FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

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

School Information

School Name: Dream Lake Elementary School	District Name: Orange County Public Schools
Principal: Gary Schadow	Superintendent: Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Ben Ramos	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	Gary Schadow	Bachelors of Science Education Masters of Science Curriculum and Instruction Masters of Science Educational Leadership Certification- Biology 6-12, General Science 5-9, School Principal (All levels), Middle Grades Endorsement	6	21	2006-7 Grade A /567 points/ AYP 100%/Reading 78%/Math 76%/Science 47%/Writing 72%/Reading Gains 73%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 63%/Math Bottom 25% 82% 2007-08 Grade A /583 points/ AYP 98%/Reading 83%/Math 76%/Science 47%/Writing 77%/Reading Gains 73%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 73%/Math Bottom 25% 77% 2008-09 Grade A /565 points/ AYP 92%/Reading 82%/Math 77%/Science 49%/Writing 90%/Reading Gains 75%/Math Gains 70%/Reading Bottom 25% 55%/Math Bottom 25% 67% 2009-10 Grade A /546 points/ AYP 67%/Reading 81%/Math 76%/Science 52%/Writing 81%/Reading Gains 63%/Math Gains 69%/Reading Bottom 25% 52%/Math Bottom 25% 72% 2010-11 Grade A /613 points/ AYP 85%/Reading 79%/Math 85%/Science 52%/Writing 94%/Reading Gains 64%/Math Gains 84%/Reading Bottom 25% 68%/Math Bottom 25% 87% 2011-12 Grade A /564 points/ Reading 60%/Math 67%/Science 49%/Writing 79%/Reading Gains 69%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 79%/Math Bottom 25% 84%

Assis Principal	Patricia Weisbach	Bachelors of Science Special Education Masters of Science Leadership and Supervision Certification- Special Education K-12 General Education K-6 Educational Leadership	3	14	Employed in Michigan as principal of Title 1 Elementary School and Special Education Supervisor of Inclusive Programs. Responsible for managing the growth on standardized state testing from 21% proficiency to 74% over 5 years. Lake County Fl Curriculum Director 2007-2009.District attained an A grade and improved scores both years. 2009-10 Grade A /546 points/ AYP 67%/Reading 81%/Math 76%/Science 52%/Writing 81%/Reading Gains 63%/Math Gains 69%/Reading Bottom 25% 52%/Math Bottom 25% 72% 2010-11 Grade A /613 points/ AYP 85%/Reading 79%/Math 85%/Science 52%/Writing 94%/Reading Gains 64%/Math Gains 84%/Reading Bottom 25% 68%/Math Bottom 25% 87% 2011-12 Grade A /564 points/ Reading 60%/Math 67%/Science 49%/Writing 79%/Reading Gains 69%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 79%/Math Bottom 25% 84%

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.

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

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	Cindy Craft	Certifications- El Education Early Childhood Reading ESOL	10	6	2006-7 Grade A /567 points/ AYP 100%/Reading 78%/Math 76%/Science 47%/Writing 72%/Reading Gains 73%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 63%/Math Bottom 25% 82% 2007-08 Grade A /583 points/ AYP 98%/Reading 83%/Math 76%/Science 47%/Writing 77%/Reading Gains 73%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 73%/Math Bottom 25% 77% 2008-09 Grade A /565 points/ AYP 92%/Reading 82%/Math 77%/Science 49%/Writing 90%/Reading Gains 75%/Math Gains 70%/Reading Bottom 25% 55%/Math Bottom 25% 67% 2009-10 Grade A /546 points/ AYP 67%/Reading 81%/Math 76%/Science 52%/Writing 81%/Reading Gains 63%/Math Gains 69%/Reading Bottom 25% 52%/Math Bottom 25% 72% 2010-11 Grade A /613 points/ AYP 85%/Reading 79%/Math 85%/Science 52%/Writing 94%/Reading Gains 64%/Math Gains 84%/Reading Bottom 25% 68%/Math Bottom 25% 87% 2011-12 Grade A /564 points/ Reading 60%/Math 67%/Science 49%/Writing 79%/Reading Gains 69%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 79%/Math Bottom 25% 84%
CRT	Shannon Snyder	Certifications- El Education ESOL Ed Leadership	6	2	2010-11 Grade A /613 points/ AYP 85%/Reading 79%/Math 85%/Science 52%/Writing 94%/Reading Gains 64%/Math Gains 84%/Reading Bottom 25% 68%/Math Bottom 25% 87% 2011-12 Grade A /564 points/ Reading 60%/Math 67%/Science 49%/Writing 79%/Reading Gains 69%/Math Gains 77%/Reading Bottom 25% 79%/Math Bottom 25% 84%

<u>Effective and Highly Effective Teachers</u>

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

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
Dream Lake Elementary School attempts to retain teachers by providing support in all areas. Support teachers and mentors along with PLC teams work directly with teachers to enable teachers to rise to the standards expected of a highly effective educator. The DLE Leadership Team provides professional development opportunities based on the demonstrated need of the staff as defined in the annual SIP.	Principal	On-going
Dream Lake uses the Orange County Hiring System to recruit teachers. We post openings and screen and hire from the pool provided by the district.	Principal	On-Going

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0% (55)	All instructional staff and paraprofessionals have received an effective evaluation and are teaching/working in field.

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
55	4%(2)	18%(10)	35%(19)	43%(24)	47%(26)	100% (55)	11%(6)	4%(2)	76%(2)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Kristy King	Karenza Flores	Kari and Kristy work next to each other and teach first grade. Kristy and Kari have known each other and have a professional relationship.	Common Planning and Weekly PLC
Alma Washington	Stephanie Celis	Alma and Stephanie work next door to each other and teach third grade. Alma is a senior teacher and team leader.	Common Planning and Weekly PLC
Laura Stile	Samantha Howe	Laura and Samantha work next door to each other and teach third grade. Laura was Samantha's internship supervisor.	Common Planning and Weekly PLC
Laura Fish	Amanda Willer	Laura and Amanda are on the fourth grade team together. Amanda is new to the school but not to teaching. Laura's knowledge of the school and community will expedite Amanda's ability to acclimate to the school.	Common Planning and Weekly PLC
Shari Austin	Deborah Pope	Shari and Deborah are on the first grade team together. Deborah is new to the school but not to teaching. Shari's knowledge of the school and community will expedite Deborah's ability to acclimate to the school.	Common Planning and Weekly PLC
Stacey Clemens	Nicole Tambini	Stacey and Nicole are on the first grade team together. Nicole is new to the school but not to teaching. Stacey's knowledge of the school and community will expedite Nicole's ability to acclimate to the school.	Common Planning and Weekly PLC
Janice McElroy	Lorimar Rosa	Janice and Lorimar are on the VPK team together. Lorimar is new to the school but not to teaching. Janice's knowledge of the school and community will expedite Lorimar's ability to acclimate to the school.	Common Planning and Weekly PLC

Additional Requirements

***Coordination and Integration-*Title I Schools Only**
This Section Not Required for Dream Lake Elementary

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

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

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.

Principal/Asst. Principal
General Education Teachers
Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers
Instructional Coach (es) CRT/RtI
Reading Instructional Specialist
School Psychologist
Speech Language Pathologist
Student Services Personnel

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?

Principal/Asst. Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.
General Education Teachers: Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.
Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.
Instructional Coach (es) CRT/RtI: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Reading Instructional Specialist: Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.
School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.
Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.
Student Services Personnel: provides interventions to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

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

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 team meets as needed or at least two times per month to engage in the following activities: Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and assign resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation school-wide. Each team within the school systematically works towards the common goal stated above. All teams are coordinated through the central school leadership team, which works to integrate the work of each of the other teams, Dream Lake teams are: grade level team leaders, literacy team, ESE resource team and grade level PLC's.

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. Reading •Universal Screen FAIR/FLKRS •Targeted Diagnostic FAIR •Targeted Diagnostic FAIR Math •Envision BOY/ •OCPS Benchmark •Envision Targeted Diagnostic Science •OCPS Benchmark •Topic Tests Pearson Writing •Write Score Writing Behavior •DLE Discipline Referral
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Training the staff begins with the RtI Leadership Team meeting to help develop the goals and professional development for student achievement on the SIP. The team provides data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; helps set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); and aligns processes and procedures. Once those things have been accomplished, the RtI Team meets with grade level PLC's to deliver the information listed above and to facilitate conversations and learning. The team will also work with the CRT and Reading Coach to facilitate building wide learning opportunities during learning celebrations(staff meetings)

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

Describe the plan to support MTSS. Dream Lake has designed its academic day to meet the needs of all students. Tier 1,2 and 3 lessons are scheduled and consistent. Each day begins with intervention or enrichment for every student. This framework allows for understanding and ease of use. When a student exhibits a need the team works quickly with the teachers to provide the intervention or enrichment called for. Our high percentage of learning gains especially in our struggling students provides us with the motivation to continue the process.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Principal/Assistant Principal Literacy Coach CRT Grade Level Chairs Teachers
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). This group is a subcommittee of the leadership team and meets on an as needed basis to research, recommend, and model best practices in the area of literacy.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The two major initiatives of this group this year is to strengthen the independent reading portion of the 90 minute reading block by focusing on student choice, word work and responding to text, and supporting teachers in the use of the newly adopted science and social studies tests during the reading block.

Public School Choice <mark>*Not Required*</mark>

- **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 <mark>*Not required*</mark>

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

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

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.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. Teacher fidelity with AR	1A.1. Develop and implement a school-wide AR Program	1A.1. •Literacy Coach •CRT •Media Specialist	1A.1. Monitor AR points earned by students	1A.1. Quarterly AR reports
Reading Goal #1A: Our goal is to have 3% more of our students in grades 3, 4, 5 reach level 3 on the 2012 FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *32%(113)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *35%(124)*					
			1A.2. Unreliable computers	1A.2. Develop a protocol for the use of the STAR Reading Assessment for progress monitoring for all students at a DRA level of 24 or higher	1A.2. •Literacy Coach •CRT •Media Specialist	1A.2. Monitor STAR Reports	1A.2. STAR Reports
			1A.3. Teachers understanding of Focus Maps	1A.3. Research and design grade level specific focus maps during PLC's	1A.3. •LTM •Teachers	1A.3. Monitor PLC Notes	1A.3. Focus Maps
			1.A.4 Time and resources to assess younger students in a timely fashion	1.A.4 Teachers will progress monitor all students quarterly in grades K-5	1.A.4 Principal RtI Team	1.A.4 Progress Monitoring Reports	1A.4 Progress Monitoring Reports
			1B.1. The ability for students to cognitively understand how to use the computer equipment.	1B.1 Implement and gather data on the effectiveness of the software programs; Early Literacy Skill Builder Pathways to Reading	1B.1. •Principal •Inclusion Spec •Self-contained ESE Teachers	1B.1. Monitor the use of the two programs	1B.1. Program Reports
Reading Goal #1B: Our goal is to have 9% more of our students in grades 3,4,5 reach level 4,5,6 on the 2013 FAA	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *55%(6)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *64%%(7)*					
			1B.2. consistency in programming	1B.2. Provide opportunities for ESE students on alternative assessment to practice test taking skills	1B.2. •Principal •Inclusion Spec •Self-contained ESE Teachers	1B.2. Monitor Common board for evidence of strategies being used.	1B.2. portfolio of student work
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

13

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. Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring at level 4 and 5 on the FCAT Reading Test by 3%			2A.1. Calibrating the pace correctly with new cut scores.	2A.1. Calibrate 2012 FCAT Scores with Success Maker reading to determine rigorous goals.	2A.1. •CRT •Classroom Teachers	2A.1 Correlation to 2013 FCAT scores and goals set	2A.1. Data Report illustrating correlation
	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *27%(95)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *30%(106)*					
			2A.2. Managing with limited time for other essential professional development activities.	2A.2. Establish a 75 minute planning block using formative assessments and the FCIM model after school to support reading intervention and enrichment PLC for grades K-2	2A.2. •Principal •Asst. Principal •Reading Coach •CRT •Teachers	2A.2. PLC Notes	2A.2. Common SIM Lesson displayed on common board
			2A.3. Teachers utilizing the time to enrich above level readers.	2A.3. Continue to provide 30 minutes of independent reading at students independent reading level for all students at a DRA 24 level and above during the 90 minute reading block	2A.3. •CRT •Classroom Teachers	2A.3. Monitor AR Reports	2A.3. Report Results
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2B: Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring at level 7on the FAA Reading Test by 9%			2B.1. Supervising students as they access the program	2B.1. Refine implementation of English in a Flash Program upon RtI Team recommendation for student on FAA	2B.1. •Principal •Inclusion Spec •Self-contained ESE Teachers	2B.1. Monitor Reports	2B.1. Report Results
	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *18%(2)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *27%(3)*					
			2B.2. Consistency in programming	2B.2. Provide opportunities for ESE students on alternative assessment to practice test taking skills	2B.2. •Principal •Inclusion Spec •Self-contained ESE Teachers	2B.2. Monitor Common board for evidence of strategies being used.	2B.2. Portfolio of student work
			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 reading.			3A.1. Time and resources	3A.1. Refine and continue Reading Lesson Study	3A.1. •Principal •Asst Principal •Literacy Coach •Teachers	3A.1. Monitor teacher use of the lesson study model during non training time	3A.1. Administrative observation during evaluations
Our goal is to increase the percentage of third, fourth, and fifth graders making learning gains in reading on FCAT 2.0 by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *69%(244)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *72%(255)*					
			3A.2. Timelines for receiving results	3A.2. Review and disaggregate FCAT Reading data to determine areas of strength and weakness and plan instruction	3A.2. •Principal •Asst Principal •Literacy Coach •Teachers	3A.2. Compilation of historical data	3A.2. FCAT results
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3B: Our goal is to increase the percentage of third, fourth, and fifth graders making learning gains in reading on FAA by 9%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *45%(5)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 54%(6)	3B.1. Timeline for administering assessment does not provide optimum time for students to learn each year before test is given.	3B.1. Review and disaggregate FAA Reading data to determine areas of strength and weakness and plan instruction	3B.1 •Principal •Asst Principal •Inclusion specialist •Literacy Coach •Teachers	3B.1. Compilation of historical data	3B.1. FAA Results
			3B.2. Teacher ability to accelerate progress.	3B.2. Monthly monitoring of FAA tested skills for students on AA	3B.2. •Principal •Asst Principal Inclusion specialist •Literacy Coach •Teachers	3B.2. Compilation of historical data	3B.2. FAA Results
			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 reading. Our Goal is for 82% of the bottom 25% of students to make learning gains in reading.		4A.1. Maintaining momentum and attendance	4A.1. Provide tutoring in reading after school to our lowest quartile of readers grades 3-5	4A.1. •Principal •Asst Principal •Literacy Coach •Teachers	4A.1. Compare FCAT reading data with students in tutoring and those not attending	4A.1. Progress monitoring data
	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *79%(70)* / **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *82%(72)*					
		4A.2. Time and understanding of RTI Philosophy	Refine and continue the RtI Process in Reading for grades K-5	4A.2. •Principal •Asst Principal •Literacy Coach •Teachers	4A.2. RTI Data Logs/IMS System	4A.2. FCAT Scores
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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** White/Black 12.2% White/Hispanic 20.8%	White/Black 11.9% White/Hispanic 27%	White/Black 10.7% White/Hispanic 23.8%	White/Black 9.5% White/Hispanic 20.6%	White/Black 8.3% White/Hispanic 17.4%	White/Black 7.1% White/Hispanic 14.2%	White/Black 5.9% White/Hispanic 11%
Reading Goal #5A: We will reduce our achievement gap White/Black by 1.2% and White/Hispanic by 3.2%.							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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. White: Funding for interventions Black: Funding for interventions	5B.1. Disaggregate data for all benchmark tests to determine gaps	5B.1. Principal Assistant Principal	5B.1. Regular PLC meetings to discuss data.	5B.1. Benchmark and formal summative/formative tests

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

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

Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Hispanic: Funding for interventions	in performance and remediate in the Intervention and Enrichment sessions daily.	RTI Coach Teachers		
We are going to lower the percentage of students not proficient in reading by three percent for all. We will drop our percentage for black students an additional 1.2% and our Hispanic students an additional 3.2% in order to impact the achievement gap.	White:29%(42) Black:41%(35) Hispanic:56% (85)	White:26% (37) Black:36.8% ((31) Hispanic:49.8 %(75)					
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5A.1. Maintaining momentum and attendance	5A.1. Provide tutoring in reading after school to our lowest quartile of readers grades 3-5	5A.1. •Principal •Asst Principal •Literacy Coach •Teachers	5A.1. Compare FCAT reading data with students in tutoring and those not attending	5A.1. Progress monitoring data
Reading Goal #5C: *3% fewer ELLstudents will be classified as non-proficient in math on the 2013 FCAT*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 69.1% (58)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 66.1%(55)	5B2 Time and understanding of RTI Philosophy	5B2 Refine and continue the RtI Process in Reading for grades K-5	5B2 •Principal •Asst Principal •Literacy Coach •Teachers	5B2 RTI Data Logs/IMS System	5B2 FCAT Scores
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5D.1. Maintaining momentum and attendance	5D.1. Provide tutoring in reading after school to our lowest quartile of readers grades 3-5	5D1. •Principal •Asst Principal •Literacy Coach •Teachers	5D.1. Compare FCAT reading data with students in tutoring and those not attending	5D.1. Progress monitoring data

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

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

Reading Goal #5D: *3% fewer ESE students will be classified as non-proficient in math on the 2013 FCAT*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 63.6%(53)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 60.6%(50)	5E2 Time and understanding of RTI Philosophy	5E2 Refine and continue the RtI Process in Reading for grades K-5	5E2 •Principal •Asst Principal •Literacy Coach •Teachers	5E2 RTI Data Logs/IMS System	5E2 FCAT Scores
.			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Maintaining momentum and attendance	5E.1. Provide tutoring in reading after school to our lowest quartile of readers grades 3-5	5E.1. •Principal •Asst Principal •Literacy Coach •Teachers	5E.1. Compare FCAT reading data with students in tutoring and those not attending	5E.1. Progress monitoring data
Reading Goal #5E: *3% fewer ED students will be classified as non-proficient in math on the 2013 FCAT*	2012 Current Level of Performance: 48.7% (123) 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 45.7%((116)	5E2 Time and understanding of RTI Philosophy	5E2 Refine and continue the RtI Process in Reading for grades K-5	5E2 •Principal •Asst Principal •Literacy Coach •Teachers	5E2 RTI Data Logs/IMS System	5E2 FCAT Scores

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
Using Independent Reading to Enrich and Engage	K-5	CRT	All Instructional K-5	Weekly PLC	Weekly progress monitoring for richer instruction during PLC's	CRT Principal/Asst. Principal
Formative Assessments	K-5	CRT	All Instructional K-5	Weekly PLC	Weekly progress monitoring for richer instruction during PLC's	CRT Principal/Asst. Principal

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

Reading in the Content Areas	K-5	CRT	All Instructional K-5	Weekly PLC	Weekly progress monitoring for richer instruction during PLC's	CRT Principal/Asst. Principal
Lesson Study	1st	CRT	1st Grade Team	2 days x3 times per year	Weekly progress monitoring for richer instruction during PLC's	CRT Principal/Asst. Principal

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
After school tutoring	Teacher pay	SAI	$20,000
After school tutoring	Materials	SRI	10,000
			Subtotal 30,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
AR Program	Licenses	School Budget	$1,500
STAR	Licenses	School Budget	$2,000
English in a Flash	Licenses	School Budget	$2,500
Success Maker	Tech support	School Budget	$6,000
Fast Forward	Tech Support	School Budget	$2,500
			Subtotal 14,500.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Lesson Study Training	Paying for subs for release time and training	Title 2 Funds	2,100.00
			Subtotal:2,100.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total 46,600.00

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: *3% more students will score proficiently in listening /speaking on the 2013 Cella*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *46%(31)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *49%(33)*	1.1. Time away form grade level core curriculum	1.1. DLE ELL students will use English in a Flash software to improve vocabulary and background knowledge	1.1. • Principal • Media Specialist • CCT • Teachers	1.1. Monitoring reports of usage and progress	1.1. Reports
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2: *3% more students will score proficiently in reading on the 2013 Cella*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *48%(32).*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *51%(34)*	2.1. Time and resources	2.1. Providing after school tutoring guided reading session	2.1. • Principal • Asst Principal • Reading Coach	2.1. Weekly progress monitoring	2.1. Results for progress monitoring

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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: *3% more students will score proficiently in writing on the 2013 Cella*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *48 %(32).* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *51% (34)*	1A.2. Teacher understanding and consistency	1A.2. Develop and implement a word study program using word patterns to help students with writing conventions	1A.2. Assistant Principal CRT Reading Coach	1A.2. Weekly spelling units aligned with word patterns assigned at each grade level	1A.2. Weekly spelling matches word patterns list for assigned grade level
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
After school tutoring	Teacher Pay	SRI Funds	3,000
			Subtotal:3,000.00

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

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:00000

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. Mathematics Goal #1A: Our Goal is to have 3% more students reach level 3 or above on FCAT math	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *37%(130)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *40%(141)*	1A.1. Having computer labs operational during preplan	1A.1. Provide St Math Training for all teachers grades 1-5 who are not already using program	1A.1. •Principal •Asst. Principal •ST Math Staff	1A.1. Administrator attend training with teachers	1A.1. Exit slips from teachers attending the training

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

		1A.2. The amount of time it takes to populate Edusoft	1A.2. Use benchmark assessments three times per year	1A.2. CRT •Teachers	1A.2. Monitor Edusoft comparison reports to see students who are projected to make learning gains	1A.2. Edusoft/Envision comparison reports
		1A.3. Adequate computer lab space	1A.3. Use computer lab for practice ST Math 2x's 45 minutes per week or 3% growth syllabus and 3% Mastery 2% for grades K-2	1A.3. •Principal •Asst. Principal •Lab Coordinator •Teacher	1A.3. Monitor lab reports to ensure 6% completion per week.	1A.3. St Math weekly lab reports
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.		1B.1. Individual supervision of student during lesson	1B.1. Determine appropriate grade level focus for students on FAA in ST Math register for instructional level in place of grade level.	1B.1. Principal •Asst. Principal •Lab Coordinator •Inclusion Facilitator •Teacher	1B.1. Monitor lab reports to ensure growth	1B.1. ST Math Reports
Mathematics Goal #1B: Our goal is to have 3% more students receive a 4, 5 or 6 in the FAA math test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *44%(4)* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *55%(5)*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.		2A.1. Have adequate personnel to impact group size	2A.1. Refine and continue 40 minute daily math intervention and enrichment for grades 3,4,and 5	2A.1. •Principal •Asst. Principal	2A.1. Monitor FCAT Scores	2A.1. FCAT Scores
Mathematics Goal #2A: Our Goal is for 4% growth in our students scoring 4 and 5 on the Math FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *27%(94)* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *31%(109)*					

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

		2A.2. Time and resources	2A.2. Monitor math instruction through informal observation protocol looking for evidence of: •small group instruction •whole group instruction •common focus calendar •common formative assessments	2A.2. •Principal •Asst. Principal •Leadership Team	2A.2. Classroom Observations	2A.2. Marzano Evaluation Protocol
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.		2B.2. Time and resources	2B.2. Monitor math instruction through informal observation protocol looking for evidence of: •small group instruction •whole group instruction •common focus calendar •common formative assessments	2B.2. •Principal •Asst. Principal •Leadership Team	2B.2. Classroom Observations	2B.2. Marzano Evaluation Protocol
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B</u>: Our Goal is for 11% growth in our students scoring 4 and 5 on the Math FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>* *0(0)*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>* *11%(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. Time for teams to meet and assimilate data	3A.1. Review and disaggregate FCAT Math data to determine areas of strength and weakness and plan instruction	3A.1 •Principal •Asst Principal •Teachers	3A.1. Compilation of historical data	3A.1. FCAT Results
To Increase the percentage of 3rd,4th, and 5th graders making	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>*	3A.2. Lab supervision off school hours	3A.2. use computer labs before and after school to keep students on goal for ST Math	3A.2. •Principal •Asst. Principal	3A.2. Review reports weekly to schedule students who are not making weekly goals	3A.2. ST Math Reports

learning gains in math by 3%	67%(237)	70%(247)	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.

3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1. Students cognitive ability	3B.1. Include ESE students in all mainstream math activities	3B.1. •Principal •Asst. Principal •Inclusion Specialist •Classroom Teacher	3B.1. Monitor common boards for access point activities	3B.1. Marzano Evaluation System
To Increase the percentage of 3rd,4th, and 5th graders making learning gains in math by 11% on the FAA	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *44%(4)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 55%(5)					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.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
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Time for teams to meet and assimilate data	4A.1. Review and disaggregate FCAT Math data to determine areas of strength and weakness and plan instruction	4A.1 •Principal •Asst Principal •Teachers	4A.1. Compilation of historical data	4A.1. FCAT Results
Mathematics Goal #4: 3% more of our bottom 25% students will make learning gains on the FCAT	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	4B.2. Lab supervision off school hours	4B.2. Use computer labs before and after school to keep students on goal for ST Math	4B2. •Principal •Asst. Principal	4B.2. Review reports weekly to schedule students who are not making weekly goals	4B.2. ST Math Reports
	84%(74)	*87%(77)*	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

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

5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 White/Black 9.8% White/Hispanic 9.5%	White/Black 13.6% White/Hispanic 13.4%	White/Black 11.86% White/Hispanic 11.67%	White/Black 10.12% White/Hispanic 9.94%	White/Black 8.38% White/Hispanic 8.21%	White/Black 6.64% White/Hispanic 6.48%	White/Black 4.9% White/Hispanic 4.75%
Mathematics Goal #5A: We will reduce our achievement gap White/Black by 1.74% and White/Hispanic by 1.73%.							

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: Funding for interventions Black: Funding for interventions Hispanic: Funding for interventions	5B.1. Disaggregate data for all benchmark tests to determine gaps in performance and remediate in the Intervention and Enrichment sessions daily.	5B.1. Principal Assistant Principal RTI Coach Teachers	5B.1. Regular PLC meetings to discuss data.	5B.1. Benchmark and formal summative/formative tests
Mathematics Goal #5B: ***We are going to lower the percentage of students not proficient in math by three percent for all.. We will drop our percentage for black students an additional 1.74% and our Hispanic students an additional 1.73% in order to impact the achievement gap.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:25%(36) Black:38.6% (33) Hispanic:38.4% (58) — 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:22%(31) Black:35.6% (30) Hispanic:35.4% (53)					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Time for teams to meet and assimilate data	5C.1. Review and disaggregate FCAT Math data to determine areas of strength and weakness and plan instruction	5C.1 •Principal •Asst Principal •Teachers	5C.1. Compilation of historical data	5C.1. FCAT Results
Mathematics Goal #5C: *3% fewer Ell students will be classified as non-proficient in math on the 2013 FCAT*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 45.3%(30)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 42.3%(28)	5C.2. Lab supervision off school hours	5C.2. use computer labs before and after school to keep students on goal for ST Math	5C.2. •Principal •Asst. Principal	5C.2. Review reports weekly to schedule students who are not making weekly goals	5C.2. ST Math Reports
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. Time for teams to meet and assimilate data	5D.1. Review and disaggregate FCAT Math data to determine areas of strength and weakness and plan instruction	5D.1. •Principal •Asst Principal •Teachers	5D.1. Compilation of historical data	5D.1. FCAT Results
Mathematics Goal #5D: *3% fewer ESE students will be classified as non-proficient in math on the 2013 FCAT*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 45.5%(22)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 42.5%(20)	5D.2 Lab supervision off school hours	5D.2 use computer labs before and after school to keep students on goal for ST Math	5D.2 •Principal •Asst. Principal	5D.2 .Review reports weekly to schedule students who are not making weekly goals	5D.2 ST Math Reports

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 Time for teams to meet and assimilate data	5E.1 Review and disaggregate FCAT Math data to determine areas of strength and weakness and plan instruction	5E.1 •Principal •Asst Principal •Teachers	5E.1 Compilation of historical data	5E.1 FCAT Results

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

Mathematics Goal #5E: *3% fewer ED students will be classified as non-proficient in math on the 2013 FCAT*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	5E.2 Lab supervision off school hours	5E.2 use computer labs before and after school to keep students on goal for ST Math	5E.2 •Principal •Asst. Principal	5E.2 .Review reports weekly to schedule students who are not making weekly goals	5E.2.2 ST Math Reports
	37.9%(85)	34.9%(78)					

End of Elementary School Mathematics Section

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
ST Math	1-5	CRT/AP	All PLC's 1-5	During Preplanning with quarterly sessions after.	Weekly St Math Reports	PLC's/CRT/Asst. Principal

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
ST Math Incentives for achieving goals	T shirts	School Budget	1,000.00
			1,000.00:
Technology			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Use of ST Math	Web based software highlighting spatial/temporal math and brain based strategies	School Budget	3,500.00
			3,500.00:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			4,5000.00:

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.		1A.1. Teachers understanding of integration	1A.1. Integrate science and reading during the reading block using the newly adopted OCPS science materials in grades 3,4,5.	1A.1. CRT Classroom Teachers Reading Coach	1A.1. Classroom observations	1A.1. Marzano Evaluation System
Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

3% more students will show proficiency by scoring a 3 or above on the Science FCAT	*36%(41)*	*39%(45)*					
			1A.2. Systematic progress monitoring	1A.2. Integrate science materials into the after-school tutoring program for all level 1 and 2 students in grades 3,4,5	1A.2. CRT Reading Coach	1A.2. Weekly progress monitoring	1A.2. Progress monitoring results
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1 Time and resources	1B.1 Monitor science instruction through informal observation protocol looking for evidence of: •small group instruction whole group instruction common focus calendar common formative assessments	1B.1 Principal Asst. Principal Leadership Team	1B.1 Classroom Observations	1B.1 Marzano Evaluation System
Science Goal #1B: 17% more of our students will score at level 4,5,and 6 on the science portion of the FAA	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *50%(3)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *67%(4)*	1B.2. 1B.3.	1B.2. 1B.3.	1B.2. 1B.3.	1B.2. 1B.3.	1B.2. 1B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1 Teachers understanding of integration	2A.1 Integrate science and reading during the reading block using the newly adopted OCPS science materials in grades 3,4,5.	2A.1 CRT Classroom Teachers Reading Coach	2A.1 Classroom observations	2A.1 Marzano Evaluation System
Science Goal #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.

3% more of our students will receive a 4 or a 5 on the science FCAT.	*13%(15)*	*16%(18)*	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			1B.1 Time and resources	1B.1 Monitor science instruction through informal observation protocol looking for evidence of: •small group instruction whole group instruction common focus calendar common formative assessments	1B.1 Principal Asst. Principal Leadership Team	1B.1 Classroom Observations	1B.1 Marzano Evaluation System
Science Goal #2B: 3% more of our students taking the FAA will receive score of 7 or above.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
	17%(1)	*34%(2)*	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Integrating Science Content in the reading Block	345	CRT/AP	Grade Level PLC	School Year	Monitor PLC Designed Focus Maps	CRT/AP
Developed integrated focus maps with reading and science standards together	345	CRT/AP	Grade Level PLC	School Year	Monitor PLC Designed Focus Maps	CRT/AP

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

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
Technology			
	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Visually support new science adoption for students	Posters, markers, overheads	School Budget	500
			500.00
			500.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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. Teacher understanding and consistency	1A.1.Develop and implement a writing plan for K-3 students with a benchmark assessment and quarterly reporting	1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Teachers	1A.1. Monitoring completion of plan and carry through of quarterly benchmarks.	1A.1. Quarterly benchmark scores
Writing Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

3% more students will score proficient on the 2013 FCAT Writing Test	*79%(88)* *82%(92)*						
			1A.2. Teacher understanding and consistency	1A.2. Develop and implement a word study program using word patterns to help students with writing conventions	1A.2. Assistant Principal CRT Reading Coach	1A.2. Weekly spelling units aligned with word patterns assigned at each grade level	1A.2. Weekly spelling matches word patterns list for assigned grade level
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1B: *3% more students will score a 4 or above on the 2013 FAA.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *33%(1)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *66%(2)*	1B.1. Time and curriculum resources matched to students cognitive levels	1B.1. ESE students will be provided with daily writing instruction integrated with literacy activities.	1B.1. CRT Teachers	1B.1. Observation of common board activities	1B.1. Marzano Evaluation System
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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
Integrating writing activities in daily literacy for cognitively impaired students	Self-contained IND.	CRT Inclusion Coach	All IND Teachers	Early release Wednesday x4	Weekly PLC focus	CCT PLC Facilitator

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

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Write Score	On Line Writing Assessment Scoring	School Budget	3,200.00
			Subtotal:3,200.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			00000

End of Writing Goals

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]).

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

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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			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.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Civics Professional Development

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

35

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6">Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</td>
<td>Grade Level/Subject</td>
<td>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</td>
<td>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</td>
<td>Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</td>
<td>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

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

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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
U.S. History Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			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.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
U.S. History Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			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

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

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

		Subtotal:
		Total:

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: We will reduce students with 10 or more days absent by 3%((10)	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* *95%(772)* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *299* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* *96%(780)* 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *289* 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	1.1. time and resources	1.1. Centralize attendance services and have one person responsible for all aspects of attendance	1.1. AP Attendance Registrar Teachers	1.1. Weekly attendance reports	1.1. Improved Attendance Reports

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

	61	58					
			1.2 .time and resources	1.2. Develop and implement a plan for improving parents understanding of the frequency of student absence	1.2. AP Attendance Register Teachers	1.2. Family communications tools Letters, newsletters, connect orange messages, meeting announcements	1.2. Improved attendance reports
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:00000
			Total:

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: *Continue to have discipline levels in the single digits.*	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions	1.1. Continuation of funding for in school support team	1.1. Continue to refine RtI process for behavior.	1.1 Principal AP RtI Team .	1.1. Monitoring of behavioral issues attended to by behavioral specialist	1.1. Behavioral log reports and referral monitoring
	2	*0*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	2	*0*					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	4	*0*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					

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

41

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

	4	0					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Suspension Professional Development

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

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

	Subtotal:
	Total:

End of Suspension Goals

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 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

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			

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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			1.1. Finding incentives that students would want	1.1. We will offer incentives to students to bring their parents to all curriculum nights.	1.1. Principal Asst. Principal CTR Curriculum Night Chairs	1.1. Monitoring number of parents attending curriculum nights	1.1. Registrations sheets
Parent Involvement Goal #1: *We will increase parent participation by 3% at all curriculum night events* *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* *18%(150)*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* *21%((177)*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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

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
Curriculum Nights	Incentives	School budget	1000
			Subtotal:

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

	1,000.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: We will raise the number of JIJI Jedi Masters at Dream Lake in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades from 211 students to 220 students.	1.1. Technology malfunction	1.1. Students will be expected to complete 6% of the STMath program weekly in order to complete the program by the end of the school year.	1.1. Principal AP Teachers	1.1. Monitoring program reports	1.1. ST Math Program Reports
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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
Use of the ST Math Program	K-5	CRT/AP/Mind Research Institute Staff	Teachers in grades K-5	Preplanning then quarterly	Monitor ST Math Reports	Teachers/AP
OCPS STEM Training	K-5	OCPS Staff	Teachers in K	Throughout school year	PLC reports by participants	CRT/AP

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
ST Math use	Web based soft ware	School Budget	3,500.00
			3,500.00
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
ST Math Incentives	T shirts	School Budget	1,000.00
			1,000.00
			4,500.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

See additional Goals for Destination College

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
CTE Professional Development

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6">Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</td></tr>
<tr><th>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</th><th>Grade Level/Subject</th><th>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</th><th>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</th><th>Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</th><th>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

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:

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

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

	Total:

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s) OCPS Additional Required Goals

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal Additional Goal #1: *Increase by 3 Percent the number of VPK Students Who Will Enter Elementary School Ready Based on FLKRS Data (score 70% and above)*	2012 Current Level :* 89%(72).	2013 Expected Level :* 92%(74)	1.1.Number of students in VPK	1.1 .Teachers will use the new VPK Assessment to determine individual needs of students and program throughout the year based on the data gathered.	1.1 Principal Assistant .Principal VPK teachers	1.1. Monitor disaggregated data	1.1. Florida VPK Screener
			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
1. Additional Goal Additional Goal #1: *Increase College and Career Awareness (i.e., Destination College, AVID, school wide activities) by completing year 1 requirements of DC.*	2012 Current Level :* 0%	2013 Expected Level :* 100%	1.1. Time to implement within the school program	1.1 Develop and implement a plan to integrate Destination College into our culture at Dream Lake	1.1 Principal Assistant .Principal Leadership Team	1.1. Keep a portfolio of activities which support Destination College	1.1. Destination College School Wide Portfolio

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

		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
1. Additional Goal Additional Goal #1: *While Dream Lakes overall ratio of ESE to General students is proportionate there is still a gap in the number of black students labeled. We will decrease our number of black students identified as ESE by 3%*	2012 Current Level :* *34%(34)*	2013 Expected Level :* *31% (32)*	1.1. Understanding of alternative strategies	1.1 Include race information in RtI data collection in order to increase awareness of gaps	1.1 Principal Assistant .Principal RtI Team	1.1. Keep RtI Notebook with racial information disaggregated	1.1. RtI notebook
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

Addressed in section Reading 1.A.4
Increase by 3 to 5% - Students Who Read on Grade Level by Age 9
 Address reading progress monitoring for K-2 in action plan
Addressed in section Mathematics 1.A.3
Increase by 3 to 5% - Students Who Become Fluent in Math Operations
Addressed in section Reading and Mathematics 5
Decrease the Achievement Gap for Each Identified Subgroup by 10% by June 30, 2016
Dream Lake Data does not demonstrate need for an additional goal.
- Maintain High Fine Arts Enrollment Percentage
  - All Dream lake students are enrolled and take part in Art and Music Classes.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Destination College Training	5	CRT/PDS online	5th grade PLC	1 online session	PLC discussions	CRT/AP

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

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

	Subtotal:
	Total:

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	46,6000.00
CELLA Budget	
	3,000.00
Mathematics Budget	
	4,500.00
Science Budget	
	500.00
Writing Budget	
	3,200.00
Civics Budget	
	0000
U.S. History Budget	
	0000
Attendance Budget	
	0000
Suspension Budget	
	0000
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	0000
Parent Involvement Budget	
	1,000.00
STEM Budget	
	1,000.00
CTE Budget	

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

	0000
Additional Goals	
	59,200.00

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
Priority	Focus	Prevent

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

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

   Yes   No

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