# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
# Form SIP-1

## Proposed for 2012-2013

# 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### School Information

| | |
|---|---|
| School Name: Cypress Park Elementary | District Name: Orange |
| Principal: LaTonya Brown | Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins |
| SAC Chair: Nilda Morales | Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013 |

### Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

### Administrators

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

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | LaTonya Brown | **Degrees** Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education<br><br>Master of Education in Elementary Education<br><br>Educational Specialist in Educational Leadership<br><br>Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership<br><br>**Certifications** Elementary Education Grades 1-6<br><br>School Principal<br><br>ESOL Endorsement | 0 | 12 | **2011-2012 District Data** <br>**District Grade** – B <br>**Reading AMO** - No <br>Proficiency – 57% <br>Learning Gains - <br>Lowest 25% Learning Gains – 68% <br>**Math AMO -** No <br>Proficiency – 57% <br>Learning Gains - <br>Lowest 25% Learning Gains – 64% <br>**Science** Proficiency - <br>**Writing** Proficiency – 81% <br><br>**2010-2011 District Data** <br>**District Grade** – B <br>**AYP** – 59% <br>**Reading** Proficiency – 67% <br>Learning Gains – 60% <br>Lowest 25% Learning Gains – 57% <br>**Math** Proficiency – 72% <br>Learning Gains – 68% <br>Lowest 25% Learning Gains – 65% <br>**Science** Proficiency – 48% <br>**Writing** Proficiency – 83% <br><br>**2009-2010 Hunter's Creek MS** <br>**School Grade** – A <br>**AYP** – 100% <br>**Reading** Proficiency – 81% <br>Learning Gains – 72% <br>Lowest 25% Learning Gains – 67% <br>**Math** Proficiency – 86% <br>Learning Gains – 83% <br>Lowest 25% Learning Gains – 76% <br>**Science** Proficiency – 58% <br>**Writing** Proficiency – 92% |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **2008-2009 Hunter's Creek MS**<br>**School Grade** – A<br>**AYP –** 95%<br>**Reading** Proficiency – 82%<br>Learning Gains – 68%<br>Lowest 25% Learning Gains – 66%<br>**Math** Proficiency – 83%<br>Learning Gains – 77%<br>Lowest 25% Learning Gains – 72%<br>**Science** Proficiency – 59%<br>**Writing** Proficiency – 99%<br><br>**2007-2008 Palm Lake ES**<br>**School Grade** – A<br>**AYP** – 100%<br>**Reading** Proficiency – 96%<br>Learning Gains – 72%<br>Lowest 25% Learning Gains – 73%<br>**Math** Proficiency – 97%<br>Learning Gains – 82%<br>Lowest 25% Learning Gains – 92%<br>**Science** Proficiency – 92%<br>**Writing** Proficiency – 78% |
| Assistant Principal | NA | NA | NA | NA |

## 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading/ CRT | Megan Faust | Master of Education in Reading from the University of Central Florida Bachelor of Science from Radford University in Interdisciplinary Studies | 2 | 1 | 2011-2012 school grade of "D". 48% scored level 3 or above in Reading, 33% scored level 3 or above in Math, 80% learning gains in Reading, 47% learning gains in Math, 76% of the lowest 25% made learning gains, 37% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Math |
| | | | | | |

## Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Pairing of new teachers with veteran teachers | CRT/Instructional Coach | Ongoing |
| 2. Provide professional development on the Marzano Protocol | Leadership Team | Ongoing |
| 3. Support team member paired with grade levels to plan for rigorous instruction | Principal | Ongoing |
| 4. Use of the Coaching Cycle | CRT and Reading Coach | Ongoing |

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

*Non-Highly Effective Instructors*

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

| Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only). | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| 100% (29) | CRT will ensure that new teachers receive the guidelines for OCPS and have a school handbook to outline procedures and expectations.<br>Mentors will meet with new teachers monthly to discuss instructional strategies. Time will be provided as needed to visit model classrooms.<br>Each new teacher to CPE is assigned a mentor to refer to as needed.<br>The leadership team will meet with all teachers to ensure they have a clear understanding of the data and how it drives their instruction.<br>The leadership team will provide professional development as outlined by the state, district, and as determined by the data. |

*Staff Demographics*

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

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

| Total number of Instructional Staff | % of first-year teachers | % of teachers with 1-5 years of experience | % of teachers with 6-14 years of experience | % of teachers with 15+ years of experience | % of teachers with Advanced Degrees | % of teachers with an Effective rating or higher | % of Reading Endorsed Teachers | % of National Board Certified Teachers | % of ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 29 | 3 | 41% (12) | 34% (10) | 14% (4) | 28% (8) | | 14% (4) | 0 | 48% (14) |

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

*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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Megan Faust | Beatriz Berriz Castro and Katy D'Angelo | Former primary teacher; knowledge of curriculum; ability to model lessons | Weekly meetings to offer assistance; coverage of classroom to allow for classroom visitations |
| Nilda Morales | Sasha Chavez and Bianca Rodriguez | Knowledge of curriculum; ability to model lessons; leadership experience | Weekly meetings to offer assistance; coverage of classroom to allow for classroom visitations |
| | | | |

## Additional Requirements

*Coordination and Integration-*<span style="color:red">Title I Schools Only</span>

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<br>Title 1 services will be used for staff development, parent workshops, new technology, instructional materials, and additional resources and materials as identified by the needs of the school, community, and School Advisory Council. SES tutoring is funded by the federal government and provides tutoring for students on campus by state approved tutoring providers. This program takes place after school and is coordinated by an SES facilitator. |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant<br>Migrant liaison provides services and support to the parents and the students as necessary. |
| Title I, Part D<br>N/A |
| Title II<br>Title II grant monies are provided to schools to provide professional development to maintain highly qualified teachers in the core content areas. Cypress Park Elementary will receive approximately $1,400 to provide this professional development. |
| Title III<br>Title III monies are provided through the district for students that have been identified as English Language Learners as well as the education of immigrants. These monies are to provide services for these students as directed by Multilingual Services. |

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

| |
|---|
| Title X- Homeless<br>The district homeless liaison works with the school homeless coordinator to ensure that the needs of the students and parents of our homeless population are met. They have provided backpacks, hygiene products, and other essential items for the day to day needs of these families. |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)<br>SAI funding is provided for schools based on the number of Level 1 readers on the FCAT Reading Assessment. Cypress Park will propose the use of these funds for morning tutoring opportunities as well as Writing Wizards. Cypress Park will not only target Level 1 students, but also those students receiving Good Cause Exemptions for ELL, ESE and portfolio students. |
| Violence Prevention Programs<br>The dean will provide four Code of Conduct reviews during the school year to ensure students are aware of the different levels of offenses. In addition, teachers will create a Buddy System to help each other when discipline issues arise. The School Resource Officer teaches GREAT to the students in 4th grade and MAGIC to the students in 5th grade to raise awareness for Drugs and Alcohol. |
| Nutrition Programs<br>The school implements a healthy school program. The school asks that parents adhere to the Healthy School Policy by not sending high sugar foods and treats but instead send in healthy alternatives. The school food services staff will post the nutritional information for students, so that students are aware of the nutritional factors relating to the food which they eat. |
| Housing Programs<br>N/A |
| Head Start<br>Cypress Park allows the local Head Start program to bring their parents and students to Cypress Park each year as a transition from Head Start to Kindergarten. |
| Adult Education<br>N/A |
| Career and Technical Education<br>N/A |
| Job Training<br>N/A |
| Other<br>Cypress Park Elementary will provide three parents workshops this year to promote literacy, science, and math as well as familiarize parents on the FCAT. The school also sends home a monthly newsletter with Science, Math, and Reading articles to provide parents with strategies to assist their students in these areas as well as increase student achievement. |
| |

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

| School-Based MTSS/RtI Team |
|---|

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.
The purpose of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team is to provide a delivery of service model which addresses academic and behavioral concerns.

LaTonya Brown – Principal
Megan Faust – Reading Coach/CRT
Nadine Pasquot- MTSS/RtI Coach
Nilda Morales – Dean/Instructional Support/ELL Compliance Teacher
Robin Bird – Behavior Specialist
Anna Arcebido – Speech and Language Pathologist
Lindsey Smith – School Psychologist
David Lansing – VE 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?

The MTSS leadership team will meet bi-weekly focusing on our classroom instruction in content areas including whole/small group instruction, school/district curriculum, and classroom environment and set up to best meet the needs of all students and to increase student achievement. The team will use disaggregated data, instructional focus calendars, differentiated classroom instruction, and current interventions to determine how to provide tiered support to students. The MTSS leadership team will hold bi-weekly data meetings with grade levels to discuss students who are struggling and would benefit from the MTSS process. During the bi-weekly meetings, the MTSS leadership team will use disaggregated data to assess whether students' needs are being met in their intervention groups, or if they need to transition to a different tier of support. The MTSS leadership team will continually look at disaggregated data and the current interventions that are in place to determine if they are continually effective in increasing student progress. The school-based leadership team will meet weekly with grade level teams to monitor lesson plans and ensure that our content areas are being taught consistently with rigor. This time also gives classroom teachers a weekly opportunity to collaborate with the leadership team on academic and behavioral concerns within the classroom. The principal will hold the bi-weekly MTSS meetings and ensure that all data reports are kept in the data binder. The curriculum resource teacher is responsible for collecting, planning, and analyzing data reports that will be utilized during the MTSS meetings. He will also be responsible for providing professional development to teachers on how to use disaggregated data to inform their instruction. The reading coach will also assist the curriculum resource teacher with collecting and analyzing data and with working with teachers on effective instructional strategies to use within the classroom. She will also provide professional development to teachers on increasing the rigor in the classroom through text complexity and differentiating instruction. The MTSS coach will keep track of students who need to be discussed during MTSS leadership team meetings and working with exceptional education teachers in gathering and charting data and offering instructional resources, materials, and strategies for students who are struggling to make learning gains.

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?

The MTSS leadership team along with the instructional staff worked collaboratively in developing the School Improvement Plans and determining our barriers and strategies for increasing student achievement. Members of the MTSS leadership team will utilize the goals of the School Improvement Plan during planning and data meetings with grade level teams to determine if we are succeeding in meeting the goals and objectives. We will use the discussions with grade levels to plan appropriate professional development to support the teachers with effectively implementing Tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction and interventions to students. The MTSS team and instructional staff utilized each step of the problem-solving process in developing the School Improvement Plan. When determining our school's goals we had to first discuss and determine what the problems were. Next, we had to determine why these problems were occurring or barriers that we have in achieving our goals. Lastly, we developed effective strategies to use in solving the problems that we had identified. As the school year proceeds, it will be the role of the MTSS leadership team in implementing the School Improvement Plan and to implement the last step of the problem-solving process which is to analyze if our strategies are working and to make necessary adjustments.

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

| 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.<br><br>It is essential to consider formative and summative assessments in determining appropriate interventions for students. For reading, the MTSS leadership team will utilize Florida's Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Edusoft Benchmark Data, Write Score, intervention program progress monitoring, and on-going mini New Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) benchmark assessments. In mathematics, the team will look at the students' FCAT score, Edusoft Benchmark Data, Write Score, Envision Math unit tests, and on-going mini NGSSS benchmark assessments to determine the tiered level of support needed by a student. When considering the support level needed by a student for science, the MTSS leadership team will use FCAT scores, Edusoft Benchmark Data, Write Score, on-going mini NGSSS benchmark assessments, and progress monitoring students using the Fusion Science program. Writing data is collected through scored prompts using the FCAT Writes Rubric. Behavior data is collected through the different levels of referrals and the Code of Conduct agreement. |
| Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.<br><br>For students to receive effective, appropriate tiered interventions it is essential for the staff to understand and utilize the MTSS process. We will train the staff by providing professional development opportunities to build a foundation on what MTSS is, what it should look like, and how it should be monitored to ensure that we are implementing the MTSS process fluidly as a school. The MTSS leadership team will also be following the MTSS problem-solving cycle when we are working in our grade level lesson planning and data meetings so that instructional staff become familiar with what the problem-solving cycle looks like and how it should be used in the decision making process of MTSS. |
| Describe the plan to support MTSS.<br><br>Our plan to support MTSS is to begin by ensuring that all students are receiving effective Tier 1 support in their classrooms. Our Tier 1 support will be high quality instruction that is focused on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and Common Core State Standards supported by Imagine It, Envision Math, Fusion Science, Write Traits and Write from the Beginning. We will be doing on-going progress monitoring to ensure that all students are being successful within Tier 1. If students are struggling within Tier 1, they will be moved into Tier 2 where they will receive small group instruction 2-4 times a week using a research based intervention program. The Tier 2 intervention groups will also progress monitor to ensure students are making progress. When a student is still struggling with Tier 1 and Tier 2 support, the MTSS leadership team will determine how to best provide Tier 3 support by giving researched based 1 to 1 or 2 to 1 instruction. With progress monitoring, if a student is still struggling while receiving Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 support, the MTSS leadership team will need to meet to determine other strategies to help the student be successful within the classroom. In considering support for behavior, the Administrative Dean and Behavior Specialist work closely together to ensure that students are successful. For our school wide behavior program we use the Awesome Mustangs, where students can earn Mustangs on a class chart and be recognized in the cafeteria with a prize when they reach a certain amount. If students are struggling with behavior with the current incentive program, the Administrative Dean and Behavior Specialist will work with the MTSS leadership team to determine if a Behavior Improvement Plan is needed. The MTSS leadership team will keep a data notebook of meetings and utilize the grade level data meeting notebooks to monitor progress of the MTSS problem-solving cycle. |

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

*Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)*

| School-Based Literacy Leadership Team |
|---|
| Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). <br><br> LaTonya Brown - Principal <br> Megan Faust – Curriculum Resource Teacher/Reading Coach <br> Nilda Morales – Instructional Support <br> Kelli McClusky – Kindergarten Teacher <br> Andrea Chuck – 1st Grade Teacher <br> Gabriela Soto – 1st Grade Teacher <br> Donna Smith – 2nd Grade Teacher <br> Brandon Jackson – 3rd Grade Teacher <br> Tammi Bennett – 4th Grade Teacher <br> Laura Petrik – 5th Grade Teacher <br> Pauline Fitterer – ASD Teacher |
| Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). <br><br> The main purpose of the Literacy Leadership Team is to increase the success of our students in reading, as well as addressing literacy concerns school-wide. The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly, and includes representatives from each grade level and administration. We will be discussing school wide initiatives, planning literacy nights, and looking at reading across the grade levels. |
| What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? <br><br> The major initiatives of the Literacy Leadership Team this year is to ensure that our core reading block is strong and consistent. We will also be analyzing the FAIR data and developing classroom solutions to close any gaps in the data. We are going to implement a book study on engagement for our students with a text called *Tools for Engagement*. Lastly, we will be organizing reading celebrations and literacy nights to involve the whole school and parents with the reading success of our students. |

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

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

***Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition***

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

Cypress Park Elementary does not have a pre-school unit for the 2012-2013 school year. However, Cypress Park does allow the local Head Start unit to visit Kindergarten classes at the end of the year.

***Grades 6-12 Only*** Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S
For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

N/A

***High Schools Only***

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

N/A

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?

N/A

***Postsecondary Transition***

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

N/A

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

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Reading Goals**

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

| 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.**<br><br>Reading Goal #1A:<br><br>*All educators at our school will stress improvement in reading. Fluency and vocabulary strategies will be emphasized across the curriculum content areas. Research-based programs will be used for level 1 and 2 students. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the Benchmark assessments. In addition, in alignment with the OCPS Intense Focus on Student Achievement goal, the percent of students who read on grade level by age 9will increase by 3-5%.* | **2012 Current Level of Performance:***<br><br>*In June 2012, 48% (65) of students scored at or above a level 3 on the FCAT Reading assessment* | **2013 Expected Level of Performance:***<br><br>*In June 2013, 65% (87) of students will score at or above a level 3 on the FCAT Reading assessment* | 1A.1.<br>Students are coming in below grade level | 1A.1.<br>Continue morning reading interventions; provide tutoring opportunities and initiatives supporting parent involvement | 1A.1.<br>Leadership Team | 1A.1.<br>Ongoing progress monitoring meetings and data talks | 1A.1.<br>Edusoft, FAIR, and ongoing classroom formative assessments |
| | | | 1A.2.<br>Core content area curriculum does not meet all the standards with enough rigor | 1A.2.<br>Meet with teachers weekly as a support team to plan lessons and provide an instructional focus | 1A.2.<br>Leadership Team | 1A.2.<br>Review of student data and lesson plans with the classroom teachers | 1A.2.<br>Edusoft, FAIR, and ongoing formative assessments |
| | | | 1A.3<br>Targeting the specific interventions and strategies necessary to meet the needs of the struggling readers | 1A.3.<br>Hold bi-weekly data and RtI meetings to discuss specific students and their reading deficiencies | 1A.3.<br>RtI Leadership team | 1A.3.<br>Through on-going progress monitoring and data talks with staff | 1A.3.<br>Edusoft, FAIR, and ongoing formative assessments |
| | | | 1.A.4<br>Lack of students coming to Kindergarten with VPK or daycare exposure | 1.A.4<br>Send communication home on a regular basis to promote VPK in the community | 1.A.4<br>Leadership Team | 1.A.4<br>Observation of students based on the FLKRS data | 1.A.4<br>FLKRS |
| | | | 1.A.5<br>Number of students reading at grade level by age 9 | 1.A.5<br>Implement school wide interventions for Reading | 1.A.5<br>Leadership Team | 1.A.5<br>Have intervention teachers report progress monitoring data weekly | 1.A.5<br>Intervention Progress Monitoring Assessments |

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

| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Reading Goal #1B:** In June 2013, 63% (5) of students will score a level 4, 5 or 6 on the FAA. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *In June 2012, 0% (0) students scored a 4, 5, or 6 on the FAA.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *In June 2013, 20% (1) will score a level 4, 5 or 6 on the FAA* | 1B.1. Lack of communication skills limiting their ability to process their thoughts verbally or in written form | 1B.1. Increase the variety of communication models such as visuals/pictures, task schedules, and prompted response | 1B.1. Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 1B.1 IEP data collection | 1B.1. Florida Alternative Assessment |
| | | | 1B.2. Cognitive functioning levels vary greatly from one student to the next. Many of them are functioning well below their peers | 1B.2. Provide daily instruction aligned with the Access Points | 1B.2. Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 1B.2. IEP Data collection | 1.B.2 Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 1B.3. Students require multiple accommodations to access curriculum | 1B.3. Student tasks will be chunked based on individual needs. Students will be provided through individualized daily schedules. Student work areas will be structured. | 1B.3. Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 1B.3. IEP data collection | 1B.3. Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 1.B.4 Decrease the disproportion classification of students in Special Education | 1.B.4 Continue to monitor the RtI process | 1.B.4 RtI Team | 1.B.4 SMS enrollment classifications | 1.B.4 SMS |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading. | | | 2A.1. High interest level materials | 2A.1. Interest inventories and integration of technology | 2A.1. CRT | 2A.1. Meet with Media Clerk to order high interest materials and integration of Smart Boards in the classroom | 2A.1. Accelerated reader reports |
| **Reading Goal #2A:** *All educators at our school will stress improvement in reading. Fluency and vocabulary strategies will be emphasized in all content classes across the curriculum. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *In June 2012, 8% (12) of the students taking in the FCAT Reading assessment scored a level 4 or above* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *In June 2013, 15% (19) of the students taking the FCAT Reading assessment will score a level 4 or above.* | | | | | |
| | | | 2A.2. Lack of enrichment activities | 2A.2. Implement gifted strategies and supplemental guided reading materials | 2A.2. Reading Coach | 2A.2. Provide a checkout system of supplemental guided reading materials | 2A.2. Lesson Plan checks |

**August 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised April 29, 2011**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Benchmark assessments.* | | | 2A.3.<br>Time for enrichment | 2A.3.<br>While students are receiving interventions, students needing enrichment will be provided enrichment activities | 2A.3.<br>Principal | 2A.3.<br>Bi-weekly data meetings and monitor of benchmark mini assessments | 2A.3.<br>Edusoft, Benchmark assessments and mini assessments, teacher created formative assessments and FCAT test maker assessments |
| **2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.** | | | 2B.1<br>Lack of communication skills limiting their ability to process their thoughts verbally or in written form | 2B.1.<br>Increase the variety of communication models such as visuals/pictures, task schedules, and prompted response | 2B.1.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 2B.1.<br>IEP Data Collection | 2B.1.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |
| Reading Goal #2B:<br><br>*In June 2013, 63%(5) of the students will score at or above a level 7 on the FAA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*In June 2012, 60% (3) of the students scored a level 7 or above on FCAT* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*In June 2013, 63%(5) of the students will score at or above a level 7 on the FAA* | | | | | |
| | | | 2B.2.<br>Cognitive functioning levels vary greatly from one student to the next. Many of them are functioning well below their peers. | 2B.2.<br>Provide daily instruction aligned with the Access Points | 2B.2.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 2B.2.<br>IEP Data Collection | 2B.2<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 2B.3.<br>Students require multiple accommodations to access curriculum. | 2B.3.<br>Student tasks will be grouped based on individual needs.<br>Students will be provided through individualized daily schedules.<br>Student work areas will be structured. | 2B.3.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 2B.3.<br>IEP Data Collection | 2B.3.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |

| 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.<br>Fidelity of intervention programs | 3A.1.<br>Intervention teachers will provide interventions using Triumphs and will provide progress monitoring and assessment data to the Reading Coach and classroom teacher | 3A.1.<br>Reading Coach | 3A.1.<br>Bi-weekly data talks with classroom teachers and meeting with intervention teachers | 3A.1.<br>Edusoft, FAIR, and ongoing formative assessments |
| Reading Goal #3A:<br><br>*All educators at our school will stress improvement in reading. Fluency and vocabulary strategies will be emphasized in all content classes across the curriculum. Research-* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*In June 2012, 80% (108) of the students taking the FCAT Reading assessment made a learning gain* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*In June 2013, 86% (100) of the students taking the Reading assessment will make a learning gain* | | | | | |

| | | | 3A.2.<br>Attendance | 3A.2.<br>Regular phone calls homes for truancy issues and meet with the social worker for home visits | 3A.2.<br>Principal | 3A.2.<br>Monitoring of SMS and EDW data | 3A.2.<br>Daily attendance reports |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *based programs will be used for level 1 and 2 students. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the Benchmark assessments* | | | 3A.3.<br>Students coming in below grade level | 3A.3.<br>Continue to provide school-wide interventions and tutoring opportunities through SAI and NCF tutoring | 3A.3<br>Leadership Team | 3A.3.<br>Bi-weekly data talks with teachers | 3A.3.<br>Edusoft Benchmark assessments and mini-assessments, FAIR, and ongoing formative assessments |
| **3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.** | | | 3B.1.<br>Lack of communication skills limiting their ability to process their thoughts verbally or in written form | 3B.1.<br>Increase the variety of communication models such as visuals/pictures, task schedules, and prompted response | 3B.1.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 3B.1.<br>IEP Data Collection | 3B.1.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |
| Reading Goal #3B:<br><br>In June 2013, 63% (5) of the students taking the FAA will make a learning gain. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2012, 60% (3) of the students made a learning gain on the FAA.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2013, 63% (5) of the students taking the FAA will make a learning gain.* | | | | | |
| | | | 3B.2.<br>Cognitive functioning levels vary greatly from one student to the next. Many of them are functioning well below their peers | 3B.2.<br>Provide daily instruction aligned with the Access Points | 3B.2.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 3B.2.<br>IEP Data Collection | 3B.2.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 3B.3.<br>Students require multiple accommodations to access curriculum | 3B.3.<br>Student tasks will be chunked based on individual needs.<br>Students will be provided through individualized daily schedules.<br>Student work areas will be structured. | 3B.3.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 3B.3.<br>IEP Data Collection | 3B.3.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.** | | | 4A.1.<br>Lack of resources | 4A.1.<br>Provide additional resources for intervention groups | 4A.1.<br>Principal and CRT | 4A.1.<br>Inventory of current materials | 4A.1.<br>Edusoft, AIR, and ongoing formative assessments |
| Reading Goal #4:<br><br>All educators at our school will stress improvement in reading. Fluency and vocabulary strategies will be emphasized in all | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2012, 76% (51) of the students in the lowest 25% made a learning* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2013, 85% (59) of the students in the lowest 25% will make a learning* | | | | | |

**August 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised April 29, 2011**

| content classes across the curriculum. Research-based programs will be used for level 1 and 2 students. Students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 30% will be placed in an intervention group. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the Benchmark assessments | *gain.* | *gain.* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 4A.2.<br>Lack of love for reading | 4A.2.<br>Identify areas of interest and find books that correlate | 4A.2.<br>Reading Coach | 4A.2.<br>Accelerated Reader report | 4A.2.<br>Edusoft, AR, FAIR, and ongoing formative assessments |
| | | | 4A.3.<br>Lack of student confidence | 4A.3.<br>Include a school wide incentive program and provide outside opportunities for student success | 4A.3.<br>Dean | 4A.3.<br>Tracking of student progress and provide recognition during lunch time and awards ceremonies | 4A.3.<br>Awesome Mustang program |

| 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**<br><br>43% | **T 48%**<br>**A 73%**<br>**B 37%**<br>**H 45%**<br>**W 46%**<br>**ELL 43%**<br>**SWD 29%**<br>**ED 45%** | **T 53%**<br>**A 75%**<br>**B 43%**<br>**H 54%**<br>**W 51%**<br>**ELL 48%**<br>**SWD 36%**<br>**ED 50%** | **T 57%**<br>**A 78%**<br>**B 48%**<br>**H 55%**<br>**W 56%**<br>**ELL 54%**<br>**SWD 42%**<br>**ED 55%** | **T 62%**<br>**A 80%**<br>**B 54%**<br>**H 60%**<br>**W 61%**<br>**ELL 59%**<br>**SWD 49%**<br>**ED 60%** | **T 67%**<br>**A 83%**<br>**B 60%**<br>**H 65%**<br>**W 66%**<br>**ELL 64%**<br>**SWD 55%**<br>**ED 65%** | **T 72%**<br>**A 85%**<br>**B 66%**<br>**H 71%**<br>**W 69%**<br>**ELL 62%**<br>**SWD 70%**<br>**ED 70%** |
| Reading Goal #5A:<br>Cypress Park Elementary will reduce the achievement gap in Reading by moving 48% on grade level to 72% on grade level by the 2016-2017 school year. | | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | 5B.1.<br>Gaps in reading instruction | 5B.1.<br>Plan curriculum backwards by starting with the benchmark and supplementing the curriculum with Science and SS | 5B.1.<br>Leadership Team | 5B.1.<br>Weekly meeting with grade level teams and support staff to ensure lesson planning is taking into account the test specifications, deconstructed standards and FCIM lessons | 5B.1.<br>Edusoft, FAIR and ongoing formative assessments | |
| Reading Goal #5B:<br><br>All educators at our school will stress improvement in reading. Fluency and vocabulary strategies will be emphasized in all content classes across the curriculum. Research-based | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>White: 46%<br>Black: 24%<br>Hispanic: 51%<br>Asian: 71%<br>American Indian: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>White: 51%<br>Black: 43%<br>Hispanic: 54%<br>Asian: 75%<br>American Indian: | | | | | |

| | | 5B.2.<br>Number of students come to school with lack of background knowledge or experiences | 5B.2.<br>Use components of core and supplemental curriculum to build background knowledge.  Implement a great deal of visuals, graphic organizers, previewing, and read alouds. | 5B.2.<br>Leadership Team | 5B.2.<br>Weekly meeting with grade level teams and support staff  to ensure lesson planning is taking into account the test specifications, deconstructed standards and FCIM lessons | 5B.2.<br>Edusoft, FAIR and ongoing formative assessments |
| programs will be used for level 1 and 2 students. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the Benchmark assessments. | | 5B.3.<br>Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup | 5B.3.<br>Implement school wide interventions for Reading | 5B.3.<br>Leadership Team | 5B.3.<br>Weekly meeting with grade level teams and support staff  to ensure lesson planning is taking into account the test specifications, deconstructed standards and FCIM lessons | 5B.3.<br>Edusoft, FAIR and ongoing formative assessments |

| 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.<br>Lack of resources in native language | 5C.1.<br>Ensure students with limited English are provided ELL strategies when providing instruction | 5C.1.<br>Principal | 5C.1.<br>Bi-weekly meeting with teachers to discuss data and RtI | 5C.1.<br>Edusoft, FAIR, and ongoing formative assessments |
| Reading Goal #5C:<br><br>All educators at our school will stress improvement in reading. Fluency and vocabulary strategies will be emphasized in all content classes across the curriculum. Research-based programs will be used for level 1 and 2 students. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the Benchmark assessments. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2012, 43.8%(57) of the ELL students taking FCAT Reading assessment were proficient* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2013, 48% (74)of the ELL students taking the FCAT Reading assessment will be proficient* | | | | | |
| | | | 5C.2.<br>Communication Barriers | 5C.2.<br>Provide additional professional development on Thinking Maps | 5C.2.<br>CRT | 5C.2.<br>Implementation of thinking maps | 5C.2.<br>CWT data |
| | | | 5C.3.<br>Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup | 5C.3.<br>Implement school wide interventions for Reading | 5C.3.<br>Leadership Team | 5C.3.<br>Weekly meeting with grade level teams and support staff  to ensure lesson planning is taking into account the test specifications, deconstructed standards and FCIM lessons | 5C.3.<br>Edusoft, FAIR and ongoing formative assessments |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | 5D.3.<br>Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup | 5D3.<br>Implement school wide interventions for Reading | 5D.3.<br>Leadership Team | 5D.3.<br>Weekly meeting with grade level teams and support staff  to | 5D.3.<br>Edusoft, FAIR and ongoing formative assessments |

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

| Reading Goal #5D: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | ensure lesson planning is taking into account the test specifications, deconstructed standards and FCIM lessons | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All educators at our school will stress improvement in reading. Fluency and vocabulary strategies will be emphasized in all content classes across the curriculum. Research-based programs will be used for level 1 and 2 students. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the Benchmark assessments. | *46 students with disabilities scored at level 3 or above.* | *56 students with disabilities will score at level 3 or above.* | 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. Increase in the number of students that are identified as Economically Disadvantaged | 5E.1. Promote tutoring and enrichment opportunities for ED students | 5E.1. Principal | 5E.1. Bi-weekly data meetings with teachers to discuss the effectiveness of tutoring an intervention groups. Provide progress monitoring data to Reading Coach | 5E.1. Edusoft, FAIR, and ongoing formative assessments |
| Reading Goal #5E: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| All educators at our school will stress improvement in reading. Fluency and vocabulary strategies will be emphasized in all content classes across the curriculum. Research-based programs will be used for level 1 and 2 students. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the Benchmark assessments. | *In June 2012, 50% (59) of the ED students taking the FCAT Reading were proficient* | *In June 2013, 65%(60) of the ED students taking the FCAT Reading will be proficient* | 5E.2. Limited exposure to reading materials outside of school | 5E.2. Promote interest to the students to read the Sunshine State Readers and encourage students to complete AR tests | 5E.2. Principal and Media Clerk | 5E.2. Media Clerk will offer incentives to students who complete AR tests | 5E.2. FCAT, Edusoft, FAIR and ongoing formative assessments |
| | | | 5E.3. Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup | 5E.3. Implement school wide interventions for Reading | 5 E.3. Leadership Team | 5E.3. Weekly meeting with grade level teams and support staff to ensure lesson planning is taking into account the test specifications, deconstructed standards and FCIM lessons | 5E.3. Edusoft, FAIR and ongoing formative assessments |

**August 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised April 29, 2011**

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

## Reading Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Thinking Maps | K-5 | Thinking Maps trainer | All Teachers | August 2012 | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, FAIR data, Edusoft data, Imagine It assessment data | Leadership Team |
| Book Study on Tools for Engagement | K-5 | CRT | All Teachers | December 2012 | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, FAIR data, Edusoft data, Imagine It assessment data | Leadership Team |
| Lesson Study | K-5 | CRT | All Teachers | June 2013 | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, FAIR data, Edusoft data, Imagine It assessment data | CRT |
| Test Item Analysis | K-5 | CRT | All Teachers | Ongoing | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, FAIR data, Edusoft data, Imagine It assessment data | Leadership Team |
| IMS | All teachers | CRT/Dean | All Teachers | Ongoing | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, FAIR data, Edusoft data, Imagine It assessment data | Leadership Team |
| Common Core State Standards | 3-5 | CRT/Reading Coach | Begin 3-5 Black Belt teams | Ongoing | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, FAIR data, Edusoft data, Imagine It assessment data | CRT/Reading Coach |
| Common Core State Standards | K-2 | CRT/Reading Coach | Continue implementation of the standards in grades K-5 | Ongoing | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, FAIR data, Edusoft data, Imagine It assessment data | CRT/Reading Coach |
| Creating Learning Goals and Scales | K-5 | Reading Coach | K-5 | Ongoing | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, FAIR data, Edusoft data, Imagine It assessment data | Reading Coach |
| Differentiating Instruction | K-5 | Reading Coach/CRT | K-5 | November 2012 | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, FAIR data, Edusoft data, Imagine It assessment data | Reading Coach/CRT |
| Text Complexity and Deconstructing the Standards | K-2 | Reading Coach | K-2 | December 2012 | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, FAIR data, Edusoft data, Imagine It assessment data | Reading Coach |
| Webb's Depth of Knowledge Follow-Up | K-5 | Reading Coach | K-5 | January 2012 | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, FAIR data, Edusoft data, Imagine It assessment data | Reading Coach |
| Design Questions 2, 5, 7, and 8 of Marzano Protocol | All Teachers | CRT | All Teachers | Begin October then Ongoing | I Observation | Leadership Team |

**August 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised April 29, 2011**

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

**Reading Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Purchase additional Intervention materials | Intervention Kits | Title I | $4000 |
| Purchase additional Imagine It materials | Core Curriculum | General and Title I | $4000 |
| | | | Subtotal: $8000 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Increase use of technology | I-station Web Based software | Title I | $6500 |
| Increase student achievement | FCAT Test Maker Pro Update | Title I | $5000 |
| | | | Subtotal: $11,500 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Purchase of Tools for Engagement Book | Book for Professional Development | Title I | $1000 |
| Substitutes for PD | Temporary Duties | Title 1 | $3000 |
| | | | Subtotal: $4000 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| After school tutoring | Teachers paid for tutoring | SAI | $8000 |
| | | | Subtotal:$8000 |
| | | | Total: $31,500 |

*End of Reading Goals*

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

**<u>Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals</u>**

* 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.** <br><br> <u>CELLA Goal #1:</u> <br>75% of students will score Proficient on the Listening/Speaking part of the 2013 CELLA | <u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u> <br><br> *56% (27) of the ELL students are currently below proficient on the listening/speaking portion of the CELLA* | 1.1. <br>Language barrier for students and parents | 1.1. <br>Provide a translator for all parent meetings and hold four PLC meetings for ELL parents | 1.1. <br>Dean (translator) | 1.1. <br>CELLA results | 1.1. <br>CELLA |
| | | 1.2. <br>Limited time for direct language instruction | 1.2. <br>Paraprofessional support for small group instruction | 1.2. <br>Principal | 1.2. <br>CELLA results | 1.2. <br>CELLA |
| | | 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.** <br><br> <u>CELLA Goal #2:</u> <br>75% of students will score Proficient on the Reading portion of the CELLA | <u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u> <br><br> *49% (23) of the ELL students were Proficient on the Reading portion of the CELLA* | 2.1. <br>Need for differentiated instruction for ELL learners | 2.1. <br>Teachers will document differentiated instruction in lesson plans. | 2.1. <br>Support team | 2.1. <br>Weekly team meetings with grade levels | 2.1. <br>CELLA |
| | | 2.2. <br>High percentage of students performing below grade level | 2.2. <br>Teachers will incorporate ELL strategies into their lesson plans | 2.2. <br>Leadership Team | 2.2. <br>Weekly grade level meetings | 2.2. <br>CELLA |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

## 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.<br>Lack of background experiences to write from | 2.1<br>Use graphic organizers | 2.1.<br>Reading Coach | 2.1.<br>CELLA results | 2.1.<br>CELLA |
| CELLA Goal #3:<br><br>75% of the students will score proficiency on the Writing portion of the CELLA | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :<br><br>*35% (17) of the students taking the CELLA scored proficiency.* | | | | | |
| | | 2.2.<br>Lack of writing support | 2.2.<br>Implement interactive writing | 2.2.<br>Reading Coach | 2.2.<br>CELLA results<br>Writing Prompts | 2.2.<br>FCAT writes<br>CELLA |
| | | 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 |
| Provide PD on conventions | Professional Development on Strategies | Title I | $4000 |
| | | | |

*End of CELLA Goals*

**August 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised April 29, 2011**

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

## Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

| Elementary Mathematics Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.** | | | 1A.1.<br><br>The core curriculum does not fully cover the standards. | 1A.1.<br><br>Incorporate supplemental materials and lessons into math instruction. | 1A.1.<br><br>Classroom teachers<br>Grade Level Administrative Contacts | 1A.1.<br><br>Benchmark Testing and Edusoft testing | 1A.1.<br><br>FCAT 2.0 |
| Mathematics Goal #1A:<br><br>All educators at our school will stress improvement in Mathematics. Fluency in basic mathematical operations, conceptual development and problem solving will be the focus. Research-based programs will be used for core and interventions. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring, and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the use of NGSSS benchmark assessments | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2012, 33% (46) of the students taking the FCAT Math assessment scored at or above a level 3.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2013, 86% (107) of the students taking the FCAT Math assessment will score at or above a level 3* | | | | | |
| | | | 1A.2.<br>Insufficient prior knowledge of basic facts and math foundation | 1A.2.<br>Math interventions and motivational math computer programs | 1A.2.<br>Math intervention teachers<br>Classroom teachers | 1A.2.<br>Computer Use<br>Intervention group progress monitoring | 1A.2.<br>Edusoft<br>Benchmark testing<br>FCAT 2.0 |
| | | | 1A.3.<br>Struggling with using higher order thinking skills | 1A.3.<br>Encourage activities that involve analysis, synthesis, and evaluation in math | 1A.3.<br>Classroom teachers<br>Intervention teachers | 1A.3.<br>Edusoft and Benchmark testing | 1A.3.<br>FCAT 2.0 |
| **1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.** | | | 1B.1.<br>Lack of communication skills limiting their ability to process their thoughts verbally or in written form | 1B.1.<br>Increase the variety of communication models such as visuals/pictures, task schedules, and prompted response | 1B.1.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 1B.1.<br>IEP Data Collection | 1B.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #1B:<br>In June 2013, 20% (1) of students will score a level 4, 5 or 6 on the FAA. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2012, 0% (o) of the students taking the FAA made a 4, 5 or 6 on the FAA.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*IN June 2013, 20% (1), of the students taking the FAA will score a 4, 5 or 6.* | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1B.2.<br>Cognitive functioning levels vary greatly from one student to the next. Many of them are functioning well below their peers | 1B.2.<br>Provide daily instruction aligned with the Access Points | 1B.2.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 1B.2.<br>IEP Data Collection | 1B.2. |
| | | 1B.3.<br>Students require multiple accommodations to access curriculum | 1B.3.<br>Student tasks will be chunked based on individual needs.<br>Students will be provided through individualized daily schedules.<br>Student work areas will be structured. | 1B.3.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 1B.3.<br>IEP Data Collection | 1B.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.**<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2A:<br><br>All educators at our school will stress improvement in Mathematics. Fluency in basic mathematical operations, conceptual development and problem solving will be the focus. Research-based programs will be used for core and interventions. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring, and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the use of NGSSS benchmark assessments | | | 2A.1.<br><br>Not enough rigor due to remediation | 2A.1.<br><br>Higher level center activities and challenging interventions | 2A.1.<br><br>Classroom teachers<br>Intervention teachers<br>Grade level administrative contacts | 2A.1.<br><br>Edusoft<br>Benchmark testing | 2A.1.<br><br>FCAT 2.0 |
| | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2012, 17% (23) of the students taking the FCAT Math assessment scored at a level 4 or above* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2013, 25% (31) of the students taking the FCAT Math assessment will score at a level 4 or above* | | | | | |
| | | | 2A.2.<br>Testing different concepts at different grade levels | 2A.2.<br>Vertical Planning | 2A.2.<br>Administrative Team | 2A.2.<br>Lesson Plans<br>Team Meeting Discussion | 2A.2.<br>Survey of teachers |
| | | | 2A.3.<br>Lack of intrinsic rewards | 2A.3.<br>Recognition of achievement | 2A.3.<br>Administrative Team<br>Classroom Teachers | 2A.3.<br>Edusoft<br>Benchmark Testing | 2A.3.<br>FCAT 2.0 |
| **2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.** | | | 2B.1.<br>Lack of communication skills limiting their ability to process | 2B.1.<br>Increase the variety of communication models such as | 2B.1.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, | 2B.1.<br>IEP Data Collection | 2B.1.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |

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

| | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal #2B:<br><br>In June 2013, 63% (5) of the students taking the FAA will score at or above a level 7. | *In June 2012, 60% (3) of the students taking the FAA scored a level 7 or above.* | *In June 2013, 63% (5) of the students taking the FAA will score at or above a level 7.* | their thoughts verbally or in written form | visuals/pictures, task schedules, and prompted response | ESE paraprofessionals | | |
| | | | 2B.2.<br>Cognitive functioning levels vary greatly from one student to the next. Many of them are functioning well below their peers | 2B.2.<br>Provide daily instruction aligned with the Access Points | 2B.2.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 2B.2.<br>IEP Data Collection | 2B.2.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 2B.3.<br>Students require multiple accommodations to access curriculum | 2B.3.<br>Student tasks will be chunked based on individual needs.<br>Students will be provided through individualized daily schedules.<br>Student work areas will be structured. | 2B.3.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 2B.3.<br>IEP Data Collection | 2B.3.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |

| 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.<br><br>Students are already too far behind. They are playing catch up. | 3A.1.<br><br>Differentiated instruction<br>Math intervention groups<br>Tutoring programs | 3A.1.<br><br>Classroom Teacher<br>Intervention Teacher<br>Grade Level Administrative Contact | 3A.1.<br><br>Progress Monitoring Data<br>Edusoft<br>Benchmark Testing | 3A.1.<br><br>FCAT 2.0 |
| Mathematics Goal #3A:<br><br>All educators at our school will stress improvement in Mathematics. Fluency in basic mathematical operations, conceptual development and problem solving will be the focus. Research-based programs will be used for core and interventions. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring, and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the use of NGSSS benchmark assessments | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2012, 47% (63) of the students taking the FCAT Math assessment made a learning gain* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*IN June 2013, 86% (108) of the students taking the FCAT Math will make a learning gain* | | | | | |
| | | | 3A.2.<br><br>Students lack motivation. | 3A.2.<br><br>Positive Incentive System<br>Math challenges and engaging projects/activities | 3A.2.<br><br>Classroom Teachers<br>Administrative Team | 3A.2.<br><br>Progress Monitoring Success Charts<br>Edusoft<br>Benchmark Testing | 3A.2.<br><br>FCAT 2.0 |
| | | | 3A.3.<br><br>Students have a wide range of comprehension levels. | 3A.3.<br><br>Differentiated Instruction<br>Math Intervention Groups | 3A.3.<br><br>Classroom Teachers<br>Intervention Teachers<br>Grade Level Administrative Contact | 3A.3.<br><br>Lesson Plans<br>Progress Monitoring for Intervention Groups | 3A.3.<br><br>Edusoft Data<br>FCAT 2.0 |

**August 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised April 29, 2011**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.** | | | 3B.1.<br>Lack of communication skills limiting their ability to process their thoughts verbally or in written form | 3B.1.<br>Increase the variety of communication models such as visuals/pictures, task schedules, and prompted response | 3B.1.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 3B.1.<br>IEP Data Collection | 3B.1.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |
| Mathematics Goal #3B:<br><br>In June 2013, 63% (5) of the students taking the FAA will make a learning gain. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2012, 60% (3) of the students taking the FAA made a learning gain.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2013, 63% (5) of the students taking the FAA will make a learning gain.* | | | | | |
| | | | 3B.2.<br>Cognitive functioning levels vary greatly from one student to the next. Many of them are functioning well below their peers | 3B.2.<br>Provide daily instruction aligned with the Access Points | 3B.2.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 3B.2.<br>IEP Data Collection | 3B.2.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 3B.3.<br>Students require multiple accommodations to access curriculum | 3B.3.<br>Student tasks will be chunked based on individual needs. Students will be provided through individualized daily schedules. Student work areas will be structured. | 3B.3.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 3B.3.<br>IEP Data Collection | 3B.3.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.** | | | 4A.1.<br><br>Lack of interventions in place | 4A.1.<br><br>Math Interventions<br>Target Tier 3 Students | 4A.1.<br><br>Math Intervention Teachers<br>RtI Coach and Team<br>Classroom Teacher | 4A.1.<br><br>Progress Monitoring<br>Benchmark Testing | 4A.1.<br><br>Edusoft Data<br>FCAT 2.0 |
| Mathematics Goal #4:<br><br>All educators at our school will stress improvement in Mathematics. Fluency in basic mathematical operations, conceptual development and problem solving will be the focus. Research-based programs will be used for core and interventions. OCPS district assessment tools will be | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2012, 37% (18) of the students in the lowest 25% taking the FCAT Math assessment made a learning gain* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2013, 55% of the students in the lowest 25% taking the FCAT Math assessment will make a learning g* | | | | | |
| | | | 4A.2.<br><br>Lack of Progress Monitoring | 4A.2.<br><br>Anecdotal Records | 4A.2.<br><br>Classroom Teacher | 4A.2.<br><br>IMS | 4A.2.<br><br>FCAT 2.0 |

| used for measuring, monitoring, and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the use of NGSSS benchmark assessments | | | IMS | | Benchmark Testing Edusoft Data | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 4A.3.<br><br>Lack of Math Vocabulary | 4A.3.<br><br>Explicit math vocabulary instruction in the math block | 4A.3.<br><br>Classroom Teacher | 4A.3.<br><br>Lesson Plans Benchmark Testing Edusoft Data | 4A.3.<br><br>FCAT 2.0 |

| 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**<br><br>37% | **T 42%**<br>**A 73%**<br>**B 29%**<br>**H 37%**<br>**W 43%**<br>**ELL 36%**<br>**SWD 26%**<br>**ED 39%** | **T 48%**<br>**A 75%**<br>**B 35%**<br>**H 43%**<br>**W 48%**<br>**ELL 42%**<br>**SWD 33%**<br>**ED 44%** | **T 53%**<br>**A 78%**<br>**B 42%**<br>**H 48%**<br>**W 54%**<br>**ELL 48%**<br>**SWD 39%**<br>**ED 50%** | **T 58%**<br>**A 80%**<br>**B 48%**<br>**H 54%**<br>**W 59%**<br>**ELL 53%**<br>**SWD 46%**<br>**ED 55%** | **T 63%**<br>**A 83%**<br>**B 55%**<br>**H 60%**<br>**W 64%**<br>**ELL 59%**<br>**SWD 53%**<br>**ED 61%** | **T 69%**<br>**A 85%**<br>**B 61%**<br>**H 66%**<br>**W 69%**<br>**ELL 65%**<br>**SWD 60%**<br>**ED 67%** |
| Mathematics Goal #5A:<br>Cypress Park will decrease the achievement gap by 50% by increasing the number of students who become fluent in number operations.<br><br>Currently, Cypress Park has 67% of the students below proficiency in Mathematics | | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | 5B.1.<br>White:<br><br>Students lack of background knowledge | 5B.1.<br><br>Math intervention groups High interest math computer programs Supplemental math texts and materials | 5B.1.<br><br>Classroom Teachers Intervention Teachers Grade Level Administrative Contact | 5B.1.<br><br>Lesson Plans Intervention Progress Monitoring | 5B.1.<br><br>Edusoft Data FCAT 2.0 | |
| Mathematics Goal #5B:<br><br>All educators at our school will stress improvement in Mathematics. Fluency in basic mathematical operations, conceptual | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>White: 36% Black: 18% Hispanic: 22% Asian: 64% American Indian: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>White: 48% Black: 35% Hispanic: 43% Asian: 75% American Indian: | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| development and problem solving will be the focus. Research-based programs will be used for core and interventions. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring, and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the use of NGSSS benchmark assessments | | 5B.2.<br>Students lack of math vocabulary | 5B.2.<br>Explicit vocabulary instruction and strategies during math content instruction | 5B.2.<br>Classroom Teachers | 5B.2.<br>Lesson Plans<br>Progress Monitoring<br>Benchmark Data | 5B.2.<br>Edusoft Data<br>FCAT 2.0 |
| | | 5B.3.<br><br>Parental involvement | 5B.3.<br><br>Provide parent math nights to encourage a parent/school partnership | 5B.3.<br><br>Classroom Teachers<br>Administrative Team | 5B.3.<br><br>Parent Survey | 5B.3.<br><br>FCAT 2.0 |
| | | 5B4.<br>Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup | 5B.4.<br>Implement school wide interventions for Math | 5B.4.<br>Leadership Team | 5B.4.<br>Weekly meeting with grade level teams and support staff to ensure lesson planning is taking into account the test specifications, deconstructed standards and FCIM lessons | 5B.4.<br>Edusoft, Envision and ongoing formative assessments |

| 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.<br><br>Students lack math vocabulary | 5C.1.<br><br>Explicitly teach math vocabulary in the math content time | 5C.1.<br><br>Classroom Teacher | 5C.1.<br><br>Lesson Plans<br>Progress Monitoring<br>Benchmark Testing | 5C.1.<br><br>Edusoft Data<br>FCAT 2.0 |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u><br><br>All educators at our school will stress improvement in Mathematics. Fluency in basic mathematical operations, conceptual development and problem solving will be the focus. Research-based programs will be used for core and interventions. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring, and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the use of NGSSS benchmark | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u><br><br>*In June 2012, 39% (10) of the ELL students taking the FCAT Math assessment scored at or above a level 3* | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u><br><br>*In June 2013, 50% of the ELL students taking the FCAT Math assessment will score at or above a level 3* | | | | | |
| | | | 5C.2.<br><br>Language barrier in instruction and with teacher | 5C.2.<br><br>Work closely with ELL paraprofessional<br>Incorporate ELL strategies within the classroom instruction and intervention time | 5C.2.<br><br>Classroom Teachers<br>Intervention Teachers<br>Grade Level Administrative Contact | 5C.2.<br><br>Lesson Plans<br>Progress Monitoring | 5C.2.<br><br>FCAT 2.0 |
| | | | 5C.3.<br><br>Language barrier between parents | 5C.3.<br><br>Bilingual support for parent/teacher | 5C.3.<br><br>Administrative Dean | 5C.3.<br><br>Monitor the amount of response | 5C.3.<br><br>Parent Survey |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| assessments. | | and teachers | conferences<br>Bilingual school/home forms of communication | ELL Paraprofessionals<br>Bilingual Staff | from parents | |
| | | 5C.4.<br>Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup | 5C.4.<br>Implement school wide interventions for Math | 5C.4.<br>Leadership Team | 5C.4.<br>Weekly meeting with grade level teams and support staff  to ensure lesson planning is taking into account the test specifications, deconstructed standards and FCIM lessons | 5C.4.<br>Edusoft, Envision and ongoing formative assessments |

| 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.<br><br>Students lack math vocabulary | 5D.1.<br><br>Explicitly teach math vocabulary in the math content time | 5D.1.<br><br>Classroom Teacher | 5D.1.<br><br>Lesson Plans<br>Progress Monitoring<br>Benchmark Testing | 5D.1.<br><br>Edusoft Data<br>FCAT 2.0 |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u><br><br>All educators at our school will stress improvement in Mathematics. Fluency in basic mathematical operations, conceptual development and problem solving will be the focus. Research-based programs will be used for core and interventions. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring, and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the use of NGSSS benchmark assessments. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u><br><br>*32 students with disabilities scored at Level 3 or above.* | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u><br><br>*42 students with disabilities will score at Level 3 or above.* | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. |
| | | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | | 5E.1.<br><br>Lack of RtI support | 5E.1.<br><br>Math Interventions<br>Target Tier 3 Students | 5E.1.<br><br>Math Intervention Teachers<br>RtI Coach and Team<br>Classroom Teacher | 5E.1.<br><br>Progress Monitoring<br>Benchmark Testing | 5E.1.<br><br>Edusoft Data<br>FCAT 2.0 |
| Mathematics Goal #5E:<br>All educators at our school will stress improvement in Mathematics. Fluency in basic mathematical operations, conceptual development and problem solving will be the focus. Research-based programs will be used for core and interventions. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring, and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on the use of NGSSS benchmark assessments | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2012, 35% of the students taking the FCAT Math assessment scored at or above a level 3* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2013, 50% of the students taking the FCAT Math assessment will score at or above a level 3* | | | | | |
| | | | 5E.2<br><br>Lack of Progress Monitoring | 5E.2<br><br>Anecdotal Records<br>IMS | 5E.2.<br><br>Classroom Teacher | 5E.2.<br><br>IMS<br>Benchmark Testing<br>Edusoft Data | 5E.2.<br><br>FCAT 2.0 |
| | | | 5E.3<br><br>Lack of Math Vocabulary | 5E.3<br><br>Explicit math vocabulary instruction in the math instructional block | 5E.3<br><br>Classroom Teacher | 5E.3.<br><br>Lesson Plans<br>Benchmark Testing<br>Edusoft Data | 5E.3.<br><br>FCAT 2.0 |
| | | | 5E4.<br>Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup | 5E.4.<br>Implement school wide interventions for Math | 5E.4.<br>Leadership Team | 5E.4.<br>Weekly meeting with grade level teams and support staff to ensure lesson planning is taking into account the test specifications, deconstructed standards and FCIM lessons | 5E.4.<br>Edusoft, Envision and ongoing formative assessments |

*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 |
| Math Vocabulary | ALL | CRT and Mr. Justin MacDonald | School-Wide | Ongoing | Monitor of lesson plans and CWT | Principal, CRT |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FASTT Math | ALL | Nilda Morales | K-5 | Ongoing | Monitor of FASTT Math reports | Principal, CRT |
| Deconstructing the Standards | ALL | District Support | K-5 | October 2012 | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, Edusoft data, Envision assessment data | Principal, CRT |
| IMS | ALL | CRT | All Teachers | August | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, Edusoft data, Envision assessment data | Principal. CRT |
| Lesson Study | 3-5 | CRT | 3-5 teachers | October and March | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, Edusoft data, Envision assessment data | CRT |
| Integrating Math and Writing | All Teachers | 4th grade teacher | All Teachers | March | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, Edusoft data, Envision assessment data | Principal |
| Envision Math | New Teachers | District Support | New Teachers | August | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, Edusoft data, Envision assessment data | Principal |
| Book Study | Math Leadership Team | CRT | Select teachers | Ongoing | Weekly data meetings; Weekly grade level meetings, Edusoft data, Envision assessment data | CRT |

## **Mathematics Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Use of math manipulatives for use with the math curriculum | Math Manipulatives | Title 1 | $3,000 |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal: $3000** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| To provide math instructional support with SmartBoards | SmartBoard Resources and Games | Title I | $2000 |
| To support math fluency | Purchase of FASTT Math | Title I | $8000 |
| | | | **Subtotal:$9000** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Continued professional development with | Substitutes for professional development | Title I | $3000 |

**August 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised April 29, 2011**

| Envision Math | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:$1000** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Student recognition materials for achievement | Recognition Materials | School Improvement | $2,000 |
| | | | **Subtotal: $2000** |
| | | | **Total: $15,000** |

*End of Mathematics Goals*

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| **Elementary and Middle Science Goals** | | | **Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.** <br><br> Science Goal #1A: <br><br> It is the main focus of Cypress Park Elementary to increase the use of Science Vocabulary. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring, and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on Benchmark Testing. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <br><br> *In June 2012, 26% (10) of the students taking the FCAT Science scored at or above a level 3* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <br><br> *In June 2013, 45% (19) of the students taking the FCAT Science will score at or above a level 3* | 1A.1. <br><br> Content not being taught across grade levels limited background knowledge when students get to 5th Grade | 1A.1. <br><br> Implement Science across the curriculum | 1A.1. <br><br> Classroom Teacher Grade Level Administrative Contact | 1A.1. <br><br> Lesson Plans | 1A.1. <br><br> FCAT 2.0 Edusoft Data |
| | | | 1A.2. Implementation of new curriculum | 1A.2. Provide professional development on Fusion Science curriculum | 1A.2. Classroom Teachers | 1A.2. Lesson Plans | 1A.2. FCAT 2.0 Edusoft Data |
| | | | 1A.3. Lack of content area reading strategies | 1A.3. Teach students to read as if they were scientists. Incorporate reading strategies in science instruction and science content into the reading block | 1A.3. Classroom Teachers Grade Level Administrative Contact | 1A.3. Lesson Plans Edusoft Data Benchmark Testing | 1A.3. FCAT Edusoft |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1.A.4<br>Need for data analysis | 1.A.4<br>Implement the FCIM model | 1.A.4<br>Classroom Teachers<br>Leadership Team | 1.A.4<br>Lesson Plans<br>Edusoft Data | 1.A.4<br>FCAT<br>Edusoft |
| **1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**<br><br>Science Goal #1B:<br><br>*Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* | *2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | *2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | 1B.1.<br>Lack of communication skills limiting their ability to process their thoughts verbally or in written form | 1B.1.<br>Increase the variety of communication models such as visuals/pictures, task schedules, and prompted response | 1B.1.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 1B.1.<br>IEP Data Collection | 1B.1.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 1B.2.<br>Cognitive functioning levels vary greatly from one student to the next. Many of them are functioning well below their peers | 1B.2.<br>Provide daily instruction aligned with the Access Points | 1B.2.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 1B.2.<br>IEP Data Collection | 1B.2.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 1B.3.<br>Students require multiple accommodations to access curriculum | 1B.3.<br>Student tasks will be chunked based on individual needs.<br>Students will be provided through individualized daily schedules.<br>Student work areas will be structured. | 1B.3.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 1B.3.<br>IEP Data Collection | 1B.3. Florida Alternate Assessment |

| 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.**<br><br>Science Goal #2A:<br><br>It is the main focus of Cypress Park Elementary to increase the use of Science Vocabulary. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring, and forecasting student progress with an emphasis on Benchmark Testing. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | 2A.1.<br><br>Lack of content area reading strategies | 2A.1.<br><br>Explicit content area reading instruction and integrating reading and science strategies. | 2A.1.<br>Classroom Teachers<br>Grade Level Administrative Contact | 2A.1.<br>Lesson Plans<br>Edusoft Data<br>Benchmark Assessments | 2A.1.<br><br>FCAT 2.0 |
| | | | 2A.2.<br>Lack of prior knowledge/interest | 2A.2.<br>Engaging lessons, labs, and activities | 2A.2.<br>Classroom Teachers<br>Grade Level Administrative Contact | 2A.2.<br>Lesson Plans<br>Benchmark Assessment | 2A.2.<br>FCAT 2.0<br>Edusoft Data |
| | | | 2A.3.<br>Lack of exposure to high interest nonfiction science texts | 2A.3.<br>Expanding classroom libraries<br>Weekly book features<br>Science Accelerated Reading | 2A.3.<br>Classroom Teachers | 2A.3.<br>Lesson Plans<br>Benchmark Assessments | 2A.3. |

| | | | incentives | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.** | | | 2B.1. Lack of communication skills limiting their ability to process their thoughts verbally or in written form | 2B.1. Increase the variety of communication models such as visuals/pictures, task schedules, and prompted response | 2B.1. Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 2B.1. IEP Data Collection | 2B.1. Florida Alternate Assessment |
| Science Goal #2B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 2B.2. Cognitive functioning levels vary greatly from one student to the next. Many of them are functioning well below their peers | 2B.2. Provide daily instruction aligned with the Access Points | 2B.2. Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 2B.2. IEP Data Collection | 2B.2. Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 2B.3. Students require multiple accommodations to access curriculum | 2B.3. Student tasks will be chunked based on individual needs. Students will be provided through individualized daily schedules. Student work areas will be structured. | 2B.3. Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 2B.3. IEP Data Collection | 2B.3. Florida Alternate Assessment |

*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 |
| STEM | All | CRT | K-5 | Ongoing | Implementation of STEM Lessons | Principal |
| New Curriculum Implementation | ALL | CRT/Reading Coach | K-5 | Ongoing | Documentation of FUSION science in lesson plans | Principal |
| P-SELL grant | 5th grade teachers | District | 5th | Ongoing | Implementation of P-Sell curriculum and attendance at trainings | Principal and District Coordinator |
| Deconstructing the Science Standards | All Teachers | District | All Teachers | October | Backwards planning for Science Lessons | Leadership Team |

## Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Ensure students had academic science vocabulary | Science Thesaurus | Title 1 | $2000 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal:$2000 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Implementation of Best practices with Science Fusion | Professional Development days | Title I | $2000 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: $2000 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total:$4000 |

*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 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.** | 1A.1. <br><br> Limited Knowledge of Conventions | 1A.1. <br><br> Daily sentence dictation | 1A.1. <br><br> Classroom Teacher | 1A.1. <br><br> Ongoing progress monitoring | 1A.1. <br><br> FCAT Writes |

| Writing Goal #1A:<br><br>90% (36) of the 4th graders at Cypress Park Elementary will score a level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2012, 87% (34) of the students taking the FCAT Writes scored a level 3 or above on the 2012 FCAT Writes.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*IN June 2013, 90% (36) of the 4th graders at Cypress Park Elementary will score a level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes* | | incorporating high frequency and troublesome words, as well as the various punctuation marks. | | through prompts scored on the FCAT Writes rubric | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1A.2.<br>Limited Writing Experience | 1A.2.<br>Variety of prewriting activities to motivate students to enhance writing motivation. | 1A.2.<br><br>Classroom Teacher | 1A.2.<br><br>Ongoing progress monitoring through prompts scored on the FCAT Writes rubric | 1A.2.<br><br>FCAT Writes |
| | | | 1A.3.<br>Lack of Knowledge of Writing Process | 1A.3.<br>Provide intensive instruction in the writing process and monitor progress at each stage. | 1A.3.<br><br>Classroom Teacher | 1A.3.<br><br>Ongoing progress monitoring through prompts scored on FCAT Writes rubric | 1A.3.<br><br>FCAT Writes |
| **1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.**<br><br>Writing Goal #1B:<br><br>In June 2013, 100% (3) of the students taking the FAA will score a 4 or higher | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2012, 100% (2) of the students taking the FAA scored a 4 or higher in Writing.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In June 2013, 100% (3) of the students taking the FAA will score a 4 or higher in Writing.* | 1B.1.<br>Lack of communication skills limiting their ability to process their thoughts verbally or in written form | 1B.1.<br>Increase the variety of communication models such as visuals/pictures, task schedules, and prompted response | 1B.1.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 1B.1.<br>IEP Data Collection | 1B.1.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 1B.2.<br>Cognitive functioning levels vary greatly from one student to the next. Many of them are functioning well below their peers | 1B.2.<br>Provide daily instruction aligned with the Access Points | 1B.2.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 1B.2.<br>IEP Data Collection | 1B.2.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |
| | | | 1B.3.<br>Students require multiple accommodations to access curriculum | 1B.3.<br>Student tasks will be chunked based on individual needs.<br>Students will be provided through individualized daily schedules.<br>Student work areas will be structured. | 1B.3.<br>Behavior Specialist, Program Assistant, Classroom Teachers, ESE paraprofessionals | 1B.3.<br>IEP Data Collection | 1B.3.<br>Florida Alternate Assessment |

**Writing Professional Development**

**August 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised April 29, 2011**

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

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Conquering Conventions Part 1 and Part 2 | K-5 | Writing Leader | Instructional Staff | Pre-Planning | Documentation of lesson plans for writing across the content | Leadership Team Grade Level Contacts |
| Thinking Maps Training | K-5 | Writing Leader | Instructional Staff | Pre-Planning | Bi-weekly data meetings and documentation of lesson plans | Leadership Team Grade Level Contacts |
| Writing Across the Curriculum | K-5 | Writing Leader | Instructional Staff | Ongoing | Documentation of lesson plans | Leadership Team |

*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.

## 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 |
| Increase descriptors and vocabulary word choice | Writing Thesaurus | General Budget | $250 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal:$250 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Provide teachers with multiple strategies through games to increase knowledge of conventions | Literature and writer resource notebooks and a variety of materials to enhance the in class writing experience | Title 1 | $2700 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal:$2700 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |

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

| Writing Wizards | To increase motivation amongst writers | SAI | $4000 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **Subtotal: $4000** |
| | | | **Total:$6950** |

*End of Writing Goals*

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

| **Attendance Goal(s)** | | | **Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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.<br><br>Lack of importance of school | 1.1.<br><br>Provide parents with ongoing support and information to increase importance of education | 1.1.<br><br>Principal | 1.1.<br><br>Monitor EDW Attendance Report | 1.1.<br><br>Monthly Attendance Report |
| Attendance Goal #1:<br><br>*With the Title I compact, students and parents are aware of the importance of attending school every day. Our attendance goal is to have 96% of our students in attendance.* | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:*<br><br>*During the 2011-2012 school year the attendance rate was 94% (152).*<br><br>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)<br><br>*During the 2011-2012 school year the number of students with excessive absences was 88.*<br><br>2012 Current Number of | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*<br><br>*During the 2012-2013 school year the attendance rate will be 96% (108).*<br><br>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)<br><br>*During the 2012-2013 school year the number of students with excessive absences will be 78.*<br><br>2013 Expected Number of | | | | | |

| | Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *During the 2011-2012 school year the number of students with excessive tardies was 54.* | *During the 2012-2013 the number of students with excessive tardies will decrease to 44.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. Lack of recognition for attendance | 1.2. School-wide incentive program to recognize perfect attendance | 1.2. Registrar and Leadership Team | 1.2. Review of Attendance Rate | 1.2. EDW Attendance Rates and SMS Reports |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Attendance Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Implementation of School Wide Behavioral Support | K-5 | Dean | All staff | Ongoing | Awesome Mustang Program | Administrative Dean |
| Ruby Payne Strategies | K-5 | Principal | All staff | Ongoing | Identify in IObservation | Leadership Team |
| | | | | | | |

## 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 |
| Ruby Payne Strategies | Materials from Aha Process | Title 1 | $250 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal:$250 |
| 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 |
| Character education and recognition of good behavior choices | Student incentives and trophies | 001 | $1500 |
| | | | **Subtotal:$1500** |
| | | | **Total:$1750** |

*End of Attendance Goals*

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Suspension Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1.  Suspension**<br><br>Suspension Goal #1:<br><br>*Students must be in school and engaged in learning to academically achieve, be engaged in learning, and therefore, suspensions are counterproductive in reaching achievement goals.* | 2012 Total Number of  In –School Suspensions<br><br>*The total number of in-school suspensions for the 2011-2012 school year was 7.*<br><br>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School<br><br>*The total number of students who had in-school suspensions* | 2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions<br><br>*The total number of in-school suspensions will decrease by 50% to 3.*<br><br>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School<br><br>*The total number of students who had in school suspension will* | 1.1.<br><br>Lack of recognition | 1.1.<br><br>Implementation of Awesome Mustang Program | 1.1.<br><br>Administrative Dean | 1.1.<br><br>Review of Suspension Rates and SMS | 1.1.<br><br>SMS |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *was 6.* | *decrease by 50% to 3.* | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | | |
| | *During the 2011-2012 school year there were 16 out-of-school suspensions.* | *During the 2012-2013 school year the number of out-of-school suspensions will decrease by 25% to 12.* | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School | | | | |
| | *During the 2011-2012 the number of students who received out-of-school suspensions was 9.* | *During the 2012-2013 school year the number of students who receive out-of-school suspension will decrease by 23% to 7.* | | | | |
| | | | 1.2.<br>Lack of understanding of school expectations and behaviors | 1.2.<br>The Dean and Alpha counselor will hold Code of Conduct meetings every quarter with students to review rules and procedures at Cypress Park. | 1.2.<br>Dean | 1.2.<br>Review of Suspension Rates and Monthly Discipline Reports | 1.2.<br>Monthly Discipline Reports |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## 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 |
| Implementation of School Wide Discipline Plan | K-5 | Dean | All staff | Ongoing | Suspension Rates | Administrative Dean |
| Code of Conduct Reviews | K-5 | Dean/Alpha Counselor | All staff | Quarterly | Suspension Rates | Administrative Dean |
| | | | | | | |

## 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) |

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

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

*End of Suspension Goals*

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| Parent Involvement Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Parent Involvement** | | | 1.1. Limited English | 1.1. Provide a translator as necessary for parent events | 1.1. Principal/Dean | 1.1. Compare sign in sheets across school years | 1.1. Parent newsletters/ sign in sheets |
| Parent Involvement Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cypress Park encourages all parents to attend school activities through the communication of the newsletter, Connect Orange, and planners. | *In June 2012, approximately 35% of parents participated in after school activities that were related to curriculum, SAC/PLC, movie nights.* | *In June 2013, approximately 45% of parents will participate in after school activities that relate to curriculum, SAC/PLC, movie nights.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. Communication | 1.2. Provide monthly newsletters, update the school website and communicate upcoming events on the marquee and School Messenger | 1.2. Leadership Team | 1.2. Documentation of newsletters, call logs, and sign in sheets for events | 1.2. Parent newsletters and sign in sheets |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## 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 |
| Monthly curriculum nights | K-5 | CRT | Parents in all grade levels | Ongoing | Copies of sign in sheets | Title I coordinator |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

## Parent Involvement Budget

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

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Provide curriculum presentations by certified teachers | Teachers | Title I | 1500 |
| | | | **Subtotal: $1500** |
| | | | **Total: $1500** |

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

## 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:<br><br>Cypress Park Elementary will implement STEM across all grade levels so that students and teachers are working collectively and collaboratively while communicating with content area vocabulary that is grade level specific. | 1.1.<br>Lack of knowledge of STEM | 1.1.<br>Provide professional development opportunities for all teachers to educate teachers on the components of STEM. | 1.1.<br>CRT | 1.1.<br>Documentation in lesson plans | 1.1.<br>Assessment data and reports from Effective Educators |
| | 1.2.<br>Lack of Knowledge of STEM | 1.2.<br>Provide modeling for lesson plans while working collaboratively with district and state personnel as a Partnership school | 1.2.<br>Leadership Team | 1.2.<br>Documentation in lesson plans | 1.2<br> Assessment data and reports from Effective Educators |

**August 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised April 29, 2011**

| | | 1.3.<br>Shift from the NGSSS to the CCSS | 1.3.<br>Provide training and updates on the implementation of the CCSS in K-1 and the blending of the CCSS in grades 2-5 | 1.3.<br>CRT | 1.3.<br>Documentation in lesson plans and ongoing professional development | 1.3<br>. Assessment data and reports from Effective Educators |
| | | 1.4<br>No STEM cross-curricular PLC exists to focus on integration of content | 1.4<br>Integrate time for STEM PLC | 1.4<br>CRT | 1.4<br>Documentation of PLC meetings | 1.4<br>Assessment data and IObservation |

## 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 |
| What is STEM | K-5 | CRT | All teachers | October | Lesson plan documentation and iObservation | Leadership Team |
| Lesson Study Cycle 1 | 3-5 | CRT | Teachers in grades 3-5 | October | Documentation from the lesson study facilitation | CRT/Lesson Study Facilitator |
| Integrating Technology into the Curriculum | All grades | CRT | All teachers | Ongoing | Lesson plan documentation and iObservation | Leadership Team |

## 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 |

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

|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Subtotal:** |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Subtotal:** |
|  |  |  | **Total:** |

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

## 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: Math Fluency | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Additional Goal**<br><br>Additional Goal #1:<br>All elementary students will become fluent in all four basic number operations for whole numbers by 4th grade. | 2012 Current Level :*<br><br>*In June 2012, 33% (45) students scored at or above grade level on the FCAT Math assessment.* | 2013 Expected Level :*<br><br>*In June 2013, 86% (108) students will score at or above grade level on the FCAT Math assessment.* | 1.1.<br>Lack of Math Fluency | 1.1.<br>Implement FASTT Math school wide and provide incentives based on achievement | 1.1.<br>CRT/Dean | 1.1.<br>FASTT Math Reports | 1.1.<br>FASTT Math reports and formative and summative assessments |
|  |  |  | 1.2.Lack of Parental Involvement | 1.2.<br>Increase opportunities to attend curriculum nights to provide strategies to be used at home for support | 1.2.<br>Grade Level Teams, Leadership Team and Principal | 1.2.<br>Attendance Sheets | 1.2.<br>Attendance Sheets |
|  |  |  | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Additional Goal #2:<br>Maintain high fine arts enrollment percentage | In June 2013, 100% (281) of the students will participate in the Arts | | **1.1**<br>Funding | 1.1<br>Increase opportunities in the master schedule for students to attend the Arts | 1.1<br>Leadership Team | 1.1<br>SMS enrollment summaries | 1.1<br>SMS |

**August 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised April 29, 2011**

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

| Additional Goal #3: Increase college and career readiness | In June 2013, 100% (108) of the students will participate in a college and career readiness program | 1.1 Lack of time to implement programs | 1.1 Provide opportunities for common planning to implement Destination College | 1.1 Leadership Team | 1.1 Documentation of implementation of Destination College | 1.1 Lesson Plans/School Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## 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 |
| FASTT Math | K-5 | Dean | K-5 | September | Bi-weekly grade level meetings | Leadership Team |
| Math Centers | K-5 | District | K-5 | November | Lesson Plans/I Observation | Leadership Team |
| | | | | | | |

## 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 |
| To increase math fluency with number operations | FASTT Math program | Title I | Included  in math portion |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |

**August 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised April 29, 2011**

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

|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Subtotal:** |
|  |  |  | **Total:** |

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

**Final Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

| Please provide the total budget from each section. |
|---|
| **Reading Budget** |
| Total: $31,500 |
| **CELLA Budget** |
| Total: |
| **Mathematics Budget** |
| Total: $15,000 |
| **Science Budget** |
| Total: $4000 |
| **Writing Budget** |
| Total: $6950 |
| **Civics Budget** |
| Total: |
| **U.S. History Budget** |
| Total: |
| **Attendance Budget** |
| Total: $1750 |
| **Suspension Budget** |
| Total: |
| **Dropout Prevention Budget** |
| Total: |
| **Parent Involvement Budget** |
| Total: $1500 |
| **STEM Budget** |
| Total: |
| **CTE Budget** |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| | **Total:** |
| **Additional Goals** | |
| | **Total:** |
| | |
| | **Grand Total:$62,000** |

**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 |
| | | |

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

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

## School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

X Yes      ☐ No

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

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

| Describe the projected use of SAC funds. | Amount |
|---|---|
| NA | |
| | |
| | |