Florida Department of Education

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Pine Grove Elementary School	District Name: Hernando County
Principal: Mr. Thomas Earl Deen	Superintendent: Mr. Bryan Blavatt
SAC Chair: Ms. Kara Hazivasilis	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)

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

Principal	Thomas Earl Deen	BS in Elementary Education from The University of Mississippi; Master's Degree in Educational Leadership from Nova South Eastern; Certifications: Principal (all levels), Educational Leadership, Elementary Education in grades 1-6, Technology Education in grades 6-12	4	16	2011-2012: Pine Grove Elementary earned a School Grade of B. 60% of students met high standards in Reading, 56% of students met high standards in Math. 45% of students met high standards in Science and 72% met high standards in Writing. 71% of our lowest 25% made learning gains in Math and 59% of this population made gains in Reading. PGES earned 499 points with 100% tested. 2010-2011: Pine Grove Elementary earned a School Grade of B with 90% AYP criteria satisfied. 82% met high standards in Reading, 71% met high standards in Math. 81% met high standards in Writing. 49% met high standards in Science, 67% making learning gains in Reading, 7% making learning gains in Math, 62% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading. 54% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in Math. Pine Grove Elementary earned 513 points with 99% of students tested.
Assistant Principal	Gina Michalicka	Early Childhood, Elementary Education, K-6, Master's in Reading, K-12, Educational Leadership (all levels), Professional Certification 7/1/2010 - 6/30/2015	0	4	2011-2012: Springstead High School earned a school grade of B. 53% of students met high standards in Math while 58% met high standards in Reading. 83% of students achieved high standards in Writing and 484 points were earned with 98% of students tested. 2010-2011: Springstead High School earned a school grade of B. 87% of criteria met for AYP. Met Math proficiency in all sub groups except Hispanic. Did not meet Reading proficiency in any sub group. Met profieciency in writing, 55% High Standards in reading, 83% high standards in Math, 77% High Standards in Writing, 53% high standards in Science.

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)
	none				

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. YMCA Wee Care offers a convenient, child care service for teachers in our school. This year, Wee Care is offering extended hours so that teachers are able to work in classes, hold parent conferences, and plan for curriculum and instruction after their regular school day.	Administration	Ongoing
2. "Pawsitive Personality" - teacher incentives. Teachers and staff take the opportunity to recognize other staff members who go above and beyond their call of duty by completing a certificate. Each Friday teachers are recognized on the school's television station.	Administration	Ongoing
3. Staff members are recognized by the principal daily and given a certificate for specific accomplishments for that day.	Administration	Ongoing
4. Tune-up Tuesdays - Substitutes are provided through Title I for monthly PLC meetings where teachers can collaborate, plan and receive professional development as a cohesive unit.	Administration	Ongoing
5. Promote the positive aspects of the school through the media.	Title I Parent Educator	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 paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
none	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
46	0% (0)	21.7 % (10)	39.1% (18)	39.13% (18)	32.6% (15)	100% (46)	2.17% (1)	0	54.35% (25)

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

Paula Clark	Jared Mazza	Dr. Clark is an 18 year veteran, was a reading coach for 6 years. She has extensive training on HOTS and Webb's as well as researched-based best practices. She is a state CET Trainer, Alternative Certification Mentor, has a record of high performance and specializes in professional development.	Collaboration on Best Practices; Strategies for Reading, Math & Writing specific to new grade level; Essential Questions; Webb's Depth of Knowledge, help with completing the Alternative Certification Process.
Paula Clark	Honora Cassels	Dr. Clark is an 18 year veteran, was a reading coach for 6 years. She has extensive training on HOTS and Webb's as well as researched-based best practices. She is a state CET Trainer, has a record of high performance and specializes in professional development.	Classroom Management; Best Practices, Strategies in Reading, Math & Writing; Webbs Depth of Knowledge; Differentiated Instruction
Tina Cordova	Cynthia Martin	Mrs. Cordova has taught for 10 years. Her strengths are in teaching math, reading and leadership. She is CET trained and has supported teachers in the area of mathematics for the last 4 years as a Math Coach and Resource teacher.	Using Assessment to drive instruction; Differentiated Instruction, Best Practices, for Reading, Math & Writing, CCSS
Diane Welch	Laura Rieker	Ms. Welch has her master's in reading, has been a reading coach and is a master teacher. Her expertise in the needed areas, as well as expertise in professional development will help the mentee in the targeted spots.	Classroom Management, Best Practices, Strategies in Reading, Math & Writing; Webbs Depth of Knowledge; Differentiated Instruction
Kristal Barnes	Christine Spinuzza	Mrs. Barnes has been teaching for 12 years. She is a model classroom for reading and writing, is CET trained and has served as Chair of the Literacy Committee for several years.	Classroom Management, Best Practices, Strategies in Reading, Math & Writing, Webbs Depth of Knowledge, Differentiated Instruction
Tina Cordova	Michelle Haenel	Mrs. Cordova has taught for 10 years. Her strengths are in teaching math, reading and leadership. She is CET trained and has supported teachers in the area of mathematics for the last 4 years as a Math Coach and Resource teacher.	Strategies in Reading, Math & Writing; Webbs Depth of Knowledge; Differentiated Instruction, Classroom Management

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

Additional Requirements

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

Title I, Part A
Pine Grove Elementary is a Title I based school, dedicated to providing, maintaining, and improving comparable, supplementary Title I education services for all of our students. Our Title I School Improvement Facilitator and Parent Educator consistently collaborate with the District's Coordinator of Family Involvement to build home support networks that facilitate targeted students' success. PGES' Title I School Improvement Facilitator and Title I Parent Educator also coordinate with the Supplemental Educational Services, (SES) providers to provide free tutoring for students scoring a Level 1 or 2 on FCAT Reading or Math in grades 3, 4, and 5 as well as those students in grade 3 who were retained due to failing FCAT. Title I Part A services at PGES are regularly coordinated with other federally funded programs, including use of Title II funds to support professional development programs and activities. Title III funds are used to support additional services for our identified migrant students. Title X funds provide services for our identified homeless students. IDEA funds are used to support supplementary services to our students with disabilities.(NCLB Elements 1,2,4,6,7,9,)
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D

Title II

Pine Grove Elementary will use its 2012-13 Title II funding allocation to support ongoing research based professional development, including Problem Solving/Response to Intervention, effective differentiation of instruction to address all students' particular needs, and inquiry based learning. PGES teachers will be encouraged to participate in district-wide, Title II funded, professional development involving Reading, Creating Independence through Student Owned Strategies (CRISS), Write Traits, and SIM Learning Strategies and Enhancement Routines. All Title II funded professional development programs at PGES are planned to support the district's strategic plan; 2011-12 District Improvement and Assistance Plan(DIAP), and School Improvement Plan(SIP) student performance goals and objectives and our annual Title I school-wide service plan.(NCLB Elements 1,2,3,7)

Title III

Pine Grove Elementary School's English Language Learners, (ELL's) are served in their classrooms and receive services from the ESOL Lead Teacher and paraprofessional in their respective rooms or in our ESOL Resource Room. District Annual Title III Entitlement Funds are used to purchase materials, equipment, and supplies to supplement ELL instruction in the classrooms that serve ELL's and in our ESOL resource rooms. Students, parents/guardians, and teachers have access to translated texts, dictionaries, graphic organizers, and computer software packages designed to increase academic proficiency of our ELL population. Pine Grove Elementary School's ESOL Lead Teacher will attend the annual state TESOL Conference to receive training and resources regarding effective ELL strategies in order to facilitate teacher training. Title III funds will also be used to train Pine Grove Elementary School's ESOL Lead Teacher and ESOL paraprofessional on how to better use computer software designed to improve the academic proficiency of our English learning students. Software purchased with Title III funds, such as English Discoveries, Orchard, and Rosetta Stone, will be regularly used to supplement classroom instruction. Title III funds will also provide extended day/year programs after school, 2-3 days per week. The extended year program will commence in June. Transportation home from extended day/year programs will be provided through Title III. Title III programs are well coordinated and often seamlessly integrated with Title I, Part A funded programs and services.(NCLB Element 1,2,6,7,8,9,)

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

Title X- Homeless

Title X and Title I funds are used to provide a social worker serving as the district's homeless liaison, coordinating exemplary local public school homeless education programs and services. The district homeless liaison is responsible for ensuring all district employees' full compliance with district policies/operating procedures for homeless students, (McKinney-Vento Act). Additionally, the district homeless liaison works closely with PGES' Title I Parent Educator and school guidance counselor. They are charged with identifying and evaluating homeless students' strengths/needs, managing appropriate referral services, cooperating school services, the equitable access to all district schools/programs, appropriate transportation systems, professional development programs, community partnerships, and parent education programs for all eligible students. Title X funds are also used to provide materials for parents regarding homelessness resources. In addition, materials are provided regarding physical examinations and vaccinations available. Finally, the Title I Parent Educator liaisons with community business partners and specific agencies to provide needed items for families who may benefit from these items.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

District Student Services, staff and PGES Guidance Counselors provide substance abuse prevention and intervention initiatives for our students and families. These initiatives and activities consist of substance abuse evaluations/assessments, grief counseling, drug testing, student drug awareness classes, crisis intervention services, classroom substance abuse instruction, parent drug awareness classes, parent drug intervention training, substance abuse protocol training for staff and administrators, tobacco awareness classes, Involuntary Marchman Act petitions, and treatment referral services. Furthermore, prevention and intervention programs are in place to address bullying and harassment throughout the district.
The staff of Pine Grove Elementary participates regularly in district professional development programs regarding violence and substance abuse prevention. The district's Student Services Department initiated additional instructional programs for issues such as anger management, conflict resolution, and sexual harassment. These programs will be used in lieu of lengthy student suspensions, minimalizing loss of instructional time at all Hernando schools for the 2011-12 school year.(NCLB Element 7)

Nutrition Programs
Pine Grove Elementary School's cafeteria staff provides a variety of balanced, attractive, well-prepared meals. The staff provides courteous, friendly service, meets high sanitary standards, and is receptive to students' ideas and suggestions and constantly strives for improvement. The PGES cafeteria staff provides free and/or reduced-priced lunches for students who qualify for participation in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National School Lunch Program.
Housing Programs
Head Start
The Title I Parent Educator presents Kindergarten readiness to the Community HeadStart Program and families. This is an ongoing, throughout the year relationship to bridge any barriers that may exist from community based/federal programs to public school programs.
Adult Education
The District's Adult & Community Education Department provides opportunities for Hernando County residents to participate in classes in GED preparation, adult ESOL classes, co-enrolled classes, Adult Basic Education, and Family Literacy. Co-enrolled classes are located at all four high schools. Other adult education classes (HEART Literacy) are located at four, community, non-school sites. Services for Adults with Disabilities are contracted to ARC of the Nature Coast. The Title I Parent Educator serves as a member of the HEART Literacy coalition to enhance relationships between that this program and the families at PGES.
Career and Technical Education
The Hernando County School District uses Carl D. Perkins Annual Entitlement Funds to support three, high school Career/Technical Education (CTE) Specialists who purchase and print marketing materials. These materials promote career academics, career and technical education programs, traditional and non-traditional student populations and provide professional development for CTE teachers. They provide the funds to pay for CTE student testing and certification fees.
Job Training
Other

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. Earl Deen, Principal Gina Michalicka, Assistant Principal Stephanie Moriaty, School Behavior Specialist Cynthia Kufner, School Guidance Counselor Pam Kasten, ESE Team Leader Deborah Piazza, Writing Resource Tina Cordova, Math Resource Michelle Rop, School Psychologist Paula Clark, Assessment Teacher
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? Our MTSS/RtI team focuses on identifying appropriate interventions/strategies to develop our staff, our students, and the school itself. The team meets each Thursday with grade level teams. The Leadership Team uses the School Improvement Plan to focus on various needs. The teams analyze data from FCAT scores, FAIR, Performance Matters, SuccessMaker, Terms, Discipline/Attendance data and progress monitoring in order to identify and immediately assist the at-risk subgroups, economically disadvantaged students, and ESE students with research based and innovative techniques in order to meet their specific needs, and the general needs of All students. According to teacher and student needs, professional development and resources are provided. Problem solving and sharing strategies through our monthly PLC meetings enables teachers to create and research techniques needed for the purpose of developing and utilizing strategies for our identified areas of concern.
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? Our leadership team, SAC Committee and Administration all work on the development of the SIP. School data, SIP goals and the development of strategies for intervention plans are discussed. The teams provide data in the following areas: Tier I, II and III targets, academic and behavioral areas that need to be addressed, help set clear expectations for instruction, facilitates the development of a systematic approach to teaching.
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. The team uses data provided by Paula Clark, our Assessment teacher to identify, assess and evaluate the need for any additional support. PGES analyzes mid-year, baseline data and year-end data, Florida Assessment for Reading, (FAIR), Performance Matters for Math and Science, will determine the success level for each student on the FCAT. Will also use SuccessMaker, Performance Matters, Grade level, subject area diagnostics tests, DWAP and FCAT. Every three weeks data chats are held with teachers to analyze the data collected and to determine appropriate interventions for at risk students as well as enrichment for high performing students. Bi-monthly, teachers hold student data chats to analyze individual student data and review individual student academic goals. Discipline data for RtI:B is reviewed monthly, through TERMS to analyze specific behavioral trends in order to create appropriate behavioral interventions for student success.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. During pre-school, our ESE team leader provided an intense overview on RTI process/documentation. Continued training and support will be offered to the staff during our Tune-up Tuesday PLC's throughout the year.

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

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

During pre-school, each team collaborated to determine specific, grade-level needs in the RtI process and met with the ESE team leader to review and discuss individual, student cases. Tier II services are provided by highly qualified teachers and paraprofessionals. Tier III services are provided by all highly qualified instructional staff.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Earl Deen, Principal Gina Michalicka, Assistant Principal Kristal Barnes, Chairperson Deborah Piazza, Writing Resource Carmela Duncan Christy Probus Stacey Leggett Sarah McKenzie Lorraine Kocolowski Robert Pellito Paula Clark D. Ilsley Dana Proeger Teresa McNeil Cynthia Martin Laura Rieker
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Pine Grove Elementary School Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly to review data and determine literacy goals for the school. They make recommendations for professional development as well as PLC topics as they relate to Reading strategies and our School Improvement goals. In addition, the LLT makes recommendations regarding Reading motivational activities and rewards for students as well as being responsible for the organization and implementation of all such approved literacy activities. The chairperson and Administration facilitate the LLT meetings.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The major initiative of the LLT, this year, will be to continue the infusion of new reading strategies and best practices in all classrooms. The team will also focus on developing a schedule for teachers to visit model classrooms and observe other teachers using best practices during the 120 minute Language Arts block. The team will also initiate the development and organization of lesson study. Teachers will receive professional development during Tune-up Tuesdays on Text Complexity and the CIS model. Implementation and utilization of these strategies will be noted by Administration during Administrative walk-throughs.

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

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

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Pine Grove schedules two opportunities for parents to attend kindergarten round-up in the Spring. One session is offered in the evening. The other is offered during the day where parents and students have the opportunity to meet kindergarten teachers and take a tour of the classrooms/campus in order to ease the transition from home to school in the fall. Students are provided with an early assessment through the guidance of the Kindergarten team. In addition, parents receive a Skills Readiness Packet to review during the summer with expectations for the upcoming year. Parents also have the opportunity to complete registration packets. Several privately owned pre-schools within close proximity to Pine Grove visit in the Spring. Students are given a tour of kindergarten classes and the campus. Pine Grove has an ESE Pre-K class to help with the transition to kindergarten. The students spend part of the day with their peers, eating lunch in the cafeteria and attending Specials with other kindergarten classes. Another learning opportunity on this campus is a cooperative agreement with the YMCA. It is a half-day program for children to attend VPK Classes on the Pine Grove Campus.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

<u>Reading Goals</u>

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

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

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1A.1. Students have not been taught to think critically and utilize higher order thinking skills.	1A.1. Provide data-driven differentiated instruction within the 90 minute reading block that meets the needs of the students. Use short, complex non-fiction materials that support student learning.	1A.1. Administration and Assessment Teacher, Classroom Teacher	1A.1. Reading student data chats. Administrative data chats with teachers. Administrative walk-throughs	1A.1. FCAT		

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

Reading Goal #1A: Reading proficiency assessed at a level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 29% to 32%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	29% (79)	**32%**				
		1A.2. Consistent use of challenging curriculum, informational text and longer passages with higher text complexity.	1A.2. Utilizing leveled books, offering challenging levels of curriculum to include non-fiction texts with higher text complexity levels. Hold students accountable for what they read by having them keep a reading response journal.	1A.2. Administration, Assessment Teacher, Classroom Teacher	1A.2. Monitor FAIR, Successmaker Data, and FCAT Weekly grades Regular review of the reading response journals.	1A.2. FCAT

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	1B.1. Teachers instructing whole class only and no differentiating instruction to the level of students' ability in small group.	1B.1. Use computer-assisted instruction (CAI)	1B.1. Administration and Classroom Teacher	1B.1. Successmaker Data, Administrative walk-throughs	1B.1. FAA		
Reading Goal #1B: Reading proficiency assessed at a level 4, 5 or 6 on the 2013 FAA will maintain at 100%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	100% (1)	**100%**					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

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

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

| 2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading. | 2A.1. Students are not expected to be independent learners. | 2A.1. Develop and ask text dependent questions, and have the students support their answers based upon evidence from the text.

Teach students how to track their own reading data on a weekly basis and take responsibility for their work. | 2A.1. Administration, Assessment Teacher, Classroom Teacher | 2A.1. Lesson Plan Review, Classroom walk-throughs, Student Data Chat review | 2A.1. FCAT | | |

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

Reading Goal #2A: Reading proficiency assessed at a level 4.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 31% to 34%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	31% (84)	**34%**				
		2A.2. Lack of teacher led small group instruction during the 90 minute reading block in grades 3-5.	2A.2. Teachers will differentiate instruction within the 90 minute reading block to provide enrichment opportunities and higher order thinking skills.	2A.2. Administration	2A.2. Administrative walk-throughs, Lesson Plan review	2A.2. Walk-through data, Lesson Plans FCAT
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.**	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	

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

Reading Goal #2B: **NA**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3A.1. Formative assessment data is not guiding instruction.	3A.1. Identify teachers who are successfully differentiating instruction during the 90 minute reading block and allow other teachers to observe and discuss their observations. Analyze and use student performance data to provide specific levels of differentiated instruction.	3A.1. Administration Assessment Teacher	3A.1. Observation notes administrative conference Data Chats	3A.1. Teacher Evaluations FCAT		

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

Reading Goal #3A: Reading proficiency for students making gains on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 31% to 34%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	62% (117	**65%**				
		3A.2. Core instruction is not meeting the needs of all students.	3A.2. Use center activities and research-based computer programs to reinforce instruction and/or extend learning.	3A.2. Administration, Computer Lab Manager	3A.2. Administrative Walk-throughs Monitor Successmaker Data Monitor FCAT Explorer Usage	3A.2. Successmaker and FCAT Explorer Data FCAT
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
Reading Goal #3B: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. Students have not been taught the five components of reading allowing them to learn to read well on their own.	4A.1. Provide explicit instruction in all five areas of reading. Implement FCRR Activities during differentiated instruction time.	4A.1. Administration	4A.1. Administrative Walk-throughs Lesson Plan review FCAT Weekly Test Data review	4A.1. FCAT		

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

Reading Goal #4A: Reading proficiency for students in the lowest 25% on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 55% to 60%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	55% (27)	60%				
		4A.2. Struggling readers are not receiving daily small group and/or individualized instruction.	4A.2. Provide small group instruction that targets specific reading deficits. Meet monthly with grade level teams and individual teachers to analyze and discuss student performance data.	4A.2. Administration Assessment Teacher SBLT	4A.2. Administrative Walk-throughs Lesson Plan review Monthly Data meeting review	4A.2. FCAT
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	

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

Reading Goal #4B: **NA**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

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**	**60%**	**72%**	**75%**	**77%**	**80%**	**83%**
Reading Goal #5A: **In six years, PGES will reduce their achievement gap 4% each year, moving from 40% to 20%.**							
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		

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5B.1. Students in identified subgroups are not taking ownership of using learning strategies on a regular basis.	5B.1. Employ a variety of learning strategies that engage students in active participation, address multiple learning styles and cultural experiences, and stimulate students' intellectual interest.	5B.1. Administration, ESOL Lead	5B.1. Administrative walk-throughs, teacher conferences with ESOL Lead Lesson plan review	5B.1. FCAT 2.0		
Reading Goal #5B: Reading proficiency for students in identified subgroups on 2013 FCAT will decrease 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: 40% (88) Black: 75% (9) Hispanic: 36% (9)	White: 37% Black:72% Hispanic: 33%					

		5B.2. Teachers are not monitoring student progress throughout the lesson.	5B.2. Incorporate "Checks for Understanding" throughout lessons and make adjustments in instructional techniques based on student responses.	5B.2. Administration	5B.2. Administrative walk-throughs	5B.2. Administrative walk-through data	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.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		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. Instructional materials are not used with fidelity.	5C.1. Utilize instructional materials that address the needs of English Language Learners.	5C.1. Administration ESOL Lead	5C.1. Administrative walk-throughs Lesson Plan Review Conference With ESOL Lead	5C.1. FCAT		

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

Reading Goal #5C: Reading proficiency for students in the ELL Subgroup on the 2013 FCAT will decrease from 73% to 70%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	73% (8)	**70%**					
		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		

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. Struggling readers are not receiving daily small group and/or individualized instruction.	5D.1. Provide small group and/or individualized instruction that targets specific reading deficits.	5D.1. Administration	5D.1. Administrative walk-throughs Lesson Plan Review	5D.1. FCAT		
Reading Goal #5D: Reading proficiency for students in SWD Subgroup on the 2013 FCAT will decrease from 52% to 49%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	52% (11)	**49%**					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.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		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Tasks and instructional activities lack rigor.	5E.1. Provide hands-on activities that include the use of appropriate content materials and technologies.	5E.1. Administration Computer Lab Manager	5E.1. Administrative walk-throughs Lesson Plan Review Successmaker Data Review	5E.1. FCAT		
Reading Goal #5E: Reading proficiency for students in ED Subgroup on the 2013 FCAT will decrease from 43% to 40%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	43% (92)	**40%**					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	

Reading Professional Development

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

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
90 minute Reading Block	K-5	Reading Coaches	School-wide	8/15/2012	Walk-throughs	Assistant Principal
Unpacking the Common Core Standards	K-5	Assistant Principal	School-Wide	8/28, 9/4, 9/11/2012	PLC Meetings, Walk-throughs, Lesson Plan Review	Administration
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	Reading Coaches	School-Wide	10/4, 10/25/2012	Lesson Plan Review, Walk-throughs	Administration
FAIR Training	K-5	Reading Coaches	School-Wide	8/14/2012	Monitor FAIR Results	Assessment Teacher
Instructional Implications	K-5	Reading Coaches	School-Wide	10/23, 10/30,11/6/ 2012	Monitor FAIR Results	Assessment Teacher
Text Complexity	K-5	Reading Coaches	School-Wide	9/18, 10/2, 10/9/2012	Monitor FAIR Results, and Administrative Walk-throughs	Assessment Teacher and Administration

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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
Shipping charges to replace existing curriculum pieces	Treasures consumables	Textbook Budget	$ 343.00
Marie Carbo Power Packs	Reading Comprehension materials	Title I	$ 2,242.00
SRA Kits	Leveled Reading passages w/ Reading Comprehension questions	Title I	$24,000.00
Subtotal: $26,585.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Pearson SuccessMaker 5.0 (Upgrade)	Computer program designed to target students' needs in Reading	Title I	$18,000.00
Subtotal: $18,000.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Instruction on Differentiated groups/ strategies, materials/resources for scaffolding instruction and review of data	Reading Core Curriculum and FCRR materials	Title II	$3,684.80
Phonemic Awareness/Phonics	Reading Core Curriculum, SRA Kits, FCRR materials	Title II	$3,684.80
Substitute Teachers for PLC's	Teachers receiving Professional Development in Reading	Title I	$13,333.33
Subtotal: $ 20,702.93			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Fluency Timers	Timers are used for oral reading fluency assessments and progress monitoring.	Title I	$455.00
Subtotal:$455.00			
Total:$65,742.93			

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. Limited listening and speaking opportunities are provided for ELL's during mainstream English/LA classes to support accurate measures and gains.	1.1. Computerized instruction provided by the ESOL paraprofessional or Developmental Language Arts teacher using Rosetta Stone English level 1,2,3 to reinforce the mastery of concepts and skills for deficient areas in listening and speaking. Additional one-on-one Reading opportunities and practice including multiple listening and reading opportunities will be provided during the LA Block.	1.1. ESOL Teacher, ESOL Paraprofessional, Classroom Teacher	1.1. Walk-throughs, Lesson Plans	1.1. FAIR CELLA	
CELLA Goal #1: *26% of our ELL students will demonstrate proficiency.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: *22.73% (5 out of 22 students)*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

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

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1. Additional training for mainstream, English/LA classroom teachers in best practices, targeted instruction, and effective strategies in Reading for ELL students is needed.	2.1. ESOL paraprofessional will assist in providing needed support in group and individualized settings utilizing bilingual instruction and ESOL instructional learning strategies focused on particular areas of deficiencies and supportive building blocks such as vocabulary development and comprehension techniques.	2.1. Administration	2.1. Walk-throughs and Lesson plans	2.1. FAIR Testing CELLA	
CELLA Goal #2: *35% of our ELL students will demonstrate Reading proficiency on the 2013 FCAT.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	31.82% (7 out of 22)					
		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.	2.1. Multiple writing opportunities are not provided for ELL students during the mainstream English/LA classes to support accurate measures and gains.	2.1. Additional one-on-one writing opportunities and small group practice will be provided during the 90 minute Reading Block.	2.1. Administration	2.1. Walk-throughs and Lesson Plans	2.1. DWAP, FCAT 2.0 CELLA	
CELLA Goal #3: *26% of our ELL students will demonstrate Writing proficiency on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 exam.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	22.73% (5 out of 22 students).					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

1A. FCAT 2.0: **Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.**	1A.1. Instruction focuses on lecture and procedural teaching practices rather than inquiry-based teaching methods.	1A.1. Teachers will be required to attend monthly trainings on Inquiry-based teaching methods and best practices for mathematics instruction.	1A.1. Math Resource Teacher Assistant Principal Principal	1A.1. Classroom Walkthroughs Training Follow-ups Lesson Plan Monitoring	1A.1. Topic Assessments Performance Matters FCIM Assessments FCAT 2.0 Teacher Observations	
Mathematics Goal #1A: *To increase the number of students receiving a level 3 on 2013 FCAT 2.0 by 4 percentage points to 40%*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	36.03% (98 out of 272)	*39%*				
		1A.2. Effectively using time allotted for Math instruction.	1A.2. *Strategically planning lessons and activities that can be completed within 60 minutes *Working with teachers to structure their math block with precision	1A.2. Math Resource Teacher Assistant Principal Principal	1A.2. Lesson Plan Reflections/Monitoring Training Follow-ups Classroom Walkthroughs & Observations	1A.2. Teacher Observations
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.**	1B.1. Students are not allowed time to struggle with mathematical problems.	1B.1. Explicitly instruct students in solving problems by using think-aloud techniques when modeling how to solve problems	1B.1 Math Resource Teacher ESE Resource Teacher.	1B.1. Lesson Plan Monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs & Observations	1B.1. Student Assessments Performance Matters FCAT 2.0	

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

Mathematics Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1. Students lack the opportunities to engage in higher order thinking (H.O.T.) activities.	2A.1. Teachers will receive training on "Good Questioning" techniques, making sure to touch on WEBB's complexity levels. Teachers will learn to incorporate "real-world" math/ problem solving in their daily instruction and centers.	2A.1. Math Resource Teacher Assistant Principal Principal	2A.1. Lesson Plan Monitoring (looking specifically for HOT questions); Training Follow-ups Classroom Walkthroughs/ Observations Teacher created centers and assessments that include HOT activities/questions	2A.1. Teacher observations FCAT 2.0 Performance Matters FCIM assessments		
Mathematics Goal #2A: _To increase the number of students receiving levels 4 & 5 on FCAT 2.0 by 3 percentage points_	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	20.22% (55 out of 272)	**23%**					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	

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

2B. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1. Lack of teacher data analysis and allowing data to guide instruction of student needs.	3A.1. Teachers will be required to participate in grade level and individual data-chat meetings with other teachers of their grade level and administration to plan and implement lessons that meet the students' needs based on data collected from district assessments.	3A.1. Math Resource Teacher Assessment Teacher Assistant Principal Principal	3A.1. Data Chat Forms/Reflections Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs/ Observations	3A.1. Performance Matters Topic Assessments		
Mathematics Goal #3A: *To increase the number of students making learning gains by 3.16 percentage points to 70%*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	66.84% (127 out of 190)	70%					

		3A.2. Students are unaware of their progress or lack of progress over time, resulting in a lack of motivation to make gains or strides to reach personal goals.	3A.2. Teachers and students will have monthly data-chats within the classroom to make students aware of their progress and to set achievable goals to ensure success.	3A.2. Classroom Teachers Assessment Teacher	3A.2. Students Data Chat Forms Classroom Data Displays	3A.2. Performance Matters Topic Assessments Weekly Facts Tests FCAT 2.0	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**	3B.1. Instruction focuses on lecture and procedural teaching practices	3B.1. Instructional methods will incorporate hands-on materials and pictorial representations	3B.1. ESE Resource Teacher Math Resource Teacher	3B.1. Lesson Plans Monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs/ Observations	3B.1. Student Assessments		
Mathematics Goal #3B: *To increase the number of students making learning gains in the mathematics portion of the FAA by 100%*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0%0 out of 1)	*100% (1 out of 1)*					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1. Lack of time within the math block to remediate students with specific deficits in math.	4A.1. School-wide remediation time allowing teachers time to remediate students as needed, as well as support personnel to assist meeting all students with deficits in math.	4A.1. RtI Coordinator Assistant Principal Assessment Teacher Math Resource Teacher Principal Classroom Teachers	4A.1. Remediation/RtI Fidelity Logs Data Collected through progress monitoring of skills being taught.	4A.1. RtI graphs and charts Topic Tests Performance Matters FCAT 2.0		
Mathematics Goal #4A: *To increase the number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 3 percentage points to 69%*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	66% (35 out of 53)	69%					
		4A.2. Lack of differentiated instruction in Math	4A.2. Teachers will use flexible, small group instruction, center activities and digital learning to reinforce and extend learning.	4A.2. Classroom Teachers Assistant Principal Math Resource Teacher Principal	4A.2. Monitoring of Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs/ Observations	4A.2. Topic Assessments Performance Matters FCAT 2.0	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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

4B. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	**56%**	**60%**	**64%**	**68%**	**72%**	**76%**
Mathematics Goal #5A: *To decrease the number of students within the achievement gap by 50% by the year 2016-2017 by a gradual decline of 4 percentage points from 2012-2014, and increase the decline by 5 percentage points.*							
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		

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Lack of examining resources and materials available for cultural sensitivity and adjusting materials, resources, and the lesson design as appropriate to meet student needs.	5B.1. Make teachers aware of resources available through Pearson to help in designing lessons to meet learning styles and cultural needs of students.	5B.1. Math Resource Teacher Assistant Principal	5B.1. Training Follow-up Monitoring of Lesson Plans	5B.1. Topic Assessments Performance Matters FCAT 2.0		
Mathematics Goal #5B: *To increase the number of students making satisfactory progress in each ethnic subgroup.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: 43%(96 out of 221 Black: 75% (9 out of 12) Hispanic: 38% (10 out of 26) Asian: NA American Indian: NA	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White:40% Black:72% Hispanic:35% Asian: NA American Indian: NA					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. Lack of examining resources and materials available for cultural sensitivity and adjusting materials, resources, and the lesson design as appropriate to meet student needs.	5C.1. Make teachers aware of resources available through Pearson to help in designing lessons to meet learning stles and cultural needs of students.	5C.1. Math Resource Teacher Assistant Principal	5C.1. Training Follow-up Monitoring of Lesson Plans	5C.1. Topic Assessments Performance Matters FCAT 2.0		
Mathematics Goal #5C: *To increase the number of ELL students making progress in mathematics by 3 percentage points to 67%*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	64% (7 out of 11)	*67%*					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.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		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. Lack of carefully designed lessons that accommodate the learning needs of students and collaboration between ESE co-teachers and General Ed. teachers	5D.1. General Education teachers and ESE teachers will collaborate in planning lessons that meet the learning needs of all students, ensuring that SWD are inclusive in planned activities.	5D.1. Classroon Teacher ESE Teacher Math Resource Teacher Assistant Principal Principal	5D.1. Lesson Plan Monitoring Classroom Walkthroughs/ Observations	5D.1. Topic Assessments Performance Matters FCAT 2.0		
Mathematics Goal #5D: *To increase the number of Students with Disabilities making progress in mathematics by 3 percentage points to 62%*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	59% (13 out of 22)	62% (					
		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

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 lacking problem solving strategies and Reading comprehension skills with Mathematics.	5E.1. Teachers will learn to implement "real-world" problem solving strategies in their instruction and equip students to tackle problems with success. Teachers will participate in monthly, Inquity-based strategies trainings to help learn how to improve mathematics instruction.	5E.1. Classroom Teachers Math Resource Teacher Assistant Principal Principal	5E.1. Classroom Walkthroughs/ Observations Lesson Plan Monitoring	5E.1. Performance Matters Topic Tests FCAT 2.0		
Mathematics Goal #5E: *To increase the number of Economically Disadvantaged Students making progress in Mathematics by 3 percentage points to 50%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	47% (99 out of 211)	*50% (*					

| | | 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
Inquiry-Based Math Strategies	K-5	Math Resource Teacher	Math Teachers	Monthly throughout the year	Training Follow-up Activities	Tina Cordova
Journaling in Mathematics	K-5	Assistant Principal	Tune-up Tuesday	9/25/12 (k-1)l 10/2/12 (2-3); 10/9/12 (4-5)	Classroom Walkthroughs	Gina Michalicka
CCSS Trainings - Mathematical Practices	2-5	District Personnel	Grade Level Teachers of Mathematics	Gr. 2: Nov. 28-30, 2012 Gr.3: Oct 25-26, 29, 2012 Gr. 4: Oct. 22-24, 2012 Gr. 5: Oct 15 - 17, 2012	ERO Evaluations Classroom Walkthroughs	Tina Cordova

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

<u>Mathematics Budget</u> (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
PearsonSuccessMaker 5.0	Computer Program designed to target students needs in math.	Title I	$18,000
Subtotal: $18,000.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Math Resource Teacher	Salary	Title I	60,000.00
Subtotal: $60,000.00			
Total:$78,000.00			

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		

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

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. Students require more preparation through classroom instruction and assessment with respect to questions representing different levels of cognitive complexity (ex: Webb's Depth of Knowledge).	1A.1. Science K-5 teachers must include different levels of cognitive complexity questions and incorporate inquiry based learning activities, science vocabulary, scientific thinking and reasoning skills, and writing opportunities in instruction and assessment. Provide data chats at each respective site for grades K-	1A.1. Administration, Science Resource Teacher Assessment Teacher	1A.1. Review and analysis of walkthrough data, test data and discussion of needed improvement in implementation of science core curriculum. Student Data Chats	1A.1. FCAT 2.0 Student Data Chats		

	8 to review progress monitoring (Performance Matters) and statewide assessment results for FCAT science (grades 5 and 8).					
Science Goal #1A: Science proficiency assessed at a level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 37% to 40%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	37% (36)	**40%**				
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	

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

Science Goal #1B: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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. Lack of teachers conducting inquiry based activities, demonstration, and/ or lab experiments on a regular basis.	2A.1. Teachers will implement SUMS Science Components in their Science instruction. Science Resource teacher will supplement classroom with "hands-on" lab activities. All students in grades 3-5 are required to complete a Science Fair Project.	2A.1. Classroom Teacher Science Resource teacher, Science Fair Coordinator	2A.1. SUMS Evaluation tool, Science Fair Rubric and judging	2A.1. Performance Matters Progress Monitoring Data FCAT		

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

Science Goal #2A: Science proficiency assessed at a level 4.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 8% to 13%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	8% (8)	**13%**					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.**	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Science Goal #2B: **NA**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	

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

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

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Text Complexity incorporating Science through LA Block	K-5	Reading Coaches	PLC	9/18, 10/2, 10/9/2012	Lesson Plans & Administrative Walk-throughs	Administration
Science K-5 Fusion Training #1	K-5	Houghton-Mifflin	District-Wide	Sept 20, 2012	Lesson Plans & Administrative Walk-throughs, ERO follow up	Administration
Science K-5 Fusion Training #2	K-5	Houghton-Mifflin	District-Wide	Oct 12. 2012	Lesson Plans & Administrative Walk-throughs, ERO follow up	Administration
Science K-5 Fusion Training #3	K-5	Houghton-Mifflin	District-Wide	Jan 24, 2013	Lesson Plans & Administrative Walk-throughs, ERO follow up	Administration

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			

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

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

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Shipping only for student texts/on-line interactive program	Freight for materials	Title I	$404.00
Subtotal:$404.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:$404.00			
Total:$404.00			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

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

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

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

1A. FCAT: **Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.5 and higher in writing.**	1A.1 Lack of common instru ctional materials to be used in the instructio n, practice and applica tion of Writing Conventio ns.	1A.1. Common grammar and conve ntions instru ctional materials have been provided for ALL teachers in grades K-5. A common assessmen t has been created from these materials for grade 2. DWAP Conve ntions Asses sment has been created from these materials for grades	1A.1. Writing Resource Teacher, Assessment Teacher, Administration	1A.1. Analysis of DWAP assessments, Grade Quick, and journal review	1A.1. DWAP, FCAT	

		3 & 4.					
Writing Goal #1A: Writing proficiency assessed at a level 3.5 or higher on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 34% to 39%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	34% (38) of our grade 4 students scored a 3.5 or higher.	39% (34) of our fourth grade students will score a level 3.5 or higher.					
		1A.2. Limited time allocated for Writing.	1A.2. The extended Language Arts Block fuses both Reading and Writing. Writing can now be included in center and direct instruction times. School-wide implementation of daily journal writing in grades K-5 will take place during this block of time to increase writing practice and improve proficiency.	1A.2. Administration	1A.2. Analysis of DWAP assessments, Grade Quick and journal review	1A.2. DWAP, FCAT	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		

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

Writing Goal #1B: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

Writing instruction, modeling, and co-teaching for all grade 4 teachers and students will be mandated 3X/week for 45/minutes per session. Instruction will be focused on Expository and Narrative Writing with additional focus on the conventions of writing. After FCAT, teachers and students in grades 2 and 3 will attend.	Grade 3 & 4, Writing	Writing Resource Teacher	All grade 3 & 4 Writing Teachers and students	3 days/week for 45 minutes commencing in August and ending after FCAT for grade 4. Immediately following FCAT, grades 2 & 3 will meet 2X/week for 30 minute sessions.	DWAP student performance, Principal's Writing Challenges, Grade level assessments	Writing Resource teacher, Assessment teacher
Writer's Club: For student enrichment and parental involvement, students and parents will be invited to meet weekly to enhance writing proficiency in the areas of narrative and expository writing.	Grade 4 Writing	Writing Resource Teacher	Students in grade 4 scoring a level 4 or higher on DWAP 1, parents/ guardians	60 minutes/week commencing in September and ending in April	DWAP , Principal's Writing Challenges,	Writing Resource teacher

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

Provide instruction on revised grading of FCAT reflecting the closer attention to conventions; Strategies training: Kwik Write, Unlocking a Prompt Grabber, Take-Away Ending Create a writing folder, Working w/ Six Traits	Grades 2,3,4,5 Writing	Writing Resource Teacher	Teachers in grades 2,3,4,5	PLC's (Tune-up Tuesdays) Ongoing from 9/25	Scoring proficiency on DWAP and Principal's Challenges, Grade Quick	Writing Resource Teacher
Reading/Writing Connection	Grades K-5	Reading Coaches	Teachers in grades K-5	PLC's 10/23, 10/30, 11/6,	Lesson Plans	Administration
FCAT 2.0 Scoring using Anchor papers	Grades 3-4	Writing Resource	Teachers in grades 3 & 4		DWAP, Grade Quick	Administration

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
Student materials	Pencils, paper, marble composition books for journals.	Title I	1,500.00
Subtotal: $1,500.00			
Technology			
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

Writing Resource Teacher	Provide Professional Development, modeling and instruction for teachers and students	Title I	60,000.00
Subtotal: $60,000.00			
Total: $61,500.00			

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance					
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Attendance	1.1. Lack of communication regarding District-wide attendance policy.	1.1. Our school newsletter and Edline will provide the District-wide attendance policy. The SBLT will target students with high absenteeism and communicate with parents. Follow up meetings with Assistant Principal and Guidance Counselor for students in danger of truancy as per district attendance policy	1.1. Guidance Counselor Assistant Principal Social Worker	1.1. SBLT will review monthly attendance to monitor progress. Truancy Process	1.1 Attendance Data Truancy Documentation	

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

Attendance Goal #1: *By 2013 PGES will maintain or improve the average daily attendance by 1%.*	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	93%	**94%**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	285 students 46%	**282 students 45%**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	59 10%	**53 9%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with						

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

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
Monthly data meeting with Leadership team	K-5	Assistant Principal	Leadership Team	Monthly	Monthly SBLT review and follow up with counselor/social worker on chronically absent students	Administration

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

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

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

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	1.1. Students and staff lack a consistent understanding of behavioral expectations on campus.	1.1. Develop school-wide expectations and location specific rules for all areas of campus; teams will work together to clearly communicate behavioral expectations.	1.1. Classroom teachers and Administration	1.1. Classroom and campus Administrative Walk-throughs	1.1. Discipline tracking sheet RtI: B reports of ODR's	
Suspension Goal #1: *PGES will decrease the number of students who receive suspensions by 1%*	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions				
	118 *19%*	*106* *17%*				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School				

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

	66 *11%*	*60* *10%*				
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
	21 3%	*19 3%*				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School				
	11 2%	*10 1%*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

1. Parent Involvement	1.1. Transportation, other commitments, work schedules and possible apprehension of importance of parent involvement in school activities.	1.1. Parents will be invited to participate in a series of parental involvement workshops and community / business partner activities at a variety of different times and days throughout the year to accommodate various parent schedules. Global Messaging system and personal phone calls (as time allows) to encourage parental participation and make parents feel more welcome.	1.1. Title I Parent Educator and Title I School Improvement Facilitator	1.1. Analysis of Title I Surveys and Event Response Form	1.1. Event Response Form and Capacity Building Report form.		

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

Parent Involvement Goal #1: Increase parental involvement for the 2012-13 school year based on all activities, parent workshops, and community/business partner activities.	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*				
	33% (826 families) per our capacity building form from 2011-12.	36% (851 families) per our capacity building form.				

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Parental Engagement Training focusing on Danielson Framework Domain 4.	K-5th grade	Title I Parent Educator and Title I School Improvement Facilitator	PLC sessions for each grade level	9/27/2012	Sign-in sheets from PLCs, continued follow-up at team meeting with Title I Parent Educator and Title I School Improvement Facilitator.	Administration, Title I Parent Educator and Title I School Improvement Facilitator

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
Parent Educator	Salary	Title I	$36,772.45
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Training for PGES teachers on		Title I	0
Best Practices in the area of PI			
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Materials and Supplies for Family Center	Consumables	Title I	$4,750
Subtotal: $41522.45			
Total: $41522.45			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: *Increase of Science instruction and student performance in FCAT Science for 5th grade. To also increase the instruction in Science in grades 3-5.* *Level 3 and above was 43.69% for 5the grade ONLY*	1.1. Insufficient time in daily schedule due to other core curriculum mandates. Fidelity of instruction at scheduled Science time. Difficulty incorporating Science in other core subjects.	1.1. Assist teachers in integration of Science in other core curriculum subjects. Walkthroughs to offer PD through PD360 to teachers that are having difficulty integrating Science into other core curriculum areas.	1.1. Administration SBLT	1.1. Performance Matters benchmark test(2 per year) to disaggregate areas of weakness .	1.1. Walkthroughs and Performance Matters assessments

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE 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
<u>CTE Goal #1:</u> *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE 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					

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

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

CTE 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 CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

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

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

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total: $65,742.93
CELLA Budget
Total:
Mathematics Budget
Total:$78,000
Science Budget
Total:$404.00
Writing Budget
Total:$61,500
Civics Budget
Total:
U.S. History Budget
Total:
Attendance Budget
Total:
Suspension Budget
Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:
Parent Involvement Budget
Total:$36,772.45
STEM Budget
Total:
CTE Budget
Total:
Additional Goals
Total:
Grand Total:$242,419.38

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.

X 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.
Support school initiatives which align to identified data weaknesses such as: Math, Reading, Science, Writing, etc.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount

FCAT breakfast	$500.00
Funding for School initiatives	$500.00