FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Lakeville Elementary	District Name: Orange
Principal: Tina Cappabianca	Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Jennifer Terry	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	Tina Cappabianca	Degrees: B.S. Elementary Education; Master's Degree in Educational Leadership; ESOL Endorsement: ESOL Certifications: Early Childhood, Elementary Education	1	4	School Grades: 2011-2012 B; 2010-11 A; 2009-10 B; 2008-09 A; Reading Proficiency: 2011-2012 53 ; 2010-11 78; 2009-10 76; 2008-09 77; Math Proficiency: 2011-2012 52 ; 2010-11 76; 2009-10 77; 2008-09 81; Writing proficiency: 2011-2012 80; 2010-11 72; 2009-10 77; 2008-09 89; Science Proficiency: 2011-2012 46; 2010-11 51; 2009-10 52; 2008-09 47. Learning Gains Reading: 2011-2012 66; 2010-11 68; 2009-10 76; 2008-09 77; Learning Gains Math: 2011-2012 66; 2010-11 61; 2009-10 52; 2008-09 65; Learning Gains Lowest 25% Reading: 2011-2012 73; 2010-11 67; 2009-10 55; 2008-09 64; Learning Gains Lowest 25% Math: 2011-2012 56; 2010-11 68; 2009-10 55; 2008-09 64; AYP 2010-11 No 79% criteria met; 2009-10 No 85% criteria met; 2008-09 Yes 100% criteria met.
Assistant Principal	Martha Nelson	Degrees: B.S. Elementary Education; Master's Degree in Educational Leadership Certifications: Elementary Education K-6 ESOL K-12 ESE K-12 Educational Leadership	Less than 1 year	Less than 1 year	School Grades: 2011-2012 B Reading Proficiency 2011-2012 53 Math Proficiency 2011-2012 52 Writing Proficiency 2011-2012 80 Science Proficiency 2011-2012 46 Learning Gains Reading 2011-2012 66 Learning Gains Math 2011-2012 66 Learning Gains Lowest 25% Reading 2011-2012 73 Learning Gains Lowest 25% Math 2011-2012 56

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	Debra Jerrett	B.A. Elementary Education Certification in Early Childhood, Elem. Ed.; Reading Endorsement.	13	5	School Grades: 2011-2012-B ; 2010-11 A; 2009-10 A; 2008-09 B; 2007-08 B; 2006-07 A; 2005-06 B; 2004-05 A; 2003-04 B. Reading Proficiency: 2011-2012 53;2010-11 77; 2009-10 75; 2008-09 75; 2007-08 80; Math Proficiency: 2011-2012-52; 2010-11 76; 2009-10 69; 2008-09 71; 2007-08 67; Writing proficiency: 2011-2012-80; 2010-11 88; 2009-10 80; 2008-09 89; 2007-08 71; Science Proficiency: 2011-2012-46; 2010-11 39; 2009-10 55; 2008-09 33; 2007-08 33. Learning Gains Reading: 2011-2012-66; 2010-11 64; 2009-10 63; 2008-09 69; 2007-08 68; Learning Gains Math: 2011-2012-66; 2010-11 69; 2009-10 71; 2008-09 63; 2007-08 65; 74; 2003-04 61. Learning Gains Lowest 25% Reading: 2011-2012-73; 2010-11 57; 2009-10 54; 2008-09 56; 2007-08 60;. Learning Gains Lowest 25% Math: 2011-2012-56 ; 2010-11 84; 2009-10 73; 2008-09 63; 2007-08 64; AYP; 2010-11 No 87% criteria met; 2009-10 No 72% criteria met; 2008-09 No 90% criteria met; 2007-08 No 79% criteria met.

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

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. Recruitment: district e-recruitment program; screening, interviewing.	Principal, Assistant Principal, School Secretary	On going
2. Protégé Program: assignment of mentors to new teachers; support from administrative team; monthly meetings which includes information relative to curriculum/ instruction; discipline and behavior strategies and ethics.	Debra Jerrett , CRT	June 7, 2013
3. Alternative Certification Program for those with temporary certification. Teachers complete a portfolio to document work toward alternative certification.	Debra Jerrett, CRT Tina Cappabianca, Principal	June 7, 2013

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 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
7 staff members are teaching out-of-field or are not highly effective.	ESOL Coursework; professional development – classroom instruction strategies, data analysis, intervention and progress monitoring

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
63	5%(3)	33%(21)	44%(28)	18%(11)	40%(25)	90%(57)	11%(7)	.08%((5)	70%(44)

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
Michael Burry	Danielle Quagliozzi	Mr. Burry is an experienced teacher on the same grade level. He is very supportive of all our staff members and will help Ms. Quagliozzi increase her knowledge level which, in turn, will support students' academic and behavioral progress.	Meet weekly to mentee to discuss standards based instruction, using research based strategies and observing the mentor implementing these strategies, creating working lesson plans and assisting in selection of appropriate training opportunities

Lynna Varitek	Lauren Smith	Ms. Varitek is an experienced teacher on the same grade level. She has achieved success as a teacher and will help Ms. Smith increase her knowledge level which, in turn, will support students' academic and behavioral progress.	Meet weekly to mentee to discuss standards based instruction, using research based strategies and observing the mentor implementing these strategies, creating working lesson plans and assisting in selection of appropriate training opportunities
Brittany Harper	Kelley Roberts	Ms. Harper is an experienced teacher on the same grade level. She has achieved success as a teacher and will help Ms. Roberts increase her knowledge level which, in turn, will support students' academic and behavioral progress.	Meet weekly to mentee to discuss standards based instruction, using research based strategies and observing the mentor implementing these strategies, creating working lesson plans and assisting in selection of appropriate training opportunities

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

Additional Requirements

*Coordination and Integration-***Title I Schools Only**

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

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Tina Cappabianca, Principal & Martha Nelson, Assistant Principal: Will assist teachers with data-based decision-making skill to ensure school based data is being utilized. Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; facilitates and supports data collection activities. **Debra Jerrett, CRT**: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered struggling learners, assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides support for assessment, and monitors implementation; recommends instruction programs appropriate for specific needs of the students. **Peggy Donovan, School Psychologist:** Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention and documentation. **Kelly Bartolotta, Staffing Specialist and Meghan Branks, Behavior Specialist:** Provide quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, these specialists will link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
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 meets each Wednesday on a weekly basis to plan and monitor the implementation of the MTSS at all grade levels. Each leadership team member is assigned as a coach to a specific grade level and specific issues/concerns are also discussed. During weekly meetings, MTSS team members facilitate the identification of student needs based on current data, assist in determining appropriate interventions, and work with the teachers to monitor assessments and collaborate in the development of progress monitoring plans for students as needed. The leadership team works with grade level Professional Learning Communities to support various Superintendents' Framework for Teaching and Learning including, but not limited to, strengthening RtI practices, supporting the development and overall health of PLC teams, Lesson Study, data analysis, and the implementation of Common Core State Standards and FCIM.
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 first met to review all FCAT Data and other student assessment data. The team then determined the subject area needs for improvement in reading, writing, math, science and behavior. Once these were confirmed, a plan of action was written for each area of need. Finally, the team planned for the presentation and facilitation of staff development trainings and activities to provide our teachers with the knowledge and skills necessary to increase learning for all students. The four steps of the problem solving process are used to analyze school wide data and then grade level data to identify the specific academic and behavioral deficits area (what is the problem). Then the team uses all available data (academic and behavioral) to determine why the problems are occurring and then develops plans to address these problems.
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. Baseline Data: FAIR (Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading), FCAT (Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test), Edusoft Benchmark Assessments, CORE Phonics Survey, Phonological Assessment Skills Test (PAST) Envision Math, FastMath Write Score, and Grade Level Writing Prompts. Progress Monitoring: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN); Curriculum Based Measurement (Easy CBM); Midyear: FAIR, Edusoft, Curriculum Based Measurement (Easy CBM); Houghton Mifflin Leveled Assessments; Write Score; Envision Math End of Year: FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT. Diagnostic: DRA (Developmental Reading Assessment), Core Phonics Survey, PAST, myON Reader, FastMath Data Management System: Teachers will upload all data to a folder on SharePoint where it will be monitored and accessible by the administration, the CRT, the staffing

specialist, the school psychologist, and the behavior specialist.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
Professional Development will be provided at a faculty meeting by the school psychologist, staffing specialist, and the instructional coach. In addition, PD will be provided during team planning days on Wednesdays. The staff will take online professional development through PDS online through Orange County Public Schools. The administrative team and MTSS coaches will evaluate the need for additional professional development throughout the year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.
Each Wednesday, specific teams will be provided time to collaborate and participate in Professional Development for an extended period of time. Special area teachers will work together to provide concentrated instruction so that teams can collaborate. Administrators and coaches will be present to provide direction, resources and support as teams evaluate their current MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Our school Literacy Leadership team will consist of the School Media Specialist – Denise Bustamante; the Curriculum Resource teacher – Debra Jerrett; Staffing Specialist -Kelly Bartolotta; Kindergarten - Rachel Szcinski; First Grade - Brittany Harper and Michelle Johnson; Second Grade - Jennifer Jordan and Carrie Morton; Third Grade - Martha Walton, Melissa Armel, and Jennifer Earnest; Fourth Grade – Patty Reno; Fifth Grade - Linda Burns
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Literacy Leadership Team will meet once a month to discuss data, professional development, student achievement and other school literacy items. One of the reading coach's goals, along with the support of the LLT, will be to get the students excited about reading and to sustain a rigorous program through Accelerated Reader incentives and rewards. The LLT will work together operating as a PLC to plan the activities for the year. The LLT will plan and implement our annual Family Reading Night to motivate and encourage reading for all our students and their families. During this event parents are provided information, various suggestions and tips to help their children in all areas of the reading process. While the parents are participating in training, their children are enjoying reading stations and reader's theater activities. Students may select a brand new book purchased by our PTA. They take the book to a dedication station and create a label for the inside cover where they write their name and decorate the label. Students continue to visit several other reading stations that encourage book care and the love of reading. Our Media Specialist will promote interest in the Sunshine State Young Reader Award books for grades 3 – 5. For grades Kindergarten – 2nd she will read and promote the chosen titles from the Florida Reading Association Book Awards. The Media Specialist will procure and provide as many of these books as possible for student checkout. All the book award titles are highlighted on a large bulletin board in the front lobby of our school. Students will be rewarded and encouraged to read all the SSYRA titles. Students earn a book charm each time they complete an SSYRA book. At the end of the school year any student who has read all the of the SSYRA titles is invited on a field trip to the bowling alley.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The major initiatives of the Literacy Leadership Team will be to promote reading success for all students. We will meet regularly to discuss as well as analyze assessment data to establish needs that promote student achievement. Team members will meet with their grade level teams to share information and plans for the school year. In addition, LLT members will share reading celebrations and concerns from their grade level with the LLT in order to facilitate problem solving discussions. With the purchase of the myON Reader program, team members will also develop a schedule for students to visit the computer lab and monitor the facilitation of the new program.

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

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

*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.

*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?

*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?

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?

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.

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.			A.1. Lack of a systematic procedure to identify strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the FCAT and Edusoft.	A.1. Implement the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)	A.1. Principal; Assistant Principal; CRT; School Psychologist; Staffing Specialist	A.1. Disaggregate the data, assess the student needs, provide focused instruction, assess and review data	1A.1. Edusoft reading assessment results; Edusoft mini assessment Results; FAIR data; FCAT Data
Reading Goal #1A: Increase the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 to at least 50% on the 2013 FCAT reading assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 25% (115) of students scored at Level 3 on the FCAT reading assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013, at least 50% (230) of students will score at Level 3 on the FCAT reading assessment.					
			A.2. New team members throughout the grade levels and three beginning teachers – one in 1st grade, one in 2nd grade, and one in 5th grade.	A.2. Match mentor teachers with new team members with support from the Instructional Coach.	A.2. Principal; Assistant Principal; Mentor Teachers; Instructional Coach	A.2. Review data from Intervention Assessments Edusoft, FAIR and FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring.	A.2. Edusoft and FAIR assessment will be placed in teacher's data notebook.
			A.3 Students need additional concentrated reading time to practice their reading skills.	A.3 Facilitate Accelerated Reader provided by Renaissance Place	A.3 Media Specialist; CRT; Classroom Teachers	A.3. Analysis of number and levels of books read; analysis of comprehension skills.	A.3. Accelerated Reader reports.
			A.4. Lack of diagnostic assessment materials and targeted intervention materials. Extended Day Coordinator; Assistant Principal	A.4 Purchase myON Reader program and facilitate intervention for students at risk; Assess primary students using the Phonological Awareness Skills Test (PAST) and Core Phonics Survey and	A.4 Principal; CRT; Staffing Specialist; School Psychologist; Classroom Teachers Edusoft assessments; FAIR assessments	A.4 Review program data, progress monitoring data	A.4 myON Reader program reports; Edusoft results; CORE and PAST results

			plan targeted interventions; Purchase Blueprint intervention materials from the *95percent Group* and provide intervention for those students at risk based on diagnostic assessments.			
		A.5. Extended day students have less available time for reading practice and homework.	A.5. Extended Day will purchase and implement a computer program titled "Kid's College"	A.5. Extended Day Coordinator; Assistant Principal	A.5. Review program reports	A.5. Edusoft assessments; FAIR assessments
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.						
Reading Goal #1B: N/A	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. There is a lack of motivation among some high achieving students limiting them from reaching their fullest potential.	2A.1. Utilize individual goal setting with students and set high expectations for participation in school wide reading incentive programs and classroom based reading incentive programs.	2A.1 Media Specialist; Reading Coach; Classroom Teachers	2A.1 Review and monitor Accelerated Reader reports; discuss success of classroom incentives during data meetings.	2A.1 Edusoft assessment results; FCAT results
Reading Goal #2A: Increase the percentage of students scoring at Level 4 or 5 to 50% on the 2013 FCAT reading assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 27% (124) of students scored at Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT reading assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013, at least 50% (230) of students will score at Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT reading assessment.					
			2A.2. Lack of a systematic procedure to identify strengths based on FCAT and Edusoft assessments; following procedure will lead teachers to provide higher level instruction and or curriculum for higher performing students.	2A.2 Implement the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)	2A.2 Principal; Assistant Principal; CRT; School Psychologist; Staffing Specialist	2A.2 Disaggregate the data, assess the student needs, provide focused instruction, periodically assess and review data	2A.2 Edusoft assessment results; formative and summative assessment results; FCAT results
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A
Reading Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Lack of a systematic procedure to identify strengths and weaknesses in student performance on FCAT and Edusoft.	3A.1. Implement the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)	3A.1. Principal; Assistant Principal; CRT; School Psychologist; Staffing Specialist	3A.1. Disaggregate the data, assess the student needs, provide focused instruction, assess and review data	3A.1. Edusoft assessment results; formative and summative assessment results; FCAT results
Reading Goal #3A: Increase the percentage of students making learning gains to at least 75% on the 2013 FCAT reading assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 57% (262) of students made learning gains on the FCAT reading assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013, at least 75% (345) of students will make learning gains on the FCAT reading assessment.					
			3A.2. Lack of diagnostic assessment materials and targeted intervention materials.	3A.2 Purchase myON Reader program and facilitate intervention for students at risk; Assess primary students using the Phonological Awareness Skills Test (PAST) and Core Phonics Survey and plan targeted interventions; Purchase Blueprint intervention materials from the 95percent Group and provide intervention for those students at risk based on diagnostic assessments.	3A.2 Principal; CRT; Staffing Specialist; School Psychologist; Classroom Teachers	3A.2 Review program data, progress monitoring data	3A.2 myON Reader program reports; Edusoft results; progress monitoring data
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Lack of a systematic procedure to identify strengths and weaknesses in student performance on FCAT and Edusoft.	4A.1. Implement the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)	4A.1. Principal; Assistant Principal; CRT; School Psychologist; Staffing Specialist	4A.1. Disaggregate the data, assess the student needs, provide focused instruction, assess and review data	4A.1. Edusoft reading assessment results; Edusoft mini assessment Results; progress monitoring data, formative and summative data; FCAT
Reading Goal #4: Increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% who make learning gains to at least 75% on the 2013 FCAT reading assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 67% (50) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on the FCAT reading assessment	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013, at least 75% (56) of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the FCAT reading assessment.					
			4A.2. Lack of diagnostic assessment materials and targeted intervention materials.	4A.2 Purchase myON Reader program and facilitate intervention for students at risk; Assess primary students using the Phonological Awareness Skills Test (PAST) and Core Phonics Survey and plan targeted interventions; Purchase Blueprint intervention materials from the 95percent Group and provide intervention for those students at risk based on diagnostic assessments.	4A.2 Principal; CRT; Staffing Specialist; School Psychologist; Classroom Teachers	4A.2 Review program data, progress monitoring data	4A.2 myON Reader program reports; Edusoft results; FAIR results; mini-assessment results.
			4A.3. Below level readers lack sufficient reading practice.	4A.3. Provide morning and afternoon reading tutoring for struggling students.	4A3 CRT; Tutoring Teachers	4A. Review program assessments with tutoring teachers.	4A3 Edusoft assessment results; FAIR assessment results; FCAT results

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** Gap between White & Black - 24% Gap between White & Hispanic – 17%	Gap between White & Black - 17% Gap between White & Hispanic – 3%	Gap between White & Black - 20% Gap between White & Hispanic – 14%	Gap between White & Black - 18% Gap between White & Hispanic – 12%	Gap between White & Black - 16% Gap between White & Hispanic – 11%	Gap between White & Black - 14% Gap between White & Hispanic – 10%	Gap between White & Black - 12% Gap between White & Hispanic – 8%
Reading Goal #5A: To reduce the achievement gap for our Black and Hispanic students by 50% at the end of 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. Lack of time for students to practice new knowledge and maintain or strengthen already learned skills.	5B.1. Provide before and after school tutoring	5B.1 CRT; Tutoring Teachers	5B.1. Review program assessments with tutoring teachers.	5B.1. Edusoft assessment results; FAIR assessment results; FCAT results.	
Reading Goal #5B: Increase the percentage of students in each subgroup scoring at Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT reading assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White :60% Black: 43% Hispanic: 57% / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 73% Black: 53% Hispanic: 59%						
		5B.2. Lack of a systematic procedure to identify strengths and weaknesses in student performance on FCAT and Edusoft.	5B.2. Implement the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)	5B.2. Principal; Assistant Principal; CRT; School Psychologist; Staffing Specialist	5B.2. Disaggregate the data, assess the student needs, provide focused instruction, assess and review data	5B.2. Edusoft reading assessment results; Edusoft mini assessment Results; progress monitoring data, formative and summative data; FCAT	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Lack of understanding about how SMART goals can positively affect teaching and learning.

Lack of knowledge on how to create SMART goals. | 5C.1.Provide professional development and collaboration time to examine and/or deconstruct the standards, plan for instruction and assessment, and then disaggregate and analyze the data. | 5C.1.Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT | 5C.1.Products created by the grade level team; student assessment data. | 5C.1. Mini assessment data; progress monitoring data; Edusoft ,FAIR, and FCAT |
| Reading Goal #5C:

Increase the percentage of ELL students scoring at Level 3 or above to at least 50% on the 2013 FCAT reading assessment. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*

2012 FCAT results showed that 22% (14) of ELL students scored a Level 3 or above on the FCAT reading assessment. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

By July 2013, at least 50% (32) of ELL students taking the FCAT reading assessment will score at Level 3 or above. | | | | | |
| | | | 5C.2. Lack of integration of grade level standards, FCAT Item specifications, and pacing guides. | 5C.2. Provide professional development on how to create focus calendars and implement and analyze mini assessments. | 5C.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT | 5C.2. Analyze mini assessment data based on the standards taught. | 5C.2. Mini assessment data; Edusoft data; program assessment data. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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.** | | | 5C.1. Lack of understanding about how SMART goals can positively affect teaching and learning.

Lack of knowledge on how to create SMART goals. | 5C.1.Provide professional development and collaboration time to examine and/or deconstruct the standards, plan for instruction and assessment, and then disaggregate and analyze the data. | 5C.1.Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT | 5C.1.Products created by the grade level team; student assessment data. | 5C.1. Mini assessment data; progress monitoring data; Edusoft ,FAIR, and FCAT |
| Reading Goal #5D:

Increase the percentage of SWD scoring at Level 3 or above to at least 50% on the 2013 FCAT reading assessment. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*

2012 FCAT results showed that 7% (4) of our SWD scored at Level 3 or above on the FCAT reading assessment. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

By July 2013, at least 50% (32) of our SWD students will score at Level 3 or above on the FCAT reading | | | | | |

		assessment.				
		5D.2 Lack of integration of grade level standards, FCAT Item specifications, and pacing guides so that teachers are able to integrate the appropriate strategies and interventions for our students with disabilities.	5D.2. Provide professional development on how to create focus calendars and implement and analyze mini assessments; review strategies that are successful with our students with disabilities.	5D.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	5D.2. Analyze mini assessment data based on the standards taught.	5D.2. Mini assessment data; Edusoft data; program assessment data.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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. Lack of understanding on the part of the teachers and staff on how to support our Economically Disadvantaged students in both academics and behavior.	5E.1. Provide staff development utilizing the book and accompanied resources of "Teaching with Poverty in Mind" by Eric Jensen.	5E.1. Curriculum Resource Teacher	5E.1. Analyze the assessment data of our Economically Disadvantaged students. Provide periodic reminders about lessons learned during Staff Meetings and in our weekly Lakeville Newsletter.	5E.1. Progress monitoring data; formative and summative data, Edusoft data, FCAT data, behavior data from SMS and EDW.
Reading Goal #5E: Increase the percentage of FRL students scoring at Level 3 or above to at least 50% on the 2013 FCAT reading assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 26% (86) of FRL students scored at Level 3 or above on the FCAT reading assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Increase the percentage of FRL students scoring at Level 3 or above to at least 50% (166) on the 2013 FCAT reading assessment.					
			5E.2. Lack of integration of grade level standards, FCAT Item specifications, and pacing guides so that teachers are able to integrate the appropriate strategies and interventions for our economically disadvantaged students.	5E.2. Provide professional development on how to create focus calendars and implement and analyze mini assessments; review strategies that are successful with our economically disadvantaged students.	5E.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	5E.2. Analyze mini assessment data based on the standards taught.	5E.2. Mini assessment data; Edusoft data; program assessment data.

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
FCIM Training	K-5	Tina Cappabianca, Principal	All K-5 teachers, including ESE	9/12/2012; 9/19/2012; 9/26/2012 during PLC meetings and early release day	Review FOCUS calendars for each grade level; classroom walkthroughs; data spreadsheets on SharePoint reflecting mini-assessments; discussions during PLC meetings;	Tina Cappabianca, Principal; Martha Nelson, Assistant Principal; Debra Jerrett, Curriculum Resource Teacher
Training on CORE and PAST	K-3	Debra Jerrett, Curriculum Resource Teacher	All K-2 teachers, including ESE who serve K-2 students	9/5/2012 during early release day	Review CORE and PAST data on SharePoint; discussions during data meetings and child chats	Tina Cappabianca, Principal; Martha Nelson, Assistant Principal; Debra Jerrett, Curriculum Resource Teacher
Professional development based on "Teaching with Poverty in Mind" by Eric Jensen	K-5	Martha Nelson, Assistant Principal	All K-5 teachers, including ESE and Special Area	October 2012 during early release days	Monitor the academic progress and discipline data of our students who are economically disadvantaged.	Tina Cappabianca, Principal; Martha Nelson, Assistant Principal; Debra Jerrett; Curriculum Resource Teacher; Meghan Branks, Behavior Specialist; Peggy Donovan, School Psychologist

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
Morning and Afternoon Tutoring	95 Percent Group – Blueprint for Comprehension; Blueprint for Phonics; Blueprint for Multi-Syllabic Words	Title II and Title III Funds	$12,000.00
			Subtotal: $12,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Computer Based Instruction	myONReader	School Budget	$7,000.00
			Subtotal: $7,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Professional Development for working with economically disadvantaged students	"Teaching with Poverty in Mind" books and DVD series	School Budget	$1,500.00
			Subtotal: $1,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Total: $20,500.00

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: Increase the percentage of ELL students scoring at the proficient level to 75% (81) on the 2013 CELLA listening/speaking assessment.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 2012 results showed that 55 % (58) of ELL students scored at the proficient level on the CELLA listening/speaking assessment.	1.1. Lack of data organization and presentation by the ELL Compliance Teacher and the administrative staff.	1.1 Create data spreadsheets to make it easier for teachers to analyze the data and make instructional decisions.	1.1. Assistant Principal; ELL Compliance Teacher	1.1. Placement of data in teachers' Lakeville Instructional Strategies and Data binder (*the blue book*); discuss the students' progress during data meetings.	1.1. CELLA data at the end of the 2012-2013 school year.
		1.2. Lack of understanding as to what the CELLA measures and how students' assessments are scored.	1.2. Share the CELLA interpretive guide with teachers of ELL students.	1.2. Principal; ELL Compliance Teacher	1.2. Interpretive guide in teachers' Lakeville Instructional Strategies and Data binder.	1.2. CELLA data at the end of the 2012-2013 school year.
		1.3. Lack of understanding on how listening and speaking affects student achievement.	1.3. Share ELL strategies for success in reading, science and math during staff meetings.	1.3. Assistant Principal; ELL Compliance Teacher	1.3. Lesson plans showing strategies; strategy information in teachers' Lakeville Instructional Strategies and Data binder.	1.3 CELLA data at the end of the 2012-2013 school year; FAIR; Edusoft data; FCAT data; program assessments.
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. CELLA Goal #2: Increase the percentage of ELL students scoring at the proficient level to 50% (54) on the 2013	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 2012 results showed that 28 % (30) of ELL students scored at the proficient level on the CELLA	2.1. Lack of process to disaggregate subgroup data, analyze the achievement gaps, and make instructional decisions.	2.1 Provide staff development and coaching on the FCIM process.	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher	2.1. Quality of mini-assessments created by the grade level teams; lesson plans; classroom walkthrough	2.1. Reduction of achievement gap as demonstrated by mini-assessment data; Edusoft data; FAIR data; FCAT data.

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

CELLA reading assessment.	listening/speaking assessment.					
		2.2. Lack of process to disaggregate subgroup data, analyze the achievement gaps, and make instructional decisions.	2.2 Create data spreadsheets to make it easier for teachers to analyze the achievement gaps and make instructional decisions.	2.2 Principal; Assistant Principal;	2.2. Placement of disaggregated data in teachers' Lakeville Instructional Strategies and Data binder.; discuss students' progress during Use data meetings	2.2. Reduction of achievement gap as demonstrated by mini-assessment data; Edusoft data; FAIR data; FCAT data.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: Increase the percentage of ELL students scoring at the proficient level to 50% (54) on the 2013 CELLA writing assessment.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 2012 results showed that 28 % (30) of ELL students scored at the proficient level on the CELLA writing assessment.	3.1 Lack of data organization and presentation by the ELL Compliance Teacher and the administrative staff.	3.1 Create data spreadsheets to make it easier for teachers to analyze the data and make instructional decisions.	3.1 Assistant Principal; ELL Compliance Teacher	3.1 Placement of data in teachers' Lakeville Instructional Strategies binder; discuss student progress during meetings;	3.1 CELLA writing data at the end of the 2012-2013 school year.
		3.2. Lack of understanding as to what the CELLA measures and how students' assessments are scored.	3.2. Share the CELLA interpretive guide with teachers of ELL students.	3.2. Principal; ELL Compliance Teacher	3.2. Interpretive guide in teachers' Lakeville Instructional Strategies binder	3.2. CELLA data at the end of the 2012-2013 school year.
		1.3. Lack of understanding on how writing proficiency affects student achievement.	1.3. Share ELL strategies for success in reading and writing science during staff meetings, specifically focusing on The Writing Process Guide by OCPS	1.3. Assistant Principal; ELL Compliance Teacher	1.3. Lesson plans showing strategies; strategy information in teachers' Lakeville Instructional Strategies binder.	1.3 CELLA data at the end of the 2012-2013 school year; quarterly writing prompts

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

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			Subtotal:
			Total: $0.00

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. Students lack fluency with math facts (addition, subtraction, and multiplication).	1A.1. Purchase FastMath computer program. Install in technology lab and on classroom computers. Create a sign up schedule for computer lab access.	1A.1. Principal, Team Leaders	1A.1. Review program reports from FastMath; review lesson plans and computer lab sign-up calendar	1A.1. Edusoft data, mini-assessment data; Envision Unit Tests
Mathematics Goal #1A: Increase the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 to at least 50% on the 2013 FCAT math assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 27 %(117) of students scored at Level 3 on the FCAT math assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013, at least 50% (230) of students will score at Level 3 on the FCAT math assessment.					
			1A.2 Teachers have not developed skills groups for math.	1A.2 Implement the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)	1A.2 Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT	1A.2 Review student achievement data and lesson plans; observe during walkthroughs.	1A.2 Edusoft data, Envision Unit Tests; mini-assessment data; Lesson plan reviews
			1A.3 Lack of organization and centralization of data that is visible to multiple stakeholders.	1A.3 Create data spreadsheets for each teacher on SharePoint to input data in a timely manner.	1A.3 Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Staffing Specialist, School Psychologist	1A.3 Weekly monitoring of data spreadsheets on SharePoint	1A.3 Increased student achievement due to targeted and timely monitoring of data.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #1B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1 Lack of organization and centralization of data that is visible to multiple stakeholders for instructional decision making.	2A.1 Create data spreadsheets for each teacher on SharePoint to input data in a timely manner.	2A.1 Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Staffing Specialist, School Psychologist	2A.1 Weekly monitoring of data spreadsheets on SharePoint	2A.1 Increased student achievement due to targeted and timely monitoring of data.
Mathematics Goal #2A: Increase the percentage of students scoring at Levels 4 and 5 to at least 50% on the 2013 FCAT math assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 23% (110) of students scored at Level 4 and 5 on the FCAT math assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013, at least 50% (230) of students will score at Level 4 and 5 on the FCAT math assessment.					
			2A.2 Teachers have not developed math skills groups to address the needs of higher level learners.	2A.2 Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)	2A.2 Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT	2A.2 Review student achievement data and lesson plans; observe during walkthroughs.	2A.2 Edusoft data, Envision Unit Tests; mini-assessment data; Lesson plan reviews
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			2A.1 Teachers have not developed math skills groups to address the needs of learners at different levels.	2A.1 Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)	2A.1 Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT	2A.1 Review student achievement data and lesson plans; observe during walkthroughs.	2A.1 Edusoft data, Envision Unit Tests; mini-assessment data; Lesson plan reviews
Mathematics Goal #3A: Increase the percentage of students making learning gains to at least 75% on the 2013 FCAT math assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 57% (258) of students made learning gains on the FCAT math assessment	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013, at least 75% (345) of students will make learning gains on the FCAT math assessment.					
			2A.2. Students lack fluency with math facts (addition, subtraction, and multiplication).	2A.2. Purchase FastMath computer program. Install in technology lab and on classroom computers. Create a sign up schedule for computer lab access.	2A.2. Principal, Team Leaders	2A.2. Review program reports from FastMath; review lesson plans and computer lab sign-up calendar	2A.2. Edusoft data, mini-assessment data; Envision Unit Tests
			2A.3. Lack of understanding about how SMART goals can positively affect teaching and learning. Lack of knowledge on how to create SMART goals.	2A.3. Provide professional development and collaboration time to examine and/or deconstruct the standards, plan for instruction and assessment, and then disaggregate and analyze the data.	2A.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT	2A.3 Products created by the grade level team; student assessment data.	2A.3 Mini assessment data; progress monitoring data; Edusoft ,FAIR, and FCAT
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	this box.	*this box*					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Students lack fluency with math facts (addition, subtraction, and multiplication).	4A.1. Purchase FastMath computer program. Install in technology lab and on classroom computers. Provide additional intervention time in the computer lab.	4A.1. Principal, Team Leaders	4A.1. Review program reports from FastMath; review lesson plans and computer lab sign-up calendar	4A.1. Edusoft data, mini-assessment data; Envision Unit Tests
Mathematics Goal #4A: Increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% who make learning gains to at least 75% on the 2013 FCAT math assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 54% (40) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on the FCAT math assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013, at least 75% (56) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the FCAT math assessment.					
			4A.2 Teachers have not developed math skills groups to address the needs of learners at different levels.	4A.2 Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)	4A.2 Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT	4A.2 Review student achievement data and lesson plans; observe during walkthroughs.	4A.2 Edusoft data, Envision Unit Tests; mini-assessment data; Lesson plan reviews

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** Gap between White & Black – 25% Gap between White & Hispanic – 11%	Gap between White & Black - 24% Gap between White & Hispanic – 10%	Gap between White & Black - 22% Gap between White & Hispanic – 9%	Gap between White & Black - 20% Gap between White & Hispanic – 8%	Gap between White & Black - 18% Gap between White & Hispanic – 8%	Gap between White & Black - 16% Gap between White & Hispanic – 7%	Gap between White & Black - 13% Gap between White & Hispanic – 6%
Mathematics Goal #5A: To reduce the achievement gap for our black and Hispanic students by 50% at the end of 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 mathematics.**			5A.1 Teachers have not developed math skills groups to address the needs of learners in different subgroups.	5A.1 Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)	5A.1 Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT	5A.1 Review student achievement data and lesson plans; observe during walkthroughs.	5A.1 Edusoft data, Envision Unit Tests; mini-assessment data; Lesson plan reviews	
Mathematics Goal #5B: Increase the percentage of students in each subgroup scoring at Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT math assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:68% Black: 44% Hispanic: 58%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:71% Black: 49% Hispanic: 62%						
			5A.2 Lack of organization and centralization of data that is visible to multiple stakeholders for instructional decision making.	5A.2 Create data spreadsheets for each teacher on SharePoint to input data in a timely manner.	5A.2 Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Staffing Specialist, School Psychologist	5A.2 Weekly monitoring of data spreadsheets on SharePoint	5A.2 Increased student achievement due to targeted and timely monitoring of data of different subgroups.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Lack of understanding about how SMART goals can positively affect teaching and learning. Lack of knowledge on how to create SMART goals.	5C.1.Provide professional development and collaboration time to examine and/or deconstruct the standards, plan for instruction and assessment, and then disaggregate and analyze the data.	5C.1.Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT	5C.1.Products created by the grade level team; student assessment data.	5C.1. Mini assessment data; progress monitoring data; Edusoft ,FAIR, and FCAT
Mathematics Goal #5C: Increase the percentage of ELL students scoring at Level 3 or above to at least 50% on the 2013 FCAT math assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 30% (19) of ELL students scored at Level 3 or above on the FCAT math assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013, at least 50% (32) of ELL students will score at Level 3 or above on the FCAT math assessment.					
			5C.2. Lack of integration of grade level standards, FCAT Item specifications, and pacing guides.	5C.2. Provide professional development on how to create focus calendars and implement and analyze mini assessments.	5C.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	5C.2. Analyze mini assessment data based on the standards taught.	5C.2. Mini assessment data; Edusoft data; program assessment data.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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 Teachers have not developed math skills groups to address the needs of learners in different subgroups.	5D.1 Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)	5D.1 Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT	5D.1 Review student achievement data and lesson plans; observe during walkthroughs.	5D.1 Edusoft data, Envision Unit Tests; mini-assessment data; Lesson plan reviews
Mathematics Goal #5D: Increase the percentage of SWD scoring at Level 3 or above to at least 50% on the 2013 FCAT math assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 27% (17) of SWD scored at Level 3 or above on the FCAT math assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013, at least 50% (32) of SWD will score at Level 3 or above on the FCAT math assessment.					

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

		5D.2 Lack of organization and centralization of data that is visible to multiple stakeholders for instructional decision making.	5D.2 Create data spreadsheets for each teacher on SharePoint to input data in a timely manner.	5D.2 Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Staffing Specialist, School Psychologist	5D.2 Weekly monitoring of data spreadsheets on SharePoint	5D.2 Increased student achievement due to targeted and timely monitoring of data of different subgroups.

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. Lack of understanding on the part of the teachers and staff on how to support our Economically Disadvantaged students in math.	5E.1. Provide staff development utilizing the book and accompanied resources of "Teaching with Poverty in Mind" by Eric Jensen.	5E.1. Assistant Principal; Curriculum Resource Teacher	5E.1. Analyze the assessment data of our Economically Disadvantaged students. Provide periodic reminders about lessons learned during Staff Meetings and in our weekly Lakeville Newsletter.	5E.1. Progress monitoring data; formative and summative data, Edusoft data, FCAT data, and Envision math assessments.
Mathematics Goal #5E: Increase the percentage of FRL students scoring at Level 3 or above to at least 50% on the 2013 FCAT math assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 36% (118) of FRL students scored at Level 3 or above on the FCAT math assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013, at least 50% (166) of FRL students will score at Level 3 or above on the FCAT math assessment.					
			5E.2. Lack of integration of grade level standards, FCAT Item specifications, and pacing guides so that teachers are able to integrate the appropriate strategies and interventions for our economically disadvantaged students.	5E.2. Provide professional development on how to create focus calendars and implement and analyze mini assessments; review strategies that are successful with our economically disadvantaged students.	5E.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	5E.2. Analyze mini assessment data based on the standards taught.	5E.2. Mini assessment data; Edusoft data; program assessment data.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School 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	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A	**N/A.**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: N/A.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. N/A	2A.1. N/A	2A.1. N/A	2A.1. N/A	2A.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #2A: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #2B: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
Mathematics Goal #3A: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics Goal #5A: N/A							

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. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
Mathematics Goal #5B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			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. N/A	5E.1. N/A	5E.1. N/A	5E.1. N/A	5E.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #5E: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School 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
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #1: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
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
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #2: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #3: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

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

Algebra 1 EOC 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Algebra 1 Goal #1: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
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
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Algebra Goal #2: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: **N/A**							

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	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**		3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.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
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.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
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

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

Geometry EOC 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Geometry Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
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
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Geometry Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Geometry Goal #3A: **N/A**						

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
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**		3B.1. **N/A**	3B.1. **N/A**	3B.1. **N/A**	3B.1. **N/A**	3B.1. **N/A**
Geometry Goal #3B: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:				
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1. N/A	3C.1. N/A	3C.1. N/A	3C.1. N/A	3C.1. N/A
Geometry Goal #3C: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.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
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1. N/A	3D.1. N/A	3D.1. N/A	3D.1. N/A	3D.1. N/A
Geometry Goal #3D: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A *in this box.*					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.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
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Geometry Goal #3E: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Geometry EOC 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
FCIM Training	K-5	Tina Cappabianca, Principal	All K-5 teachers, including ESE	9/12/2012; 9/19/2012; 9/26/2012 during PLC meetings and early release day	Review FOCUS calendars for each grade level; classroom walkthroughs; data spreadsheets on SharePoint reflecting mini-assessments; discussions during PLC meetings;	Tina Cappabianca, Principal; Martha Nelson, Assistant Principal; Debra Jerrett, Curriculum Resource Teacher
Book study and professional development based on "Teaching with Poverty in Mind" by Eric Jensen	K-5	Martha Nelson, Assistant Principal	All K-5 teachers, including ESE and Special Area	October 2012 during early release days	Monitor the academic progress and discipline data of our students who are economically disadvantaged.	Tina Cappabianca, Principal; Martha Nelson, Assistant Principal; Debra Jerrett; Curriculum Resource Teacher; Meghan Branks, Behavior Specialist; Peggy Donovan, School Psychologist

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
		Subtotal:	
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Computer Assisted Instruction – Math Fluency	FastMath Computer Program	School Funds	$10,00.00
		Subtotal : $10,000.00	
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
		Subtotal:	
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
		Subtotal:	
		Total: $10,000.00	

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1 Lack of vocabulary instruction partnered with hands-on learning.	1A.1 Fifth grade teachers will participate in P-Sell training through Orange County Public Schools.	1A.1 Principal; Curriculum Resource Teacher	1A.1 Increased opportunities for students to participate in hands-on learning; increased vocabulary instruction focusing on best practices.	1A.1 Classroom walkthrough data; lesson plans; Edusoft science data; P-Sell data
Science Goal #1A: Increase the percentage of 5th grade students scoring at Level 3 or above to at least 50% on the 2013 FCAT science assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 35% (51) of 5th grade students scored at Level 3 or above on the FCAT science assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013, at least 50% (73) of 5th grade students will score a Level 3 or above on the FCAT science assessment					
			1A.2. Lack of integration of grade level standards, FCAT Item specifications, and pacing guides so that teachers are able to integrate the appropriate strategies and plan the appropriate interventions.	1A.2. Provide professional development on how to create focus calendars and implement and analyze mini assessments; review strategies that are successful.	1A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1A.2. Analyze mini assessment data based on the standards taught.	1A.2. Mini assessment data; Edusoft data; program assessment data.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A
Science Goal #1B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Lack of knowledge about STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics).	2A.1. Provide professional development about STEM.	2A.1. Principal; Curriculum Resource Teacher	2A.1. Evidence of problem based learning activities	2A.1. Classroom walkthroughs; lesson plans
Science Goal #2A: Increase the percentage of 5th grade students scoring at Level 4 or 5 to at least 50% on the 2013 FCAT science assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 10 %(15) of 5th grade students scored at Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT science assessment.	2013Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013, at least 50% (73) of 5th grade students will score at Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT science assessment.					
			2A.2. Lack of problem-based learning activities for our students	2A.2. Begin Year 1 implementation of STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics).	2A.2. Principal; Assistant Principal; Curriculum Resource Teacher	2A.2. Analyze science assessment data; monitor classrooms for problem based activities	2A.2. Edusoft science assessments; classroom walkthroughs; lesson plans
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: N/A	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.*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

<u>Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals</u>

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

High School 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
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1. **N/A**	1.1. **N/A**	1.1. **N/A**	1.1. **N/A**	1.1. **N/A**
Science Goal #1: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
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
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1. **N/A**	2.1. **N/A**	2.1. **N/A**	2.1. **N/A**	2.1. **N/A**
Science Goal #2: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)*

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

Biology 1 EOC 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1. **N/A**	1.1. **N/A**	1.1. **N/A**	1.1. **N/A**	1.1. **N/A**
Biology 1 Goal #1: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
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
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1. **N/A**	2.1. **N/A**	2.1. **N/A**	2.1. **N/A**	2.1. **N/A**
Biology 1 Goal #2: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

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
FCIM Training	K-5	Tina Cappabianca, Principal	All K-5 teachers, including ESE	9/12/2012; 9/19/2012; 9/26/2012 during PLC meetings and early release day	Review FOCUS calendars for each grade level; classroom walkthroughs; data spreadsheets on SharePoint reflecting mini-assessments; discussions during PLC meetings;	Tina Cappabianca, Principal; Martha Nelson, Assistant Principal; Debra Jerrett, Curriculum Resource Teacher

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
			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: $0.00

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

End of Science Goals

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

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. Lack of knowledge about the writing process.	1A.1. Provide the OCPS document The Writing Process Resource Guide; writing PLC to plan implementation	1A.1. Principal; Assistant Principal; CRT	1A.1. Lesson plan reviews; classroom walkthroughs	1A.1. Quarterly student writing samples; Write Score data; FCAT Writing data
Writing Goal #1A: Increase the percentage of 4th grade students scoring at Level 3.5 or higher to 100% on the 2013 FCAT writing assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2012 FCAT results showed that 80 %(116) of 4th grade students scored at Level 3.5 or higher on the FCAT writing assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By July 2013, at least 100% (145) of 4th grade students will score at Level 3.5 or higher on the FCAT writing assessment.					
			1A.2. Lack of planning on the part of teachers in preparation for state assessments.	1A.2. Provide the 45 day FCAT Writing Preparation Plan to 4th grade teachers collaborate on how to implement it.	1A.2. Principal; Assistant Principal; CRT	1A.2. Lesson plan reviews; classroom walkthroughs	1A.2. FCAT Writing data
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A
Writing Goal #1B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Best Practices in Writing	K-5	Debra Jerrett; Writing PLC	All classroom teachers, including ESE	October 2012 during planning time	Lesson plans; classroom walkthrough; student writing samples	Principal; Assistant Principal

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
PD on the Writing Process	The Writing Process Resource Guide	School Budget	$600.00
Implement a writing instructional plan for 4th grade.	45 day FCAT Writing Preparation Plan	School Budget	$100.00
			Subtotal: $700.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $700.00

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

End of Writing Goals

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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2014-2015)*

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

Civics EOC 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Civics Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
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
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Civics Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Civics 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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Civics Goals

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

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

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

U.S. History EOC 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
U.S. History Goal #1: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
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
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
U.S. History Goal #2: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

U.S. History 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

U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: Increase the attendance rate of our students to 100%.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* 95.51% 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 199 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 180	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* 100.00% 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 196 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 177	1.1. Lack of system in place to address the issue of excessive absences with specific families.	1.1. Participate in the Early Truancy Intervention Program (ETI). In the ETI program, Lakeville will receive support every two weeks from a truancy officer who will address the issue with individual parents. In addition, two letters are sent out from Orange – Osceola State Attorney Jeff Ashton.	1.1. Staffing Specialist, Registrar, Principal	1.1 Review of attendance records.	1.1. Progress Book; EDW
			1.2 No requirement in place for parents to sign their children in when tardy; parents are able to drop their children off without getting out of their vehicle.	1.2. Require parents to walk their children to the office when late to receive a tardy slip.	1.2. Office Clerk; Assistant Principal	1.2. Review of tardy records	1.2. Progress Book; EDW

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

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			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: $0.00

End of Attendance Goals

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

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: Decrease the percentage of students who receive in-school or out- of- school suspension.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions	1.1. Lack of following the school wide behavior management plan; Lack of consulting "Setting Limits in the Classroom"	1.1. Offer informal professional development about the school wide discipline plan based on observations and discussions with the classroom teacher. Increase time on task for those students who are having discipline issues.	1.1. Assistant Principal; Behavior Specialist; Staffing Specialist	1.1. Conferences with classroom teachers; decreased incidences of intervention from the Assistant Principal, Behavior Specialists and Staffing Specialist.	Number of classroom visits based on discipline; number of office referrals.
	32	29					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	23	20					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	48	45					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	27	24					
			1.2. Those students who continually exhibit difficulty following the school wide discipline plan.	1.2. Offer behavioral support plans for students who demonstrate a need.	1.2.Behavior Specialist; Staffing Specialist	1.2. Conferences with the classroom teacher; weekly checkpoints with students	1.2. Behavior Progress Monitoring Forms; other behavior data
			1.3. Lack of understanding of poverty and how it affects students.	1.3. Offer professional development about poverty awareness and strategies to improve student achievement.	1.3. Assistant Principal, Behavioral Specialist, School Psychologist,	1.3. Feedback and surveys from Professional Development activities	1.3. Professional Development exercises and activities; analysis of behavior data.

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

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Understanding Poverty	K-5	Assistant Principal	School-wide	Teacher's planning time and during staff meetings.	Professional Development assigned activities	Assistant Principal, CRT

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $0.00

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

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
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. Dropout Prevention			1.1. Lack of mentoring program to help our academically and behaviorally struggling students.	1.1. Develop and implement a mentoring program for identified students.	1.1. Assistant Principal; School Psychologist	1.1. Increased student achievement and motivation; decreased behavior issues, and increased attendance	1.1. Student surveys; Progress Book data; classroom teacher surveys; SMS data; Educational Data Warehouse (EDW) data.
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: Decrease the percentage of 3rd grade students who are retained in the 2013 school year.	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* 2012 retention results showed that 12% (21) of 3rd grade students were retained in the 3rd grade.	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* By July 2013, 0% of 3rd grade students will be retained.					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:* 2012 promotion rates showed that 88% (152) of 3rd grade students were promoted to the 4th grade.	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* By July 2012, 100% (173) of 3rd grade students will be promoted to the 4th grade.					
			1.2. Lack of safe space for students to calm down, gather their thoughts, and communicate with a caring adult.	1.2. Provide a sensory room and scheduled visits with the Behavior Specialist.	1.2. Principal; Behavior Specialist	1.2. Increased self-awareness and decreased behavior issues.	1.2. Student discussions; teacher discussions with Behavior Specialist; discipline data from EDW.
			1.3. Lack of adequate progress of our 3rd grade retained students	1.3. Increase direct reading instruction in a small group setting – *Boost Time*	1.3. Classroom teachers; Principal; Assistant Principal	1.3. Increase in student reading achievement data	1.3. SharePoint data spreadsheets; Edusoft data; program assessments; FCAT data

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

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

Dropout Prevention 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
N/A						

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $0.00

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: Increase the ability of parents to access their child's academic progress in a timely manner. Increased knowledge of grade level expectations and curriculum standards.	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* During 2012, 47% of parents made use of Progress book for academic information and Open House for curriculum information.	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* In July of 2013, we expect 100% of parents to make use of Progress Book for academic information and Open House for curriculum information.	1.1. Parents' lack of knowledge about how to access Progress Book and monitor their child's academic progress.	1.1. Provide a Progress Book station at each parent event. Have a staff member available to assist parents in accessing and navigating the site.	1.1. Classroom teacher; Principal	1.1. Increased parental access of Progress Book.	1.1. Progress Book reports
			1.2. Parent's lack of knowledge about the curriculum and expectations of their child's grade level.	1.2. Combine Open House with grade level curriculum presentations.	1.2. Team Leaders at each grade level; CRT	1.2. Increased attendance at curriculum presentations.	1.2. Sign-in sheets.

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

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
N/A						

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
		Subtotal:	
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
		Subtotal:	
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
		Subtotal:	
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
		Subtotal:	
		Total: $0.00	

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: 2012 FCAT Science data shows that only 45% (66) of students scored at Level 3 and above on the FCAT science assessment. In order to increase the number of students who are proficient on the science test, we will begin Year 1 of <u>Moving STEM into the Main Streams</u> with all grade levels. Our 5th grade teachers will take part in the P-Sell program through Orange County Public Schools.	1.1. Lack of knowledge about what STEM is and what STEM isn't.	1.1. Provide Professional Development in the area of STEM, utilizing the OCPS curriculum services website.	1.1. Curriculum Resource Teacher; Science teacher	1.1. Lesson plan reviews; classroom walkthrough data.	1.1. Science Edusoft assessment data; science program assessment data; FCAT science data.
	1.2. Lack of knowledge, resources and materials available to our 5th grade teachers	1.2. Implement the P-Sell program with fidelity.	1.2. Principal, CRT	1.2. Lesson plan reviews; classroom walkthrough data.	1.2. P-Sell Science assessments data; Science Edusoft assessment data; FCAT science data.
	1.3. Lack of collaboration among teachers regarding STEM.	1.3. Form a STEM PLC.	1.3. Assistant Principal, CRT, Science teacher	1.3. PLC Minutes; Evidence of STEM lessons in Lesson plans. Evidence of STEM lessons during classroom walkthrough.	1.3. Science Edusoft assessment data; science program assessment data; FCAT science data.

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	Melissa Chandler, Science Teacher	All classroom teachers	Staff Meetings	Provide additional information at each staff meeting	Tina Cappabianca, Principal Martha Nelson, Assistant Principal

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $0.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Additional Goal(s)</th><th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="3">Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:</th><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">1. Additional Goal

Additional Goal #1:

Increase percentage of students who read on grade level by age 9 to at least 75% as measured by the FCAT reading assessment.</td>
<td>1.1. Lack of additional reading instruction time for our lowest performing students in 3rd grade.</td>
<td>1.1 Implement "Boost" groups in the afternoon for students in danger of scoring a Level 1 on FCAT and for those who are retained.</td>
<td>1.1. 3rd grade teachers; MTSS team</td>
<td>1.1. Review data for increased scores on assessments and increased reading level.</td>
<td>1.1.Edusoft data; mini-assessment data; FAIR data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 Current Level :*

2012 FCAT results showed that 51% (60) of 3rd grade students scored at Level 3 or above on the FCAT reading assessment.</td>
<td>2013 Expected Level :*

By July 2013, at least 75% (89) of 3rd grade students will score at Level 3 or above on the FCAT reading assessment.</td>
<td>1.2. Lack of targeted intervention in our K-2 classrooms.</td>
<td>1.2. Assess all K-2 students using the CORE and PAST; provide targeted interventions based on the data; monitor through data spreadsheets on SharePoint.</td>
<td>1.2. Classroom teachers; MTSS team</td>
<td>1.2. Review data for increased scores on assessments and increased reading level.</td>
<td>1.2. Houghton Mifflin Leveled Assessments; FAIR</td>
</tr>
</table>

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Additional Goal Additional Goal #2: Introduce Destination College to our 4th and 5th grade students.	2012 Current Level :* 0% of our students have been introduced, through Destination College, to the skills for success, specifically speaking, listening, and study skills.	2013 Expected Level :* 100% of our students will be introduced, through Destination College, to the skills for success, specifically speaking, listening, and study skills	1.1. Lack of a framework for implementing research-based strategies to prepare our students for rigorous courses in the future.	1.1. Introduce the Destination College Program to our 4th and 5th grade teachers	1.1. Assistant Principal	1.1. Increased use of research-based strategies by our 4th and 5th grade teachers.	1.1. Lesson plans; classroom walkthroughs; PDS Online participation data.
Additional Goal(s)			**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Additional Goal Additional Goal #3: Increase the percentage of VPK students scoring above the 50th percentile to 75% on the vocabulary section of the FLKRS assessment.	2012 Current Level :* 2012 FLKRS results showed that 61% (12) of VPK students scored at the 50th percentile or above on the vocabulary section of the FLKRS	2013 Expected Level :* By July 2013, at least 75% (15) of VPK students will score at the 50th percentile or above on the vocabulary	1.1. Lack of vocabulary instruction and exposure.	1.1. Research and implement vocabulary strategies that are appropriate for VPK students.	1.1. Principal; CRT; Pre-K Teacher	1.1. Increased vocabulary study and exposure.	1.1. Lesson plans; classroom walkthrough observations; FLKRS data

	assessment.	section of the FLKRS assessment.				
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Additional Goal Additional Goal #4: Increase the priority and ease of access to reading and math progress monitoring data for the MTSS team and the classroom teachers.	2012 Current Level :* During the 2012 school year, 0% of teachers input data into a shared database for use by all stakeholders enabling tracking of math fluency.	2013 Expected Level :* During the 2013 school year, 100% of teachers will input data into a shared database for use by all stakeholders enabling tracking of math fluency.	1.1. Lack of centralized and up to date progress monitoring data for reading and math.	1.1. Develop and maintain data spreadsheets for each classroom teacher on Lakeville SharePoint with the requirement that progress monitoring data is updated each Friday and data from assessments are entered in a timely manner.	1.1. MTSS team	1.1. Review spreadsheets on a weekly basis; monitor availability of current data during staffings and meetings.	1.1. Increased use of data to drive instruction, intervention and enrichment; lesson plans that are targeted; Student achievement data – FAIR; Edusoft; Envision math topic tests.
			1.2. Lack of math program to assess fluency with math facts.	1.2. Purchase the computer program FastMath. Install in technology lab and classroom computers.	1.2. MTSS team; classroom teachers; Technology coordinator	1.2. Monitor each student's proficiency with math facts	1.2. FastMath program reports; progress monitoring data on Lakeville SharePoint.

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Additional Goal Additional Goal #5: Decrease disproportionate classification in special education, specifically focusing on students who are classified as gifted.	2012 Current Level :* White: 50% Black: 27% Hispanic: 14%	2013 Expected Level :* White: 50% Black: 50% Hispanic: 50%	1.1. Lack of knowledge on how to recognize gifted characteristics in all subgroups.	1.1. Provide professional development to increase awareness.	1.1. Assistant Principal; School Psychologist	1.1. Increased student referrals for gifted.	1.1. Increased students qualifying for gifted.
			1.2. Lack of understanding on how to construct lessons that reach all students and provide equal opportunity for success.	1.2. Provide professional development in Lesson Study.	1.2. Curriculum Resource Teacher; School Psychologist	1.2. Decreased achievement gap within our special education population	1.2. Formative assessments ; program assessments; decreased classification in special education for our subgroups

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Additional Goal			1.1. Lack of Art on the special area schedule	1.1. Decrease a P.E. paraprofessional in order to purchase an allocation for an art teacher; maintain two fine arts classes despite allocation changes.	1.1. Principal	1.1. Increased exposure to fine arts during the school day.	1.1. SMS schedules
Additional Goal #6: Increase the percentage of students to 100% whose schedule reflects participation in two fine arts classes.	2012 Current Level :* 2012 student schedules reflected that 0% (0) of students were enrolled in two fine arts classes.	2013 Expected Level :* 2013 student schedules reflected that 100% (908) of students are enrolled in two fine arts classes.					
			1.2. Lack of opportunities for students to publish their writing	1.2. Students will participate in the Reflections writing contest hosted by the PTA.	1.2. Art Teacher	1.2. Participation in program.	1.2. Number of writing pieces submitted to PTA.

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Additional Goal(s)</th><th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Additional Goal

<u>Additional Goal #7:</u>

Decrease the Achievement Gap for Each Identified Subgroup by 10% by June 30, 2016.</td><td>Additional Goal for Reading is located in elementary reading section 5A.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 Current Level :*</td><td>2013 Expected .Level :*</td><td rowspan="2">Additional Goal for Math is located in elementary math goal section 5A.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Additional Goals Professional Development

<table>
<tr><th colspan="7">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.</th></tr>
<tr><td>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</td><td>Grade Level/Subject</td><td>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</td><td>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</td><td>Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</td><td>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td></tr>
<tr><td>Destination College</td><td>4th and 5th grade</td><td>OCPS District Representative</td><td>4th and 5th grade teachers, including ESE</td><td>October 17, 2012</td><td>Monitor lesson plans for implementation</td><td>Tina Cappabianca, Principal; Martha Nelson, Assistant Principal</td></tr>
<tr><td>Gifted Characteristics</td><td>K-5</td><td>Peggy Donovan, School Psychologist</td><td>All teachers</td><td>January 2013</td><td>Review of gifted referrals</td><td>Martha Nelson, Assistant Principal; Peggy Donovan, School Psychologist</td></tr>
<tr><td>Lesson Study</td><td>4th grade</td><td>Debbie Jerrett, CRT; Peggy Donovan; School Psychologist</td><td>4th grade teachers, including ESE</td><td>November, 2013</td><td>Review of referrals for ESE classification</td><td>Peggy Donovan, School Psychologist, Tina Cappabianca, Principal</td></tr>
</table>

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

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Lesson Study	Substitutes	Title II Funds	2100.00
			Subtotal: $ 2100.00
			Total: $2100.00

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total: $20,500.00
CELLA Budget
Total: $0.00
Mathematics Budget
Total: $10,000.00
Science Budget
Total: $0.00
Writing Budget
Total: $700.00
Civics Budget
Total: $0.00
U.S. History Budget
Total: $0.00
Attendance Budget
Total: $0.00
Suspension Budget
Total: $0.00
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total: $0.00
Parent Involvement Budget
Total: $0.00
STEM Budget
Total: $0.00
CTE Budget
Total: $0.00
Additional Goals
Total: $2,100.00
Grand Total: $33,300.00

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

<u>Differentiated Accountability</u>

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.

    ☒ **Yes**   ☐ No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The Lakeville SAC will first review student achievement data from 2011-2012. We will then discuss and monitor the initiatives for the 2012-2013 school year and review student assessment data when appropriate. At specific periods we will discuss our progress and change or adapt as needed. We will then begin to develop our plan for the following year.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
N/A	$ 0.00