Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

Name of School: **Area:**

AREA I

JUPITER ELEMENTARY

Principal: **Area Superintendent:**

DR. MARK MULLINS

CYNTHIA H. HARRIS

SAC Chairperson:

STACY CIRINO

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

Jupiter Elementary is a collaborative and diverse community that focuses on engaging each child with a challenging and rigorous curriculum that fosters creativity, innovation and literacy for the 21st century.

Vision Statement:

Jupiter Elementary School will challenge our diverse community of learners, establish a positive and productive school culture, set high expectations for achievement, and encourage independent, self-directed learning.

Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

CHART A: Shows the different reporting categories in the area of reading and math for 3rd grade. Students were considered proficient by a set percentage (70% was the target…some percentages may be a little higher/lower depending on the amount of points given to a particular reporting strand).

Grade Level Tested READING	Vocabulary Possible Points	Students scoring at 71% or higher (5/7)	Percent	Reading Application Possible Points	Students scoring at 70% or higher (14/20)	Percent	Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction Possible Points	Students scoring at 70% or higher (7/10)	Percent	Informational Text/ Research Process Points	Students scoring at 75% or higher (6/8)	Percent
3rd 105 Tested	7	80	76%	20	45	43%	10	71	68%	8	60	57%
3rd	Criteria Not Met	25	24%		60	57%		34	32%		45	43%

Grade Level Tested MATH	Number: Operations, Problems, and Statistics Possible Points	Students scoring at 71% or higher (15/21)	Percent	Number: Fractions Possible Points	Students scoring at 70% or higher (7/10)	Percent	Geometry and Measurement Possible Points	Students scoring at 69% or higher (9/13)	Percent			
3rd 106 Tested	21	62	58%	10	43	41%	13	65	61%			
3rd	Criteria Not Met	44	42%		63	59%		41	39%			

CHART B: Shows the different reporting categories in the area of reading and math for 4th grade. Students were considered proficient by a set percentage (70% was the target…some percentages may be a little higher/lower depending on the amount of points given to a particular reporting strand).

Grade Level Tested READING	Vocabulary Possible Points	Students scoring at 75% or higher (6/8)	Percent	Reading Application Possible Points	Students scoring at 69% or higher (11/16)	Percent	Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction Possible Points	Students scoring at 69% or higher (9/13)	Percent	Informational Text/ Research Process Points	Students scoring at 75% or higher (6/8)	Percent
4th 101 Tested	8	63	62%	16	73	72%	13	51	50%	8	65	64%
4th	Criteria Not Met	38	37%		28	25%		50	50%		36	36%

Grade Level Tested MATH	Number: Operations and Problems Possible Points	Students scoring at 72% or higher (13/18)	Percent	Number: Base Ten and Fractions Possible Points	Students scoring at 70% or higher (7/10)	Percent	Geometry and Measurement Possible Points	Students scoring at 75% or higher (9/12)	Percent			
4th 101 Tested	18	55	54%	10	53	53%	12	25	24%			
4th	Criteria Not Met	46	45%		48	48%		75	74%			

CHART C: Shows the different reporting categories in the area of reading, math and science for 5th grade. Students were considered proficient by a set percentage (70% was the target…some percentages may be a little higher/lower depending on the amount of points given to a particular reporting strand).

Grade Level Tested READING	Vocabulary Possible Points	Students scoring at 78% or higher (7/9)	Percent	Reading Application Possible Points	Students scoring at 71% or higher (10/14)	Percent	Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction Possible Points	Students scoring at 75% or higher (6/8)	Percent	Informational Text/ Research Process Points	Students scoring at 75% or higher 10/14)	Percent
5th 101 Tested	9	51	50%	14	43	43%	8	52	51%	14	41	41%
5th	Criteria Not Met	50	50%		58	57%		48	49%		59	59%

Grade Level Tested MATH	Number: Base Ten and Fractions Possible Points	Students scoring at 73% or higher (16/22)	Percent	Expressions, Equations, and Statistics Possible Points	Students scoring at 70% or higher (7/10)	Percent	Geometry and Measurement Possible Points	Students scoring at 71% or higher (10/14)	Percent			
5th 101 Tested	22	19	19%	10	28	28%	14	30	30%			
5th	Criteria Not Met	82	81%		73	72%		71	70%			

Grade Level Tested SCIENCE	Nature of Sciences Points Possible	Students scoring at 70% or higher (7/10)	Percent	Earth and Space Sciences Points Possible	Students scoring at 75% or higher (12/16)	Percent	Life Sciences Points Possible	Students scoring at 70% or higher (7/10)	Percent	Physical Science Points Possible	Students scoring at 75% or higher (12/16)	Percent
5th 100 Tested	10	40	40%	16	22	22%	16	24	24%	10	54	54%
5th	Criteria Not Met	60	60%		78	78%		76	76%		46	52%

CHART D: Shows the different reporting categories in the area of reading and math for 6th grade. Students were considered proficient by a set percentage (70% was the target…some percentages may be a little higher/lower depending on the amount of points given to a particular reporting strand).

Grade Level Tested READING	Vocabulary Possible Points	Students score	Percent	Reading Application Possible Points	Students scoring at 71	Percent	Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction	Students scoring at 71% or	Percent	Informational Text/ Research Process	Students scoring at 67	Percent

		ing at 75% or high er (6/8)			% or high her (12/17)		Poss ible Points	high her (10/14)		Point s	% or high her (4/6)	
6th 89 Tested	8	53	60%	17	51	57 %	14	61	69 %	6	53	60%
6th	Criteria Not Met	36	40%		38	43 %		28	31 %		36	40%
Grade Level Tested MATH	Fractions, Ratios/ Propo rtional Relations hips and Statistics Possible Points	St ud en ts sc or in g at 72% or high er (13/18)	P er ce nt	Expre ssions and Equati ons Poss ible Points	Stu de nts sc ori ng at 71 % or hig her (12/17)	P e r c e n t	Geo metry and Meas urem ent Poss ible Points	Stu de nts sc orin g at 78% or hig her (7/9)	P e r c e n t			

6th 89 Tested	18	40	45%	17	55	62 %	9	39	44 %			
6th	Criteria Not Met	49	55%		34	38 %		50	56 %			

CHART E – This data shows FCAT 2.0 in the area of reading. It is broken down into the content reporting strands and what percentage of the students scored as close to 70% proficiency as possible. This data compares the students as they move from grade level to grade level on the FCAT 2.0.

	Vocab	Reading Application	Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction	Information Text and Research Process
3rd Grade 2010-2011	64%	38%	68%	25%
4th Grade 2011-2012	62%	72%	50%	64%

	Vocab	Reading Application	Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction	Information Text and Research Process
4th Grade 2010-2011	38%	43%	39%	63%
5th Grade 2011-2012	50%	43%	51%	41%

	Vocab	Reading Application	Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction	Information Text and Research Process
5th Grade 2010-2011	52%	46%	54%	36%
6th Grade 2011-2012	60%	57%	69%	60%

CHART F – This data shows FCAT 2.0 in the area of math. It is

broken down into the content math strands and what percentage of the students scored as close to 70% proficiency as possible. This data compares the students as they move from grade level to grade level on the FCAT 2.0.

	Number: Operations, Problems, and Statistics	Number: Fractions	Geometry and Measurement
3rd Grade 2010-2011	45%	33%	49%
4th Grade 2011-2012	54%	53%	24%

	Number: Operations and Problems	Number: Base Ten and Fractions	Geometry and Measurement
4th Grade 2010-2011	48%	41%	33%
5th Grade 2011-2012	NA -express	19%	30%

	Fractions, Ratios/ Proportional Relationships and Statistics	Expressions and Equations	Geometry and Measurement
5th Grade 2010-2011	35% only base ten/ fractions	48%	16%
6th Grade 2011-2012	45%	62%	44%

CHART G – This data shows FCAT 2.0 in the area of reading and math. It is broken down into the reporting categories This data compares the grade level (different students each year) overall as a whole during the 2010-2011 year and the 2011-2012 school year. This chart will also show that in the area of reading from year to year, the amount of points in each reporting category changes. However, in the area of mathematics it has stayed

constant.

3rd Grade - Reading	2010-2011	Met Criteria	2011-2012	Met Criteria
Vocab	8	64%	7	76%
Reading Application	16	38%	20	43%
Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction	12	68%	10	68%
Information Text and Research Process	9	25%	8	57%
3rd Grade - Math	2010-2011	Met Criteria	2011-2012	Met Criteria
Number: Operations, Problems, and Statistics	21	45%	21	58%
Numbe:r Fractions	10	33%	10	41%
Geometry and Measurement	13	49%	13	61%
4th Grade – Reading				
Vocab	7	38%	8	62%
Reading Application	19	43%	16	72%
Literay Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction	11	39%	13	50%
Informational Text and Research Process	8	63%	8	64%
4th Grade – Math				
Number: Operations and Problems	17	48%	18	54%
Number: Base Ten and Fraction	11	41%	10	53%
Geometry and Measurement	12	33%	12	24%
5th Grade – Reading				
Vocab	8	52%	9	50%
Reading Application	17	46%	14	43%
Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction	12	54%	8	51%
Information Text and Research Process	8	36%	14	41%
5th Grade – Math				
Number: Base Ten and Fractions	22	35%	22	19%

Expressions, Equations, and Statistics	10	48%	10	28%
Geometry and Measurement	14	16%	14	30%
6th Grade – Reading				
Vocab	8	76%	8	60%
Reading Application	17	51%	17	57%
Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction	12	52%	14	69%
Informational Text and Research Process	8	62%	6	60%
6th Grade – Math				
Fractions, Ratios/ Proportional Relationships and Statistics	18	58%	18	45%
Expressions and Equations	17	75%	17	62%
Geometry and Measurement	9	35%	9	44%

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

Yearly, Jupiter teachers collaboratively establish an instructional focus for our School Improvement Plan. In 2011-12 we studied Marzano's strategies. For 2012-13, we reviewed Marzano and linked that research to Max Thompson's 2012 summer training," Creating a High-Performance Learning Culture". Our targeted goal, "To improve core level instruction through differentiated instruction facilitated by Professional Learning Communities," can best be improved by implementation of a research-based focus on nonlinguistic representations, graphic organizers, across the curricula and direct purposeful instruction in content specific vocabulary. Research shows that:

- ***Students learn best when the focus is on learning tailored to them.***
- In differentiated instruction, teachers focus on essentials; attend to student differences; modify content, process, and products; balance group and individual norms; flexibly work and collaborate with students; plan for all students to participate in respectful work; and know that assessment and instruction are inseparable (Tomlinson, 1999)
- ***Students need to know vocabulary in order to read and write about text.***
- The link between word knowledge and comprehension of content area text and quality writing makes common sense and is well established by research. (Beck, Perfetti, & McKeown, 1982; Blachowicz & Fisher, 2000)
- ***Students need formative assessments to determine what they know and what they don't know both to guide teachers to plan instruction and to give students themselves goals for their learning.***
- Math texts have been found to include "more concepts per word, per sentence, and per paragraph than any other subject area" (Schell, 1982)

- ***Students need to be engaged in their learning—understanding the vocabulary is essential.***
- Not knowing the terminology of the content compromises students' ability to inquire in the discipline and makes students "outsiders" to the discipline (Readence et. al., 1985)
- ***Student engagement is key strategy for learning and so is remembering what they learn.***
- Engaging students in nonlinguistic representations, i.e., graphic organizers, stimulates and increases activity in the brain (Gerlic & Jausovec, 1999)
- ***Nonlinguistic representation is differentiated instruction at its best and creation is the top of Bloom's Taxonomy.***
- A variety of activities produce nonlinguistic representations. (Marzano,2001; Max Thompson, 2012)
- ***Students need to learn how to explain their thinking and to justify the process.***
- Nonlinguistic representations elaborate on knowledge and are enhanced by asking students to explain and justify their elaborations. (Willoughby, etal., 1997; Marzano, 2001; Max Thompson, 2012)

Research cited supports effective instruction that:

- incorporates differentiated instruction aligned with student needs determined by formative assessments
- employs direct content vocabulary modeling, discussion, writing, and application
- uses nonlinguistic representations created by students with higher order questioning

Jupiter teachers engaged in Professional Learning Communities will improve their craft and use best practices in 2012-13 through peer collaborative discussions, developing common assessments, encouraging student created nonlinguistic representations, coaching student conversations and thinking/ questioning strategies, and using content based vocabulary in real life applications.

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

Reading:

The District adopted reading program, Treasures, enters its fifth year of implementation. Veteran teachers confidently teach the necessary skills and strategies following the pacing guide. New teachers collaborate and plan with the veterans to maximize their learning. The ninety minute reading block is scheduled with fidelity and encompasses whole group, differentiated small groups, vocabulary study, phonemic awareness/phonics (as needed), writing, Reader's Theater, and independent reading. Teachers use interest inventories and parent surveys to pinpoint student and parent interests and needs. Student goal setting and conferencing with students support student independence in the learning process. Supplemental resources include Success Maker, Triumphs, PASI/PSI, Heggerty, Scholastic Reading Inventory, Reading Counts, Text Talk, Million Word Challenge, Reading Club, Writing Club, book resources, and after school programs. Common planning for grade levels facilitates regular reading discussion of data, forming flexible groups for remediation, mini PD training, creation of common assessments, and setting/on-going adjustment of team Smart Goals. Kindergarten-second grade teacher leaders attended the CCSS training in 2011-12. K-2 teams were trained during the summer of 2012 with K-2 ready to fully implement the CCSS in 2012-13. The Literacy Coach, Title I teachers and assistants provide support for the reading program through book talks, modeling, professional development, providing classroom libraries, small group tutoring, mentoring, conferencing with teachers and students, and reading with students.

As we reflect on student achievement from 2011-12 FCAT 2.0 in reading, student data shows an increase from projected scores in third grade to actual achievement scores in level 4's and 5's from projected 24 to actual 32. Projected level three's increased and projected level two's decreased. What accounted for this change? Reading Counts and the Million Word Challenge immediately came to mind. The grade level that showed the most fidelity in reading outside of the 90 minute block was third grade with 100% participation. Their success validates Jupiter's belief that reading does count. We need to encourage more replication in our other grade levels.

The Reading Vertical Team was established to forge links among grade levels and to develop a greater understanding of the CCSS spiral of reading/language arts learning and instruction. The team developed a parent survey for 2012-13 to help identify parent/student needs.

Reading Intervention:

Students in Kindergarten through sixth grade participate in extended reading time for both remediation and enrichment. Grade level teams (PLC's) determine student needs by reviewing data of FCAT 1's and 2's, lowest 25%, and individual student concerns at weekly grade level meetings. They review summative assessment (FCAT), formative assessments (District placement tests, FAIR, FLKRS, Running Records, PASI/PSI), and common assessments, created by the grade levels. Progress is monitored by but not limited to: the PASI/PSI, Running Records, comprehension portfolio pieces, sight word lists, reader's theater, common assessments, and Success Maker tracking. Materials used could include but not be limited to: Voyager, Rewards, Phonics Lesson Library, word building, FCRR binders. Students self-monitor as they learn to set personal goals for themselves. Achievements are celebrated. Teachers monitor on a weekly schedule with adjustments and flexible grouping changes determined by student needs and/or progress. Many Jupiter students also participate in Supplemental Educational Services (SES) after school at Jupiter, at off campus sites, or in students' homes. This program for economically disadvantaged students re-teaches and reinforces basic reading skills. Further, After School Programs at Jupiter run concurrently and reach additional students needing support. Finally, our School Aged Child Care program helps students with computer skills and reading homework while they're waiting for parental pick-up.

Reading Intervention, Tier 2 and 3:

Students that make progress more slowly than peers in their intervention group, class, or grade level are referred to the Multi-Tiered Student Support Team (MTSS) Here, teachers receive more targeted interventions to ensure student success. The frequency of the intervention is increased and the size of the intervention group is decreased. Sometimes more student information is needed; for example, vision/ hearing checks, modality screening, speech /language screening, individual, diagnostic testing, behavior plans. Parent input is an essential part of the process. Lindamod/Bell, Barton, and Starlite are examples of intense reading programs often used. If the targeted interventions are not showing progress over a specific period of time, students may be referred for special services.

Mathematics:

The District adopted math program, Envision, for K-5 is in its third year of implementation. Sixth grade utilizes *Florida Math Connects Plus.* Veteran teachers in all grade levels are implementing their respective series, confidently teaching the necessary skills and strategies, and following the pacing guide. New teachers collaborate and plan with the veterans to maximize their learning. Math classes are scheduled for a sixty minute block. New materials introduced in 2011-12 were Coming to Know Number and Number Talks . Teachers use the accompanying CD to watch math model lessons. The Math Coach also modeled lessons in classrooms. Common planning for grade levels facilitates regular math discussion of data, forming flexible groups for remediation, mini PD training, creation of common assessments, and setting/ on-going adjustment of team Smart Goals. The math CCSS launch team attended training in 2011-12. These Math Primary Contact, teacher leaders, trained the Kindergarten-Second grade teams in the math CCSS in the spring of 2012. Full implementation of the CCSS begins in the fall of 2012 for K-2. The Math Coach demonstrated research-based materials (Super Source, Van de Walle, Thinking Maps) during faculty and grade level meetings throughout the year. Additional interactive, laminated materials were distributed to grade level teams to encourage student engagement and math thinking processes.

The Math Vertical Team was established to forge links among grade levels and to develop a greater understanding of the CCSS spiral of mathematics learning and instruction. The team disaggregated and analyzed 2010-11/2011-12 math data to improve targeted mathematics instruction for 2012-13.

Jupiter hosts an active business partner, Kennedy Coast Credit Union, on our campus once per week. Our goal is to provide real life experiences in mathematics for fifth grade students. . Students are trained as bank tellers are trained on campus and visit the off site branch annually. This activity in 2012-13 will include more 5th and 6th grade students.

Our chief concern in mathematics for 2011-12 was the difficulty with geometry and measurement noted in the 2010-11 FCAT math scores. Teachers were encouraged to utilize more manipulatives and real-world application activities. More math common assessments will be created by the Math Vertical Team in 2012-13.

Math Intervention:

Students in Kindergarten through sixth grade participate in extended mathematics time for both remediation and enrichment. Grade level teams (PLC's) determine student needs by reviewing data of FCAT 1's and 2's, lowest 25%, and individual student concerns at weekly grade level meetings. They review summative assessment (FCAT), formative assessments (District placement tests, Success Maker, V-Math), and common assessments, created by the grade levels. Progress is monitored by but not limited to: Mad Minutes, V-Math, Success Maker, skill tests, and common assessments. Materials used could include but not be limited to: Acaletics, V-Math, Success Maker, FCAT Explorer, Math games. Students self-monitor as they learn to set personal goals for themselves. Achievements are celebrated. Teachers monitor on a weekly schedule with adjustments and flexible grouping changes determined by student needs and/or progress. Many Jupiter students also participate in Supplemental Educational Services (SES) after school at Jupiter, at off campus sites, or in students' homes. This program for economically disadvantaged students re-teaches and reinforces basic math skills. Further, After School Programs at Jupiter run concurrently and reach additional students needing support. Finally, our School Aged Child Care program helps students with computer skills and math homework while they're waiting for parental pick-up.

Math Intervention, Tier 2 and Tier 3:

Students that make progress more slowly than peers in their intervention group, class, or grade level are referred to the Multi-Tiered Student Support Team (MTSS) Here, teachers receive more targeted interventions to ensure student success. The frequency of the intervention is increased and the size of the intervention group is decreased. Sometimes more student information is needed; for example, vision/ hearing checks, modality screening, speech /language screening, individual, diagnostic testing, behavior plans. Parent input is an essential part of the process. If the targeted interventions are not showing progress over a specific period of time, students may be referred for special services.

Writing:

Kindergarten through sixth grade participated in writing instruction and assessment based on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. Teachers used the following resources to plan and initiate writing instruction: Brevard County Writing Plan, *Piece by Piece*, *Developing Artistic Writing with Engaging Literature*, *Developing the Craft*, *Developing Ideas*, and *Developing Writing+ Skills*. The District Resource Teacher for Writing provided professional development in every grade level. She also gave additional support for third and fourth teachers. Teachers used Anchor Sets from the state to help evaluate student writing and to be models for student writing. Jupiter students participated in the Young Authors' Conference and in Discovering Quality Literature. Jupiter maintained a 4.0 in writing for two consecutive years, 2009-10 and 2010-11.

Science:

In 2011-12, individual classroom teachers K-5 planned and implemented classroom science instruction based on the new science series, National Geographic Science aligned with Florida's science standards. For sixth grade, teachers use Discovery Education Science Techbook. Both these respective series include multiple hands-on, minds-on activities that provide science content and real-world connections. The technology piece was not up to expectations in the k-5 series, so the National Geographic sent their student magazine series to supplement the curriculum. Both students and teachers enjoyed the engagement of leveled periodicals in the classroom. Science scores at Jupiter were low in fifth grade for 2010-11. To support science teachers, students, and the science curriculum, Jupiter allocated a classroom for a science laboratory. A part time Title I teacher developed hands-on science activities for students in grades third through fifth. Teachers and administration hoped that a part time science lab would help students improve their scores on the Science portion of FCAT. FCAT Explorer for science was the

technology used.
Harris Super Science Saturdays (HSSS) were developed to engage students in extended time science inquiry. The program targeted fifth grade students and low performing sixth grade students, for five consecutive Saturdays. Attendance data showed 26 out of 28 or 93% students attended at least one day. Four (15%) attended 4 days; nine (30%) attended 3 days; six (20%) attended 2 days; four (15%) attended 1 day.
Grade five students attended an average of 4 out of 5 Saturdays. They scored an average of 2.3 on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 science assessment. Grade five students who did not attend HSSS score and average of 1.9 on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 science assessment. Attendance at HSSS definitely had a direct impact on student achievement.

CONTENT AREA:

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

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

Continuation of 2011-2012 - to improve core level instruction in reading and mathematics through differentiated instruction facilitated by Professional Learning Communities.

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

Barrier	*Action Steps*	*Person Responsible*	*Timetable*	*Budget*	*In-Process Measure*
1. 100% impleme ntation of differentiate d instruction due to DI training in year one, Stage 1 on DI Continuum.	1. Professional development Stage 2, DI	DItrainers, Administration	1st semester	Title 1 $1,000	Agenda, Calendar, Attendance records, follow up activities, training syllabus

2. 100% of teachers are not trained in nonlinguistic representations.	2. Professional development in nonlinguistic representations.	Literacy Coach	1st semester	N/A	Agenda, Calendar, Attendance records, follow up activities, training syllabus
3. 100% of grade level teams/PLC's have not identified common assessments for all content areas.	3.Identify grade level common assessments across the curricula.	Administration, District Resource Personnel, Literacy Coach, Math Coach, Vertical Teams	School year 2012-13	N/A	PLC meeting agendas/notes, Vertical Team agendas/notes, upload common assessments to share site.

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

Classroom observations will show that 100% of all Jupiter teachers are planning and implementing differentiated instruction lessons that meet student interests and needs. Every lesson will give students opportunities for choice in creating products that demonstrate mastery of concepts taught.
An end of the year teacher survey will include a personal reflection of 2012-13 instructional successes and teacher needs for professional development to improve their craft for school year 2013-14.

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

Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations:
In 2011-12, 59% of Jupiter students in grades 3-6 scored satisfactory progress in reading.
In 2012-13, 70% of Jupiter students in grades 3-6 will score satisfactory progress in reading.
In 2011-12, 54% of Jupiter students in grades 3-6 scored satisfactory progress in mathematics.
In 2012-13, 65% of Jupiter students in grades 3-6 will score satisfactory progress in mathematics.
In 2011-12, 0% of Jupiter students in grades 3-6 used data notebooks to form goals and track their progress.
In 2012-13, 50% of Jupiter students in grades 3-6 will use data notebooks to form goals and track their progress.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal **1.** Improve core level instruction in reading through differentiated instruction facilitated by Professional Learning Communities. 2. Improve comprehension of complex text through the use of graphic organizers/nonlinguistic representations.	**2012 Current Level of Performance** **(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance** **(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)**
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. New teachers to Brevard County in first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades who did participate in the foundational differentiated instruction professional development, Stage 1, last year. 2.Lack of concrete strategies to analyze and unearth complex structures, themes, and insights		
Strategy(s): 1. Provide Stage 1, Differentiated Instruction, professional development to new teachers by Differentiated Instruction Trainers as well as Stage 2 DI training, scheduled for veteran teachers. 2. Professional development needed for all teachers in how to use graphic organizers/nonlinguistic representations both for instruction and for student products in dissecting complex text and showing mastery of text.		

FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 ***Level 3, Goal:*** Increase the number of students scoring level 3 in reading in grades 3-6 from 30% or 116/392 students to 36% or 156/431 students—an increase of 6% or forty students. **Barrier(s):** 1. Lack of Differentiated Instruction training for new teachers. 2. Lack of concrete strategies to analyze and unearth complex structures, themes, and insights **Strategy(s):** 1. Provide Stage 1, Differentiated Instruction, professional development to new teachers by Differentiated Instruction Trainers as well as Stage 2 DI training, scheduled for veteran teachers 2. Professional development needed for all teachers in how to use graphic organizers/nonlinguistic representations both for instruction and for student products in dissecting complex text and showing mastery of text.	3rd Grade – 23% (24/104) 4TH Grade – 35% (34/98) 5th Grade – 24% (24/101) 6th Grade – 38% (34/89) Total for Achievement Level 3 – 30% (116/392)	3rd Grade – 32% +9% (34/106) 4th Grade – 40% +5% (44/110) 5th Grade 30% + 6% (34/112) 6th Grade – 43% +5% (44/103) Total for Achievement Level 3 – 36% +6% (156/431)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	

FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading ***Levels 4 & 5, Goal:*** Increase the number of students scoring level 4 & 5 in reading in grades 3-6 from 29% or 113/392 students to 35% or 153/431 students—and increase of 6% or 153/431 students. **Barrier(s):** 1. Lack of Differentiated Instruction training for new teachers in enrichment strategies. 2. Lack of concrete strategies to analyze and unearth complex structures, themes, and insights **Strategy(s):** 1. Provide Stage 1, Differentiated Instruction, professional development to new teachers by Differentiated Instruction Trainers as well as Stage 2 DI training, scheduled for veteran teachers. 2. Professional development needed for all teachers in how to use graphic organizers/nonlinguistic representations both for instruction and for student products in dissecting complex text and showing mastery of text.	3rd Grade – 31% (32/104) 4th Grade – 29% (28/98) 5th Grade – 24% (24/101) 6th Grade – 33% (29/89) Total for Achievement Level 4 & 5 – 29% (113/392)	3rd Grade – 40% +9% (42/106) 4th Grade – 35% +6% (38/110) 5th Grade – 30% +6% (34/112) 6th Grade – 38% +5% (39/103) Total for Achievement Level 4 & 5 – 35% +6% (153/431)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading 1. Maintain the level of performance of alternate assessment students, 100% or 1/1 students to 100% or 3/3 students. **Barrier(s):** 1. Lack of Differentiated Instruction training for new teachers in re-teaching/ remediation strategies. 2. Lack of concrete strategies to analyze and unearth complex structures, themes, and insights **Strategy(s):** **1.** Provide Stage 1, Differentiated Instruction, professional development to new teachers by Differentiated Instruction Trainers as well as Stage 2 DI training, scheduled for veteran teachers.	4th Grade – 100% (1/1)	5th Grade – 100% (3/3)

Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading Maintain the level of performance of alternate assessment students, 100% or 1/1 students to 100% or 3/3 students. **Barrier(s):** 1. Lack of Differentiated Instruction training for new teachers in re-teaching/ remediation strategies. 2. Lack of concrete strategies to analyze and unearth complex structures, themes, and insights **Strategy(s):** **1.** Provide Stage 1, Differentiated Instruction, professional development to new teachers by Differentiated Instruction Trainers as well as Stage 2 DI training, scheduled for veteran teachers. 2. Professional development needed for all teachers in how to use graphic organizers/nonlinguistic representations both for instruction and for student products in dissecting complex text and showing mastery of text.	4th Grade – 100% (1/1)	5th Grade – 100% (3/3)

FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading In grades 4-6, 74% or 39/53 students made learning gains in reading on FCAT 2.0; Increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% who make learning gains in reading to 80% (number of students in lowest 25% fluctuates and will not be known until testing) **Barrier(s):** 1. New teachers to Brevard County in first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades who did participate in the foundational differentiated instruction professional development, Stage 1, last year. 2. Lack of concrete strategies to analyze and unearth complex structures, themes, and insights **Strategy(s):** **1.** Provide Stage 1, Differentiated Instruction, professional development to new teachers by Differentiated Instruction Trainers as well as Stage 2 DI training, scheduled for veteran teachers. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading Maintain the level of performance of alternate assessment students, 100% or 1/1 students to 100% or 3/3 students. **Barrier(s):** 1. Lack of Differentiated Instruction training for new teachers in re-teaching/ remediation strategies. 2. Lack of concrete strategies to analyze and unearth complex structures, themes, and insights **Strategy(s):** **1.** Provide Stage 1, Differentiated Instruction, professional development to new teachers by Differentiated Instruction Trainers as well as Stage 2 DI training, scheduled for veteran teachers. 2. Professional development needed for all teachers in how to use graphic organizers/nonlinguistic representations both for instruction and for student products in dissecting complex text and showing mastery of text.	4th Grade – 83% (14/17) 5th Grade – 72% (13/18) 6th Grade 67% (12/18) Total of students in 4-6 that made learning gains 74% (39/53)	

Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline data 2010-11:**	Using the 2010-2011 Adequate Yearly Progress Report…the following percentages are those students who did not make satisfactory progress	
Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :	Enter numerical data for current level of performance	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance
White:	35% of students tested did not make satisfactory progress in 2011-12	non proficiency decrease to 29% or (-6%)
Black:	56% of students tested did not make satisfactory progress in 2011-12	non proficiency decrease to 40% or (-16%)
Hispanic:	42% of students tested did not make satisfactory progress in 2011-12	non proficiency decrease to 35% or (-7%)
Asian:	N/A	N/A
American Indian:	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	58% of students tested did not make satisfactory progress in 2011-12	non proficiency decrease to 0% exceeded 2011-12 projected target

Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** 1. New teachers to Brevard County in first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades who did participate in the foundational differentiated instruction professional development, Stage 1, last year. 2. Lack of concrete strategies to analyze and unearth complex structures, themes, and insights **Strategy(s):** **1.** Provide Stage 1, Differentiated Instruction, professional development to new teachers by Differentiated Instruction Trainers as well as Stage 2 DI training, scheduled for veteran teachers. **2.** Professional development needed for all teachers in how to use graphic organizers/nonlinguistic representations both for instruction and for student products in dissecting complex text and showing mastery of text.	76% of students tested did not make satisfactory progress in 2011-12	non proficiency decrease to 60% or (-16%)
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** 1. New teachers to Brevard County in first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades who did participate in the foundational differentiated instruction professional development, Stage 1, last year. 2. Lack of concrete strategies to analyze and unearth complex structures, themes, and insights **Strategy(s):** **1.** Provide Stage 1, Differentiated Instruction, professional development to new teachers by Differentiated Instruction Trainers as well as Stage 2 DI training, scheduled for veteran teachers. 2. Professional development needed for all teachers in how to use graphic organizers/nonlinguistic representations both for instruction and for student products in dissecting complex text and showing mastery of text.	46% of students tested did not make satisfactory progress in 2011-12	non proficiency decrease to 32% or (-14%)

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring

• New teachers will be trained in differentiated instruction. (Overview)	October 12, 2012 On-going through the year	Lesson plans Peer/Admin observations Feedback Teacher Reflection
• Veteran teachers will review basic tenets of differentiated instruction and be trained in how to differentiate student products.	October 12, 2012 On-going through the year	Lesson plans Peer/Admin observations Feedback Teacher Reflection
• 3-6 grade teachers will be trained in CCSS for full implementation in 2013-14.	Launch team will be trained first On-going through2013	Lesson plans Peer/Admin observations Feedback Teacher Reflection
• K-2 grade teachers, trained in CCSS 2011-12, will review and refine CCSS implementation.	Grade Level meetings 2012-13	Lesson plans Peer/Admin observations Feedback Teacher Reflection
• All instructional personnel will be trained in nonlinguistic representations including but not limited to: Thinking Maps, use of iPads for nonlinguistic representations, live interactive graphic organizers.	November 2012 On-going through the year	Lesson plans Peer/Admin observations Feedback Teacher Reflection
• Support teachers will be trained in how nonlinguistic representations can be used in art, music, PE.	November 2012 On-going through the year	Lesson plans Peer/Admin observations Feedback Teacher Reflection
• Teachers previously trained in student data notebooks and currently implementing student data notebooks will share their knowledge and experiences with untrained teachers.	October 12, 2012 November 2012 January 2013	Lesson plans Peer/Admin observations Feedback Teacher Reflection

• ` Teachers interested in additional/formal training in student data notebooks will receive professional development so they can begin data notebooks with their students second semester.	November 2012 January 2013	Lesson plans Peer/Admin observations Feedback Teacher Reflection
• Teachers not ready to implement student data notebooks will be trained in how to establish student goal setting and how to begin student conferences.	October 12, 2012 November 2012 January 2013	Lesson plans Peer/Admin observations Feedback Teacher Reflection
• Quality Questioning and how it links to CCSS	October 12, 2012	Lesson plans Peer/Admin observations Feedback Teacher Reflection

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:** 3 -6 – 46% (18/39)			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:** 3 – 6 – 28% (11/39)			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**: 3 – 6 – 31% (12/39) Goal for Writing: 1. For ESOL teachers and students to develop an understanding of holistic scoring of writing.	Lack of holistic scoring due ESOL specific writing training	Provide professional development for ESOL personnel in holistic scoring of writing.	District Resource Teacher, Administration 1st semester of 2012-13 Agenda, Calendar, Attendance records, follow up activities, training syllabus

2. For grade level teams (PLC's) and ESOL teacher to develop common rubric for holistic writing across the content areas.	100% of teachers /grade level teams have not identified and/or developed common rubrics for holistic writing across the content areas.	Provide professional development and rubric s/ anchor sets to identify and/ or develop common rubrics for holistic writing across the content areas. Apply rubrics/anchor sets to common assessments. Use common assessments to evaluate student's holistic writing across the content areas. Have students and teachers self-reflect on outcomes of targeted writing samples.	District Resource Teacher, Reading Vertical Team, CCSS launch team members, Administration Attendance records, PLC/ grade level meeting agendas, Vertical team agendas, follow up activities, upload common assessments to share sites

Mathematics Goal(s): **1.** Improve core level instruction in reading through differentiated instruction facilitated by Professional Learning Communities.	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Anticipated Barrier(s): **1.** New teachers to Brevard County in first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades who did participate in the foundational differentiated instruction professional development, Stage 1, last year.		
Strategy(s): **1.** Provide Stage 1, Differentiated Instruction, professional development to new teachers by Differentiated Instruction Trainers as well as Stage 2 DI training, scheduled for veteran teachers.		

FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Increase the number of students scoring level 3 in math in grades 3-6 from 24% or 96/397 students to 32% or 136/431 students—an increase of 8% or forty students. **Barrier(s):** **1.** Lack of common assessments among the grade levels. **Strategy(s):** **1.** Math Vertical Team will create a common math assessment (VPK – 6) during time provided by the Principal.	3rd Grade – 25% (26/106) 4th Grade – 22% (22/101) 5th Grade – 22% (22/101) 6th Grade – 29% (26/89) Total of Achievement Level 3 - 24% (96/397)	3rd Grade – 34% +9% (36/106) 4th Grade – 29% +7% (32/110) 5th Grade – 29% +7% (32/112) 6th Grade – 32% +6% (36/103) Total of Achievement Level 3 – 32% +8% (136/431)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics Maintain the level of performance of alternate assessment students, 100% or 1/1 students to 100% or 3/3 students. **Barrier(s):** **1.** Lack of common assessments among the grade levels. **Strategy(s):** **1.** Math Vertical Team will create a common math assessment (VPK – 6) during time provided by the Principal.	4th Grade Scored at level 6 100% (1/1)	5th Grade Scored at levels 4, 5, and 6 100% (3/3)

FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics Increase the number of students scoring level 4 & 5 in math in grades 3-6 from 27% or 106/397 students to 34% or 146/431 students—and increase of 7% or 40 students. **Barrier(s):** 1. Lack of common assessments among the grade levels. **Strategy(s):** **1.** Math Vertical Team will create a common math assessment (VPK – 6) during time provided by the Principal.	3rd Grade – 29% (31/106) 4th Grade – 19% (19/101) 5th Grade – 15% (15/101) 6th Grade – 46% (41/89) Total of Achievement Level 4 & 5 27% (106/397)	3rd Grade – 39% +10% (41/106) 4th Grade – 26% +7% (29/110) 5th Grade – 22% +7% (25/112) 6th Grade – 50% +4% (51/103) Total of Achievement Level 4 & 5 34% +7% (146/431)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics Maintain the level of performance of alternate assessment students, 100% or 1/1 students to 100% or 3/3 students. **Barrier(s):** **1.** Lack of common assessments among the grade levels. **Strategy(s):** **1.** Math Vertical Team will create a common math assessment (VPK – 6) during time provided by the Principal.	4th Grade - 100% (1/1)	5th Grade – 100% (3/3)

FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics In grades 4-6, 67% or 37/55 students made learning gains in math on FCAT 2.0; Increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% who make learning gains in math to 72% (number of students in lowest 25% fluctuates and will not be known until testing) **Barrier(s):** **1.** Lack of common assessments among the grade levels. **Strategy(s):** **1.** Math Vertical Team will create a common math assessment (VPK – 6) during time provided by the Principal.	4th Grade – 59% (10/17) 5th Grade – 57% (12/21) 6th Grade – 76% (13/17) Total of students in 4-6 that made learning gains – 67% (37/55)	
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	4th Grade – 100% (1/1)	5th Grade – 100% (3/3)
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline Data 2010-11:**	Using the 2010-2011 Adequate Yearly Progress Report…the following percentages are those students who did not make satisfactory progress	

Student subgroups by ethnicity : White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	40% of students tested did not make satisfactory progress in 2011- 59% of students tested did not make satisfactory progress in 2011-12 45% of students tested did not make satisfactory progress in 2011-12	non proficiency decrease to 33% or (-7%) non proficiency decrease to 44% or (-15%) non proficiency decrease to 40% or (-5%)
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	71% of students tested did not make satisfactory progress in 2011-12	non proficiency decrease to 68% or (-3%) exceeded 2011-12 projected target
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	78% of students tested did not make satisfactory progress in 2011-12	non proficiency decrease to 71% or (-7%)
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	50% of students tested did not make satisfactory progress in 2011-12	non proficiency decrease to 40% or (-10%)

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Geometry/Measurement	October 12, 2012 On-going through the year	Lesson Plans, Observations
Differentiated Instruction	October 12, 2012 On-going through the year	Lesson Plans, Observations
Number Talk	On-going through the year with focus on CCSS in primary	Lesson plans, Observations
Primary mathematics instruction using Kathy Richardson books	October 12, 2012 On-going through the year	Lesson Plans, Observations

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
1. For teachers and students to develop an understanding of holistic scoring of writing.		

Barrier(s): **1.** Not 100% implementation of holistic scoring and training in year one. 2. 100% of teachers /grade level teams have not identified and/or developed common assessments for holistic writing across the content areas. **Strategy(s):** **1.** Provide professional development for teachers in holistic scoring of writing. 2. Provide professional development and rubric s/ anchor sets to identify and/or develop common assessments for holistic writing across the content areas. Apply rubrics/anchor sets to common assessments. Use common assessments to evaluate student's holistic writing across the content areas. Have students and teachers self-reflect on outcomes of common assessments.		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	75% (73/97)	80% (88/110)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	100% (1/1)	We do not have any FAA in 4th grade this year

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle)	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
1. Increase number of science level 3 students in all areas tested on 2012-13, FCAT 2.0 by improvement of core level instruction in science through differentiated instruction		

facilitated by Professional Learning Communities. 2. Increase opportunities for real-world, hands-on science engagement, participation and extension.		
Barrier(s): 1. New teachers to Jupiter in first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades who did not participate in the foundational differentiated instruction professional development, Stage 1, last year. 2. Teacher limited experience in use of laboratory and laboratory equipment. **Strategy(s):** **1.** Provide Stage 1, Differentiated Instruction, professional development to new teachers by Differentiated Instruction Trainers as well as Stage 2 DI training, scheduled for veteran teachers. **2.** Maintain a daily operating science laboratory with trained science staff to model appropriate science procedures, engage science students in inquiry, and plan/teach extended science lessons for the laboratory and classrooms. 3. Weekly modeling of science lessons, strategies and techniques by Title I Science Teacher in 5th grade classrooms.	34% (34/101) scored a level 3 or above on the Science FCAT	39% (44/112) +5% increase of students scoring a level 3 or above on the Science FCAT
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science**:**	34% (34/101)	39% (44/112)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	N/A	100% (3/3)

Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	8% (8/101)	16% (18/112)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science	N/A	

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Brevard Induction Program	Principal, Asst. Principal	on-going
2. Opportunities for professional development	District Resource Teachers	on-going
3. Assigned to PLC	Principal, Asst. Principal	1st semester
4. Mentors	Principal, Asst. Principal CET trained teachers Math and Literacy Coaches	on-going
5. Common planning times	Principal	1st semester
6. Encourage teacher leadership	Principal, Asst. Principal	on-going
7. My Florida Teacher.com	Principal, Asst Principal	As needed

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly effective	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
42% (25/60) teachers are not ESOL endorsed	Teachers are required to take classes to help met the requirement of ESOL

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

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and it role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

The MTSS Team comprises the Literacy Coach, the school psychologist, the guidance counselor, administration, support personnel (e.g. speech/language pathologist, behavior analyst, occupational therapist, the ELL teacher), classroom teachers, and resource teachers. The Team meets bimonthly on the first and third Wednesdays of each month. Our MTSS meetings alternate with the IPST Team, which allows for easy interchange of data and information between the groups. Faculty training is held during pre-planning for both MTSS and IPST procedures. New teachers that come onboard are trained individually. Agendas are sent out prior to the bimonthly meetings so teachers have time to invite parents to attend.

Data sources used but not limited to are:

- Classroom performance—weekly tests, common assessments, work samples, observation
- District required assessments—DRLA, DRMA, writing prompts, RR
- State required assessments—FAIR, FCAT
- Diagnostic assessments—DAR, Gates, ERDA, KBIT, modality tests, behavior plans
- Progress monitoring—PASI, PSI, Heggerty, RR, observation
- Intervention strategies/materials—Rewards, Voyager Passport, Text Talk, Triumphs,Barton, Lindamod-Bell, Starlite
- FCRR binders, Phonics Lesson Library, Math manipulatives, interest inventories

Data management is achieved with the Brevard County monitoring forms. Teachers refer a student to MTSS if they have concerns about a student's progress. The cumulative folder, parent input, and classroom data are reviewed. If the team believes more information is needed, recommendations for additional data are made and that data is gathered before intervention begins. If an intervention is decided, then the person teaching/monitoring the intervention is also decided upon. Most frequently for a Tier 2 intervention, the interventionist is the classroom teacher and he/she will complete the monitoring forms. The size of the intervention group and the frequency and duration of the intervention are also considered. For Tier 3 interventions the interventionist may be a resource teacher and he/she would teach and monitor the intervention.

Students who make progress more slowly than peers in their intervention group, class, or grade level are referred as many times as needed to the Multi-Tiered Student Support Team (MTSS). Here, teachers receive targeted interventions to ensure student success. The frequency and/or duration of the intervention is increased and the size of the intervention group is decreased. Sometimes more student information is needed; for example, vision/hearing checks, modality screening, speech /language screening, individual, diagnostic testing, behavior plans. Parent input is an essential part of the process. If the targeted interventions are not showing progress over a specific period of time, students may be referred for special services.

The MTSS team is very involved in the School Improvement Plan. In school-wide data collection and monitoring, to working with the grade level PLC's, to individualized testing and evaluation, to helping teachers with PGP's, to providing professional development on learning techniques and strategies, to learning the MTSS process the MTSS team impacts the school culture of learning and student growth.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

Jupiter Elementary understands the need for parental involvement to make every program at Jupiter more successful. By offering family-focused activities, we make parents feel more comfortable at Jupiter and more engaged in their child's learning. The school offers many opportunities to participate, both at school and within the school community. During the school year, 2011-2012, Jupiter offered a variety of opportunities for parents to become involved, gain a better understanding of the academics and share in celebration of Jupiter's achievements.

In order to build capacity for parental involvement, Jupiter will focus again this year on making programs at varied times during the day, offering choices for parents, and accommodating their working hours. The annual Title I meeting, curriculum nights such as Reading, Math, Science and Writing Nights and Open House will continue this year. Jupiter staff will focus on academic needs based on student achievement data to bridge the gap between home and school.

Parents attend special sessions during the curriculum nights to learn how to help their child at home. Families will take activities home that they may use right away to support lessons their students have learned at school. Make and take activities help bond the families together because parents and students work together. Teachers follow up with the students about use of activities to gather feedback. Families unable to attend are invited to come in to the school during a daily session or materials are sent home by request.

Open House is a time for parents and students to meet the teacher, learn more about the curriculum, and announce special events at school. During this time, families are plan together so they can best be prepared for the new school year. It is a time of rebuilding and renewing priorities.

Input from our parents is vital to making sound decisions at Jupiter. Data is gathered during surveys, School Advisory Council meetings, Parent/Teacher Organization meetings, and throughout the year on a personal basis.

Jupiter Elementary sponsors Parenting Partners, a specially designed program for parents that provides support toward hurdles they may face at home. A team of teachers and staff train parents how to relate to their children during daily activities, take charge as the head of the household, setting boundaries and establishing schedules with expectations. Students participate in these trainings during the parents' homework that is given to the parents to conduct during the week. Following a homework assignment, discussion of the results allows time for questions and answers plus a time to provide celebration of each parent's accomplished practices.

Parents receive communication in a variety of ways at Jupiter. Face-to-face is not always the best way for some. Jupiter sends home monthly newsletters, weekly postings on the marquee, individual letters home to grade levels or smaller groups, emails, recorded messages sent via telephone, and intercom. Parents can access EDLINE for current grades and information. Jupiter has a school website also accessible via internet.

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

Jupiter's attendance rate trend for the past three years met the benchmark of 95% with an average of 95% over the course of nine months. Monthly reports showed that Jupiter dropped below 95% in January, 2012 and remained just above 94% except in May, 2012.

Jupiter's attendance directly impacts student achievement. The total number of referrals to Family Support Team (FST) during 2011-2012 was ninety-six. Ninety students were referred for attendance and tardy concerns. Six students were referred for other issues that were related to behaviors or family. Students are referred to FST for attendance, tardies, family needs, health needs, and other reasons that may impact their academics. Jupiter supports School Board policy for attendance by conducting attendance appeals meetings with parents, students and teachers each semester. Recommendations are then made to the principal.

FST meets weekly to discuss attendance, conduct meetings with parents, students and teachers, and conduct Attendance Appeals meetings. The committee collects data from parents regarding attendance concerns, but most importantly, strives to make the student responsible for his/her own academics. Attendance is crucial for continued achievement.

Jupiter's 2012-2013 attendance goal targets chronic tardies and absences. Attendance data will be monitored along with achievement data to look for trends and close gaps where necessary.

SUSPENSION:

85 students were suspended during the 2011 – 2012 school year.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

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