problems/multi-step problems, and math vocabulary.	4A.1. More regular assessment of basic skills. More time spent in class teaching problem solving skills and math vocabulary specific to word problems. Teacher training Coaching Collaborative planning Smaller class sizes Increased use of small group instruction in math FASTT Math Go Solve Word Problems	4A.1. Classroom Teachers CRT RtI Team	4A.1. Data Meetings Grade level meetings	4A.1. Classroom Assessments FCAT Edusoft
Mathematics Goal #4A: Increase the percentage of students in the lowest quartile who make learning gains by at least 4 percentage points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 86% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains based on the 2012 Math FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* At least 90% of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains based on the 2013 Math FCAT.					
			4A.2. Adequately servicing the number of ESE students we have with 2 inclusion teachers and one self-contained/pull out unit.	4A.2. We have two inclusion teachers who service most of the ESE students in their classrooms (one class at each grade level). There is still a self-contained class for those who need it. The inclusion teachers' help also benefits non-ESE students in the same class who are also struggling.	4A.2. ESE Specialist Inclusion Teachers Administration	4A.2. ESE Team meetings Parent/Teacher conferences Data Meetings	4A.2. Classroom Assessments FCAT

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** 57%	61%	64%	68%	71%	75%	79%
Mathematics Goal #5A: Increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by at least 6 percentage points (from 58% at Level 3 and above to 64% at Level 3 and above).							

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. Students may struggle with prerequisite skills, word problems/multi-step problems, and math vocabulary. White: Black: Hispanic:	5B.1. Teacher training Coaching Collaborative planning Smaller class sizes Increased use of small group instruction in math FASTT Math Go Solve Word Problems	5B.1. Classroom Teachers CRT Administrative Team	5B.1. Classroom Walk Throughs Monthly data meetings	5B.1. FCAT results Edusoft results Classroom data	
Mathematics Goal #5B: Increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency to meet their AMO targets in Reading. White: increase at least 5 percentage points Black: increase at least 9 percentage points Hispanic: increase by 4 percentage points	2012 Current Level of Performance:* % of students making satisfactory progress in each subgroup: White: 63 Black: 37 Hispanic: 55	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* % of students making satisfactory progress in each subgroup: White: 68 Black: 48 Hispanic: 59						

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Students may struggle with prerequisite skills, word problems/multi-step problems, and math vocabulary.	5C.1. Teacher training Coaching Collaborative planning Smaller class sizes Increased use of small group instruction in math FASTT Math Go Solve Word Problems	5C.1. Classroom Teachers CRT Administrative Team	5C.1. Classroom Walk Throughs Monthly data meetings	5C.1. FCAT results Edusoft results Classroom data
Mathematics Goal #5C: Increase the percentage of ELL students achieving proficiency by 5 percentage points to meet their AMO targets in Math.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 43% of ELL students made satisfactory progress in Math.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 48% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in Math.					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. Students may struggle with prerequisite skills, word problems/multi-step problems, and math vocabulary.	5D.1. Teacher training Coaching Collaborative planning Smaller class sizes Increased use of small group instruction in math FASTT Math Go Solve Word Problems	5D.1. Classroom Teachers CRT Administrative Team	5D.1. Classroom Walk Throughs Monthly data meetings	5D.1. FCAT results Edusoft results Classroom data
Mathematics Goal #5D: Increase the percentage of SWDs achieving proficiency by 25 percentage points to meet their AMO targets in Math.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 21% of SWDs made satisfactory progress in Math.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 46% of SWDs will make satisfactory progress in Math.					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Students may struggle with prerequisite skills, word problems/multi-step problems, and math vocabulary.	5E.1. Teacher training Coaching Collaborative planning Smaller class sizes Increased use of small group instruction in math FASTT Math Go Solve Word Problems	5E.1. Classroom Teachers CRT Administrative Team	5E.1. Classroom Walk Throughs Monthly data meetings	5E.1. FCAT results Edusoft results Classroom data
Mathematics Goal #5E: Increase the percentage of ED students achieving proficiency by 9 percentage points to meet their AMO targets in Math.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 47% of ED students made satisfactory progress in Math.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 56% of ED students will make satisfactory progress in Math.					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Data Meetings	All	Admin. team	School-wide, divided by grade levels	monthly	Disaggregation of classroom data	Leadership team

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
GO Math!	Books, manipulatives, etc.	Textbook funds	
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Think Central	Web-based program	included in GO Math! adoption	
FASTT Math	Web-based program	none	none
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1.1. Students have not mastered the prerequisite skills needed based on Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, due in part to lack of background knowledge.	1.1. Teacher training Coaching Collaborative planning Smaller class sizes Science word walls/vocabulary instruction Teaching for mastery at lower grade levels, standards-based, rather than text-based instruction Hold Science Fair in first semester	1.1. Classroom Teachers CRT Administrative Team	1.1. Classroom Walk Throughs Monthly data meetings	1.1. FCAT results Edusoft results Classroom data
Science Goal #1A: Increase the percentage of students achieving a Level 3 by at least 3 percentage points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 27% (33) of students earned a Level 3 on the 2012 Science FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* At least 30% of students will score a Level 3 on the 2013 Science FCAT.					
			1.2. More specific monitoring of the progress of on and above level students.	1.2. Analyzing data provided by Edusoft and other assessments Teacher training/coaching	1.2. Classroom Teachers CRT Administrative Team	1.2. Monthly data meetings	1.2. FCAT results Edusoft results Classroom data
			1..3 Teachers don't feel they have enough time to teach Science everyday.	1.3 Collaborative planning Use science content in the reading block Science Labs for grades 3-5	1.3 Classroom Teachers CRT Administrative Team	1.3 Classroom Walk Throughs Data Meetings	1.3 FCAT Results Edusoft results Classroom 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 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. More specific monitoring of the progress of on and above level students, drilling down to determine their specific needs.	2A.1. Analyzing data provided by FCAT Star, Edusoft, and other assessments Hold Science Fair in the first semester Hold STEM Team/Math Olympiad practice from October to March Teacher training/coaching	2A.1. Classroom teachers CRT STEM Team/Math Olympiad coaches Administrative Team	2A.1. Monthly data meetings	2A.1. FCAT results Edusoft results Classroom data
Science Goal #2A: Increase the percentage of students achieving a Level 4 or 5 by at least 4 percentage points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 16% (18) of students earned a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 Science FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* At least 20% of students will score a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 Science FCAT.					

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="7" align="center">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.</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</td>
<td>Grade Level/Subject</td>
<td>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</td>
<td>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</td>
<td>Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</td>
<td>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

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
Interactive Science (2nd Year Adoption)	Textbooks, lab materials	Textbook Funds	
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Pearson online website		Included with textbook purchase	
Math Olympiad	Web-based competition	Classroom budget	
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

* 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. Writing Goal #1A: Increase the percentage of students achieving a Level 3 or higher by at least 1 percentage points. **2012 Current Level of Performance:*** 82% of students earned a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 Writing FCAT. **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** At least 83% of students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 Writing FCAT.	1A.1. Students do not come to 4th grade prepared with the appropriate writing skills	1A.1. We are continuing to implement a school-wide writing plan. Ensure that all teachers are making writing a part of their curriculum through ongoing training and collaborative planning.	1A.1. Writing Team CRT Literacy coach Teachers	1A.1. Classroom walk throughs Writing samples.	1A.1. Scored writing samples at middle and end of each nine weeks
	1A.2. Students may not enjoy writing.	1A.2. Collaboratively plan to engage students in the writing process. Author visits	1A.2. Teachers	1A.2. Classroom walk through Writing samples	1A.2. Writing samples Lesson plans

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
Schoolwide Writing Training	All	Writing Team	School-wide opportunity	August 2011 Ongoing throughout year	Lesson Plan review Classroom Walk Through	Teachers Leadership Team

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Writing Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. childhood illnesses	1.1. Better instruction on good hand washing technique, using elbow to cover coughs/sneezes, etc. Good hygiene habits posters visible. School social worker makes home visits, works with AP on children with attendance issues. Provide classrooms with hand sanitizer. Regular discussion at faculty meetings regarding sick student procedures and procedures involving the school nurse. Parent contact when students display symptoms to help deter the spread of certain illnesses.	1.1. Assistant principal Nurse School social worker	1.1. Review attendance records, clinic logs Parent meetings, as necessary Staff meetings (discussions, reminders)	1.1. Attendance records
Attendance Goal #1: To increase average daily attendance by 2 percentage points. To decrease the percentage of students absent or tardy 20 or more days by 1 percentage point.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* Average daily attendance for the 2011-12 school year was 96%. 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) Percentage of students with 20 or more absences was 4%. 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) Percentage of students with 20 or more tardies was 2%.	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* Average daily attendance will be 98%. 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) Percentage of students with 20 or more absences will be 3%. 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) Percentage of students with 20 or more tardies will be 1%.					

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

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

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
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Attendance Goals

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

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: To reduce suspensions and number of students suspended by at least 10%.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions	1.1. Inconsistency between staff members related to disciplinary procedures. Lack of parental support.	1.1. Continue to reinforce the Positive Behavior Support program with both teachers and students, clearly defining expectations for staff and students and ensuring that staff and students know what is expected of them. Community nights – outreach to help parents better understand PBS and offer support/advice.	1.1. PBS Team, Administrators Classroom Teachers School Staff Leadership Team	1.1. Discipline data will be reviewed monthly to determine if program is working. PBS action plan may be revised as necessary based on these reviews. Staff and students will be surveyed to see if PBS is having a positive effect on school culture.	1.1. Discipline referral data Classroom Walk Throughs Monitoring of problem areas Staff/student interviews and surveys
	During the 2011-12 school year, there were 11 In-School Suspensions.	There will be fewer than 10 In-School Suspensions.					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	During the 2011-12 school year, there were 11 students suspended in school.	There will be fewer than 10 students suspended in school.					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	During the 2011-12 school year, there were 49 Out-of-School Suspensions.	There will be fewer than 44 Out-of-School Suspensions.					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	During the 2011-12 school year, there were 27students suspended from school.	There will be fewer than 24 students suspended from school.					

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PBS Refresher	all	PBS Team: School Psychologist, Guidance Counselor, School Social Worker, PE Teacher, AP	All teachers, staff	Regularly	Regularly	Administrators PBS Coach

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
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Suspension Goals

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

* 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. The demands placed on parents may not allow them to attend school activities.	1.1. PTO meets at 3:30 on the second Monday of every other month. In other months, they meet directly before a planned evening activity (STEM Night/Science Fair, Family Reading Night, etc.)	1.1. Teachers Leadership Team Administration	1.1. Review of sign-in sheets and activities offered to make sure parents participate/feel welcome to participate	1.1. Parent Involvement Survey Sign-in sheets
Parent Involvement Goal #1: We will increase the level of parent participation by 5 percentage points. *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* 95% of parents/families participated in school activities during the 2011-12 school year.	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* 100% of parents/families will participate in school activities during the 2012-2013 school year.		SAC meets at 5:30 on the second Monday of every other month School Website, Newsletter, and Marquee contain dates of upcoming events Conference Night (Sept.) and Meet the Teacher (Aug.) Volunteer Program Surveys and eSembler Terrific Kid/Student of the Month Father/Daughter Dance and Mother/Son Bowling Family Reading Night STEM Night Family Picnics Grandparents Day Lunches Dads & Donuts/Moms & Muffins Community Outreach Nights off campus			

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: To increase performance in the areas of Science and Math as measured by the FCAT (see goals for each under Science and Math headings above).	1.1. Time to address the increased rigor of Math and Science content during the school day.	1.1. Grade level discussions re: Common Core, District-created Task Cards and Maps. Work towards STEM school certification. Create STEM Teams in grades 3-5; compete in District competition in February. Host STEM Night and Science Fair in first semester. Encourage standards-based Science lessons, rather than text-based. Encourage integration of Science in the Reading block.	1.1. Classroom teachers Leadership Team, including: CRT, Literacy Coach, Grade Level Representatives, and Administration	1.1. Data reviews of Benchmark assessments Grade level reviews of test data Student grades	1.1. Classroom grades Edusoft FCAT

STEM Professional Development

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

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
GO Math	Text and resources	Textbook fund	
Pearson Science	Text and resources	Textbook fund	
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
ThinkCentral	Web-based computer program (text)	Included with textbook	
Pearson Success Net	Web-based computer program (text)	Included with textbook	
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
STEM Night/Science Fair		Classroom budget	
STEM Team		none	
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

ADDITIONAL GOAL(S)			Anti-Bullying Program (Required by Lake County School Board)			
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy
1. Additional Goal Additional Goal #1: To reduce bullying incidents by 1%.	2011 Current Level :* Bullying incidents were 3% of referrals.	2012 Expected Level :* The number of bullying incidents referred will represent no more than 2% of total referrals.	1.1. Students knowing how to solve problems peacefully Students understanding the definition of bullying Students knowing how and when to report bullying behavior	1.1. Classroom Community training PBS Refresher course for teachers/staff Behavior Support Weekly Classes (Tuesdays) Quarterly PBS messages/commercials Clearly expressed school-wide expectations (classroom meetings, announcements, etc.) Bullying Complaint forms accessible to students in the Media Center.	1.1. Assistant Principal Guidance Counselors Classroom Teacher Instructional Dean	1.1. Referral counts PBS data PBS/Staff Survey Student Survey

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	Total:
CELLA Budget	
	Total:
Mathematics Budget	
	Total:
Science Budget	
	Total:
Writing Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:
STEM Budget	
	Total:
	Grand Total:

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

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

☒ Yes   ☐ No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
Round Lake's School Advisory Council meets every other month. Some of the functions of the SAC are: to review school data (from FCAT scores, parent surveys, etc.) and provide support for school initiatives.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
There are no SAC funds provided by the State.	