

# Florida Department of Education



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

Proposed for 2012-2013

## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

### PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Arlington Elementary	District Name: Duval County Public Schools
Principal: Paula Smith	Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals
SAC Chair: Marjorie Stephens	Date of School Board Approval:

### **Student Achievement Data:**

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](#)

### **Highly Effective Administrators**

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

List your school's highly effective administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Paula Smith	<p><b><u>Degrees:</u></b> BS: Elementary Education; MEd: Educational Leadership</p> <p><b><u>Certifications:</u></b> Elementary Education 1-6 Educational Leadership K-12 Level II Principal Certification for state of Florida</p>	5	10	<p>Principal of Arlington Elementary in 2011-2012: School Grade: A; Reading Proficiency 58%; Math Proficiency 62%; Writing Proficiency: 90%; Science Proficiency 34%. With new cut scores mandated by the state in Spring of 2012, we still earned 117 points, with great growth in learning gains of 83% in Reading and 88% in Math. In addition students in the Lowest 25% earned 84% in Reading and 77% in Math.</p> <p>2010-2011: School Grade: C; Reading Mastery 62%; Math Mastery 60%; Writing Mastery: 85%; Science Mastery 31%. AYP: 85%-Not proficient – Black and SES students in Math &amp; Reading</p> <p>2009-2010: School Grade: A; Reading Mastery 76%; Math Mastery 71%; Writing Mastery: 90%; Science Mastery 50%. AYP: 92%-Not proficient – Black students in Math</p> <p>2008-2009: School Grade: A; Reading Mastery 71%; Math Mastery 74%; Writing Mastery: 83%; Science Mastery 33%. AYP: 100%</p>
Assistant Principal	N/A				

## Highly Effective Instructional Coaches

List your school's highly effective 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 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.

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

## 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	Sheriece McWilliams	BS-Sociology Certification- Elementary Education 1-6, K-12 Mentally Handicapped - State of Florida	3	5	<p>School Grade: A; Reading Proficiency 58%; Math Proficiency 62%; Writing Proficiency: 90%; Science Proficiency 34%. With new cut scores mandated by the state in Spring of 2012, we still earned 117 points, with great growth in learning gains of 83% in Reading and 88% in Math. In addition students in the Lowest 25% earned 84% in Reading and 77% in Math.</p> <p>2010-2011: School Grade: C; Reading Mastery 62%; Math Mastery 60%; Writing Mastery: 85%; Science Mastery 31%. AYP: 85%-Not proficient – Black and SES students in Math &amp; Reading</p> <p>PRIOR School (R. Payne Elementary) Grades 2007-2008 – B, 2008-2009 – A, 2009-2010 – B</p>

### Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Conducting thorough interviews in order to ensure that new applicants have a clear understanding of the work ethic, commitment and professional growth expectations for all faculty members.	Principal Leadership Team Members	August 2012	
2. Provide and assign Mentors and Instructional Coach to assist with individual teacher instructional needs.	Principal Instructional Coach Reading Interventionist Math Interventionist	June 2013	
3. Maintain a supportive, collaborative, learning community and consistently extend professional growth opportunities for teachers based on their individual needs.	Principal Leadership Team Members	June 2013	

### *Non-Highly Effective Instructors*

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Effective
One - 1 <sup>st</sup> year teacher	Elementary Education 1-6	5 <sup>th</sup> grade ELA	Reading Interventionist is assigned as mentor; Reading Coach will provide coaching and modeling weekly

***Staff Demographics***

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
26	4% (1)	27% (7)	42% (11)	27% (7)	23% (6)	96% (25)	4% (1)	0%	30% (8)

***Teacher Mentoring Program***

Please describe the school’s teacher mentoring program 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
Jerrica Hall	Camden Beckmann	Hall is a great teacher that now is the Reading Interventionist; She maintained the class for the first 6 weeks of school prior to Beckmann’s hire.	Weekly planning meetings with VLC’s; Modeling and Co-teaching with Coach and Interventionist.

**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 The Title I funds are used in a variety of ways to support academic goals and parental support. Majority of the funds are used to purchase classroom materials including guided reading books, fund field trips to provide students with educational experiences, and to provide professional development for teacher’s on best practices and effective
--

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

instructional strategies. In addition, these funds are used to provide extended learning activities for students, particularly after school tutoring; . Additional resources and support are provided such as the Parent Resource Center that provides a lending library of Academic and social skills materials to support parents as they work with their families. The center supports activities which promote positive parenting, early literacy, and family involvement.
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds are used to provide extended learning opportunities for students. One hundred percent of these funds are used for teachers' salaries and materials for before and after school tutoring.
Violence Prevention Programs We implement strategies from our Behavior RtI / Foundations to create and implement school-wide systems in order to make our school safe and civil. In addition, we implement CHAMPS and Second Steps school-wide. This prevents violence from occurring because students are fully aware of behavioral expectations. ZIP committee also hosts an annual Red Ribbon/Bully Prevent week of events to celebrate our non-violence. Our guidance counselor also does lessons twice a month on social skills such as Ready for Success (2 <sup>nd</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> grades) and Student Success Skills(4 <sup>th</sup> & 5 <sup>th</sup> grades)
Nutrition Programs We are a Breakfast in the Classroom (BIC) school. This means that all students regardless of economic status receive a breakfast each morning. Having this nutritional program has allowed children to be more focused because they have all receive nourishment which assist them in being ready to learn first thing in the morning.
Housing Programs
Head Start Second year for Title I Pre-Kindergarten Program with a certificated teacher and paraprofessional. This program will assist with early childhood education with 4 year olds.
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

**School-Based MTSS/RtI Team**

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

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

**Principal – Paula Smith**

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 requirements; ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation; and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

**RtI Facilitators – Jerrica Hall (Reading Interventionist) & Chrissy Struska (Math Interventionist)**

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. This individual will assist in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, collect and analyze data, contribute to the development of intervention plans, implement Tier 3 interventions, and offer professional development and technical assistance.

**Primary General Education Teacher – Arnita Baskin**

Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions; and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

**Intermediate General Education Teacher – Elaine Roche**

One of the Intermediate Reading Teachers that provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions; and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

**ESE Inclusion Teacher – Mary Schultz**

Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions; and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

**School Guidance Counselor – Kristy Scarborough**

Provides services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; link community agencies to schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success; provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators; provides group and individual student interventions; and conducts direct observation of student behavior.

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 team will meet biweekly to 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 resources. The team will also regularly collaborate, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The school-based MTSS Team assisted with the development of the school improvement plan by providing input from their areas of expertise that will assist the school in meeting the needs of our students who are struggling. As the team meets monthly, team members will use their expertise as we create and implement plans to assist individual students with their weak areas. Members of the team will meet with their grade levels and departments to discuss school-wide data and the instructional implications. These discussions will springboard grade level initiatives to address common deficiencies.

### MTSS Implementation

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

<p>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. Data is gathered from the grade level teams who are conducting the intervention. School based forms have been created by content to ensure consistency in data that is collection. An additional form of data management will also include the Inform/Insight Data Management System which will assist in getting a comprehensive view of an individual student's progress over time.</p>
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Staff training on MTSS will be ongoing. Training will occur during faculty meetings, early release trainings, professional learning communities and grade level/department meetings. Training will be facilitated by members of the MTSS Leadership Team.. Training will also take place during one-to-one conferences, data chats and grade level meetings with the MTSS team concerning individual student data and next steps to provide support and intervention.</p>
<p>Describe plan to support MTSS. Provide MTSS team with time for data chats to share procedures with all faculty and staff. In addition, substitutes are provided for them to meet as a group to look at students' data with teachers and determine the next steps needed in the MTSS process.</p>

### *Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)*

<b>School-Based Literacy Leadership Team</b>
<p>Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). <b>Principal – Paula Smith</b> Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing literacy activities; ensures adequate professional development to support quality reading instruction is occurring; and communicates with parents regarding school-based literacy plans and activities.</p> <p><b>Reading Coach – Sheriece McWilliams</b> Assists the principal with providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing literacy activities; ensures adequate professional development to support quality reading instruction is occurring; and communicates with parents regarding school-based literacy plans and activities.</p> <p><b>Reading Interventionist – Jerrica Hall</b> Assists the principal with providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing literacy activities; ensures adequate support for students with small groups and professional development to support quality reading instruction is occurring; and communicates with parents regarding school-based literacy plans and activities.</p> <p><b>Primary General Education Teacher – Sharon Springfield</b> Provides information about core instruction; provides input on developmentally appropriate activities for students; inputs ideas for bridging gaps between primary grades.</p> <p><b>Intermediate General Education Teacher – Elaine Roche</b> Provides information about core instruction; provides input on developmentally appropriate activities for students; inputs ideas for bridging gaps between intermediate grades.</p> <p><b>Media Specialist Teacher – Ginger Barbee</b> Provides information about core instruction; provides input on developmentally appropriate activities for students; develops school wide literacy events to support our Reading goals.</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT will meet monthly to plan school-wide literacy activities.</p>



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

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

The major initiatives will be to provide plan enriching literacy activities for the students. Those activities range from Book of the Month assemblies, to school wide period of silent sustained reading (STARS) , annual Book Fair and Read It Forward Jax, which is a collaborative district and community initiative. In addition, there will be a focus on incorporating literature that encompasses response to literature across all content areas. There will be 6 core strategies implemented in all classes to emphasis the focus of literacy in all content areas: Making Connections, Predict & Prove, Questioning, Summarize, Inferencing, and Visualization.

### ***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.

During pre-planning a kindergarten orientation is held for students and parents to acclimate them to Arlington Elementary and communicate school expectations. In addition we hold an Open House for Pre-K and Kindergarten during the first month of school to review basic rituals/routines for pre-school transition. FAIR, Pre-K Assessment and FLKRS are state assessments used to document progress and any needed intervention early. The data from these assessments is used to group students for differentiated instruction and to provide immediate intensive intervention (iii). Toward the end of the school year, we will invite area day care providers to visit our school to give upcoming kindergartners a preview of our school.

## **PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

### **Reading Goals**

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

<b>Reading Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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		
<b>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>	1a.1 Students aren't able to monitor and clarify text which makes it difficult to gain meaning.	1a.1 Increase usage of accountable talk where students are providing evidence of good reasoning; use of relevant text during reading instruction; Usage of district Read It Forward Jax (RIFJ) Super 6 Strategies-Connecting to Text and Questioning for self-monitoring as students read independently.	1a.1 Principal, Reading Coach and Reading Interventionist.	1a.1 Effectiveness will be determined by an increase in students' ability to comprehend text by relevant discussions; RIFJ and Book of the Month used to model, implement strategies each month.	1a.1 Lesson plans, students work; BOM assemblies with specific questions stems using Super 6 Strategies.		

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

<p><b>Reading Goal #1a:</b> <i>37% (40 of 108) of the students will achieve mastery level 3 for Reading on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>*</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>*</p>					
	<p><i>33% ( 35 of 107) students scored a Level 3 in Reading on the 2012 administration of FCAT 2.0</i></p>	<p><i>37% (40 of 108) of the students will score a Level 3 in Reading on the 2013 administration of FCAT 2.0.</i></p>					
		<p>1a.2. Students lack a wide range of vocabulary which hinders their understanding of some text.</p>	<p>1a.2 Explicit instruction using, strategies such as think-alouds and scaffolding to build on what students already know.</p>	<p>1a.2 Principal, Reading Coach and Reading Interventionist.</p>	<p>1a.2. Effectiveness will be determined by students' increased use of vocabulary during class discussions and use vocabulary when responding to teacher written and orally.</p>	<p>1a.2. Lesson plans, interim assessments, student journals/learning logs.</p>	
		<p>1a.3 Students need to build their fluency are having difficulty reading with intensity for long period of time.</p>	<p>1a.3 Silent Sustained Reading as school wide initiative every morning; To increase students' rate/accuracy rates by implementing the more fluency strategies, such as poetry.</p>	<p>1a.3 Principal, Reading Coach and Reading Interventionist.</p>	<p>1a.3 We will determine the effectiveness of this strategy by monitoring students participation in the program, as well as completing fluency checks monthly via running records.</p>	<p>1a.3 Reading Response Journals, DRAs, Running records, Evidence of RIFJ and BOM in the classrooms.</p>	

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

<p><b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</p>	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.		
<p>Reading Goal #1b: <i>N/A</i></p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					
	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>					
<p>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:</p>	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>2a. FCAT 2.0:</b> Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.</p>	<p>2a.1 Students aren’t engaged in the learning process; They don’t feel challenged or interested.</p>	<p>2a.1 Increase level of self-monitoring by reading logs and reading response journaling; incorporate texts that are more of student interest as well as integrated with technology</p>	<p>2a.1 Principal, Classroom Teachers, Reading Coach and Reading Interventionist.</p>	<p>2a.1 Effectiveness will be determined by an increase of students consistently performing at a high level on common assessments and interim benchmarks</p>	<p>2a.1 Classroom walkthroughs, Reading response Journals and student work</p>		

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

Reading Goal #2a:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
28% (30 of 108) of the students will score at or above a Level 4 in Reading on the 2013 administration of FCAT 2.0.							
	26% (28 of 107) of the students scored at or above a Level 4 in Reading on the 2012 administration of FCAT 2.0.	28% (30 of 108) of the students will score at or above a Level 4 in Reading on the 2013 administration of FCAT 2.0.					
		2a.2 Students aren't challenged within the normal curriculum.	2a.2.Implement literature circles/novel studies in all 3 <sup>rd</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> grade classes with authentic literature	2a.2. Principal, Classroom Teachers, Reading Coach and Reading Interventionist.	2a.2.Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, student work and discussions	2a.2 Students level of collaboration and dialogue during the literature circle	
<b>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.		
Reading Goal #2b:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
N/A							
	N/A	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		
<b>3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</b>	3a.1. Students need to be given more opportunity to speak, think and write about what they are reading.	3a.1. Integration of learning journals to respond to text across all content area used daily; increase opportunities for students to use accountable talk with other students and teacher about what they are reading	3a.1. Reading Teachers, Reading Interventionists and Literacy Lead Team	3a.1. Classroom walkthroughs; students' ability to explain the what they are reading and how it relates to their tasks; Student Learning Journals	3a.1. Classroom walkthroughs with evidence of school wide implementation present in all classrooms		
<b>Reading Goal #3a:</b> <i>85% (92 of 108) of the students will exhibit learning gains in Reading on the 2012-2013 administration of FCAT 2.0.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>83% (89 of 107) students exhibited learning gains on the Reading portion of FCAT 2.0 2012.</i>	<i>85% (92 of 108) students will exhibit learning gains in Reading on the 2012-2013 of FCAT 2.0.</i>					

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

		3a.2. All students need reading instruction presented at their level in order to make them a better reader.	3a.2. Implement guided reading instruction daily on every grade level to push level of rigor	3a.2 Principal, Reading Teachers and Literacy Lead Team	3a.2. Classroom walkthroughs, guided reading lesson plans, students work	3a.2.FAIR data, Classroom walkthroughs, guided reading lesson plans, students work, DRAs	
		3a.3. Students progress toward meeting the standard needs to be monitored closely and intervention started as early as possible.	3a.3. Regular assessments will be given in 2 <sup>nd</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> grade students to monitor mastery of standards; in addition to FAIR data being analyzed to progression in K – 5 <sup>th</sup>	3a.3. Principal, Reading Teachers and Reading Interventionist	3a.3. Create an assessment calendar in which all teachers will administer assessments to students. Time will be scheduled for them to debrief and plan accordingly.	3a.3.Assessment calendar, student results and intervention documentation	
<b>3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</b>	3b.1	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #3b:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	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 group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>4a.1. Students aren't reading on grade level which makes it difficult for them to comprehend grade level text.</p>	<p>4a.1. Intensify guided reading groups with meeting with lowest 25% five days a week; as well as Reading Interventionist working with target group with supplemental resources.</p>	<p>4a.1. Reading Teachers, Reading Coach, and Reading Interventionist</p>	<p>4a.1. Weekly assessments, monitoring of groups' progress</p>	<p>4a.1 Data notebooks; lesson plans for targeted group; FAIR data, student work, DRAs</p>		
<p><b>Reading Goal #4a:</b> <i>86% (16 of 18) of the students of the Lowest 25% will exhibit learning gains in Reading on the 2012-2013 administration of FCAT 2.0.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>*</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>*</p>					
	<p><i>84% (14 of 17) of the students exhibited learning gains in Reading on FCAT 2.0 2012.</i></p>	<p><i>86% (16 of 18) of the students will exhibit learning gains in Reading on the 2012-2013 administration of FCAT 2.0.</i></p>					
		<p>4a.2. Students who aren't working on grade level need differentiated instruction to remediate their deficient areas.</p>	<p>4a.2. Incorporate activities from the FCRR in literacy centers in all grade levels that are differentiated based on student needs</p>	<p>4a.2 Principal, Reading Teachers, Reading Coach, and Reading Interventionist</p>	<p>4a.2. Classroom walkthroughs, evaluation of lesson plans</p>	<p>4a.2. Classroom walkthroughs, evaluation of lesson plans, increase in students' mastery of deficient skills</p>	
		<p>4a.3 Students lack schema to be able to connect and comprehend text</p>	<p>4a.3 Increase amount of large and small group discussion to increase student level of oral language.</p>	<p>4a.3. Principal, Reading Teachers and Literacy Lead Team</p>	<p>4a.3. Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, students work</p>	<p>4a.3. Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans</p>	



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

<b>4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #4b:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	N/A	N/A					
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	
<b>5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>						
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> <i>DATA forthcoming from the DOE of Florida</i>							
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**

<p><b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>5B.1.White: Not Applicable Black: Students aren't able to concentrate while reading for an extended period of time. Hispanic: Not Applicable Asian: Not Applicable American Indian: Not Applicable</p>	<p>5B.1. Increase students reading stamina by meeting the silent sustained reading daily school-wide</p>	<p>5B.1. Reading Coach, Reading Interventionist and Teachers</p>	<p>5B.1. Classroom walkthroughs, Teacher logs and charts</p>	<p>5B.1. Student reading logs, classroom walkthroughs</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5B:</u>  <i>61% (66 of 108) of the students will achieve mastery for Reading on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>White: n/a Black:33% (20 of 61) Hispanic: n/a Asian: n/a American Indian: n/a</p>	<p>White: Black: 61% Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>					
		<p>5B.2. Extended time on task is needed for students to grasp concepts being taught.</p>	<p>5B.2. Students will participate in Saturday School and after school tutoring.</p>	<p>5B.2. Principal and Teachers</p>	<p>5B.2. Classroom walkthrough during extended learning times, student work, lesson plans, student engagement</p>	<p>5B.2. Classroom walkthrough during extended learning times, student work, lesson plans</p>	

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

		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		
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
<u>Reading Goal</u> #5C: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
	N/A	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 subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		

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

<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
	N/A	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 subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5E.1. Extended time on task is needed for students to grasp concepts being taught.	5E.1. Students will participate in Saturday School and after school tutoring.	5E.1. Principal , Reaching Coach, Reading Interventionist and Teachers	5E.1. Classroom walkthrough during extended learning times, student work, lesson plans, student engagement	5E.1. Classroom walkthrough during extended learning times, student work, lesson plans		

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

<u>Reading Goal</u> #5E: 61% (66 of 108) of the students will achieve mastery for Reading on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	36% ( 22 of 61) students scored a Level 3 or higher in Reading on the 2012 administration of FCAT 2.0	61% (66 of 108) of the students will score a Level 3 or higher in Reading on the 2013 administration of FCAT 2.0.					
		5E.2. High absentee percentages	5E.2. Offer quarter incentives for students with perfect attendance	5E.2. Principal and Guidance Counselor and Truancy Officer	5E.2. Effectiveness will be determined by the decrease of students' absenteeism	5E.2. Daily attendance reports from DUVAL Connects reports	
		5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	

**Reading Professional Development**

<p><b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>                      Please note that each Strategy does not require a</p>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content / Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Reading Across Content Areas	K-5 / Reading, Science and Social Studies	Principal and Reading Coach & Reading Interventionist	All teachers	Early Release (every 2 weeks); PLC-common planning weekly	Classroom walkthroughs, classroom observations	Principal Reading Coach
Differentiated and Tiered Instruction	K-5 Reading Teachers	Principal and Reading Coach & Reading Interventionist	All teachers	Early Release (every 2 weeks); PLC-common planning weekly	Classroom walkthroughs, Lesson Plans	Principal Reading Coach
Using Data to Plan and Implement Strategic Lessons	K-5 Reading Teachers	Principal and Reading Coach & Reading Interventionist	All teachers	PLC-common planning weekly	Classroom walkthroughs, classroom observations	Principal Reading Coach

### Reading 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
Guided reading materials	Sets of books for small group instruction	Title I Funds	2000.00
Book clubs/Novel Studies	Sets of novels for book clubs	Title I Funds	2000.00
<b>Subtotal:4000.00</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Professional Development			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Coaching Cycle	Substitutes	Title I Professional Development Funds	1000.00
<b>Subtotal:1000.00</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Incentives to increase reading levels	Rewards, t-shirts, and field trips	SAC	\$ 1500.00 <b>Subtotal:1500.00</b>

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Total:\$ 6,500.00			
-------------------	--	--	--

*End of Reading Goals*

**Elementary School Mathematics Goals**

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>	1a.1 Students have difficulty deciphering what is required when presented with multistep math problems.	1a.1 Teachers will model multiple strategies in whole group and small group lessons so that students can choose the strategy that they best understand to solve mathematical equations.	1a.1 Principal and Math Interventionist	1a.1 Effectiveness of this strategy will be determined by the students’ ability to solve multi-step math problems.	1a.1 Classroom walkthroughs, common assessments, math benchmarks and student work problems		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #1a:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>40% (43 of 108) of the students will achieve mastery level 3 for Math on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0.</i>							
	<i>38% (41 of 107) students scored a Level 3 in Math on the 2012 administration of FCAT 2.0</i>	<i>40% (43 of 108) of the students will score a Level 3 in Math on the 2013 administration of FCAT 2.0.</i>					
		1a.2 Students are having difficulty with knowing and applying various math strategies to solve problems, only confidence in algorithms.	1a.2. Infuse various student strategies during the closing of workshop, with varying levels so that students are exposed to reasonable math strategies.	1a.2. Principal , Math Interventionist and Math teachers	1a.2 Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, students' use of vocabulary in written and oral responses in math journals	1a.2 Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, students' use of vocabulary in written and oral responses in math journals	
		1a.3. Students having difficulty with developing moderate to high level strategies to solve problems	1a.3. Increase small groups during work period to differentiate students based on needs	1a.3. Math Interventionist and Math teachers	1a.3. Monitoring of students meeting bi-weekly benchmarks	1a.3. Classroom walkthroughs and math journals	



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

<p><b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b></p>	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #1b:</u>  N/A</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u></p>					
	N/A	N/A					
<p>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:</p>	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>2a.1 Proficient children aren't tracked as closely as students who are below grade level.</p>	<p>2a.1 Teachers and students will set goals for improvement. In addition to goal setting, teachers and students will determine action steps necessary to meet their goals.</p>	<p>2a.1 Principal , Math Interventionist and Math teachers</p>	<p>2a.1 Effectiveness of this strategy will be determined by the students' ability to track their progress and articulate where they are in reaching their goals.</p>	<p>2a.1 Common assessments, math benchmarks, and student action steps.</p>		

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

<b>Mathematics Goal #2a:</b> <i>26% (28 of 108) of the students will score at or above a Level 4 in Math on the 2013 administration of FCAT 2.0.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
	<i>24% (26 of 107) of the students scored at or above a Level 4 in Math on the 2012 administration of FCAT 2.0.</i>	<i>26% (28 of 108) of the students will score at or above a Level 4 in Math on the 2013 administration of FCAT 2.0.</i>					
		2a.2 Students lack experiences with solving complex math problems.	2a.2 Students will complete math activities on Gizmo. Teachers will assign activities based on the strands in which the students have exhibited above grade level proficiency.	2a.2 Principal , Math Interventionist and Math teachers	2a.2 Effectiveness of this strategy will be determined by the students' ability to proficiently solve challenging math problems on a consistent basis.	2a.2 Reports from Gizmo	
<b>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.		
<b>Mathematics Goal #2b:</b> N/A	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
	N/A	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 group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>3a.1 Students aren't proficient in basic math facts.</p>	<p>3a.1. Grade level specific targets will be established in intervals. Grade level competitions will take place school wide that will assess the proficiency of students on the established goal.</p>	<p>3a .1. Math Intervention and Teachers</p>	<p>3a.1. Effectiveness of the strategy will be determined by the speed as to which students are able to answer basic math facts accurately.</p>	<p>3a.1. Interim assessments and grade level competition assessments</p>		
<p><b>Mathematics Goal #3a:</b> <i>90% (97 of 108) of the students will exhibit learning gains in Math on the 2012-2013 administration of FCAT 2.0.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>88% (96 of 107) students exhibited learning gains on the Math portion of FCAT 2.0 2012.</i></p>	<p><i>90% (97 of 108) students will exhibit learning gains in Math on the 2012-2013 of FCAT 2.0.</i></p>					
		<p>3a.2. Students knowing math vocabulary is a barrier.</p>	<p>3a.2 Students will review math vocabulary each morning while waiting to enter into classrooms. Students will work together in pairs to review and discuss math vocabulary.</p>	<p>3a.2. Classroom teachers and Math Interventionist</p>	<p>3a.2. Effectiveness of the strategy will be determined by the students' ability to use math vocabulary when explaining their strategies.</p>	<p>3a.2. Classroom walkthroughs, classroom observations, and student work</p>	

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

		3a.3. Many proficient students have deficits in math.	3a.3. Teachers will differentiate the content that students interact with while on Destination Success. Students will remediate content in which they are deficient as evidenced by common assessment and math benchmark data.	3a.3. Teachers	3a.3. Effectiveness of this strategy will be determined by the students' ability to complete the presented content within the proficient range.	3a.3. Destination Success reports	
<b>3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b>	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3b:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
	N/A	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 group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	4a.1. Students need additional explicit instruction in math concepts.	4a.1 Teachers will meet with children in small groups to address deficient skills three to four times per week.	4a.1. Math Interventionist and Teachers	4a.1. Effectiveness of this strategy will be determined by the students' ability to accurately complete math tasks with less scaffolding from the teacher.	4a.1. Common assessments, lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs and classroom observations		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #4a:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance-*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance-*</u>					
<i>80% (15 of 18) of the students of the Lowest 25% will exhibit learning gains in math on the 2013 administration of FCAT 2.0.</i>							
	<i>77% (13 of 17) of the students in Lowest 25% exhibited learning gains in math on FCAT 2.0 2012.</i>	<i>80% (15 of 18) of the students will exhibit learning gains in math on the 2013 administration of FCAT 2.0.</i>					
		4a.2. Complex mathematical situations are difficult to solve for some students. mathematical knowledge. The time allotted is not enough to address all of their needs as present grade level content.	4a .2. Teachers will use the Interventions Kit from EnVision to build students mathematical knowledge to assist them with solving complex problems.	4a.2. Math Interventionist and Teachers	4a.2. Effectiveness of this strategy will be determined by the students' ability to accurately solve and explain complex problems.	4a.2. Common assessments and lesson plans	
		4a.3. Some students have severe deficits in their	4a.3. Ramp-up students quickly by using SRA Number Worlds.	4a.3. Math Interventionist , VE Teacher and Teachers	4a.3. Effectiveness of this strategy will be determined by the students' ability to grasp new content while simultaneously remediating deficient math skills.	4a.3 Common assessments, lesson plans, student work, math benchmark, and classroom observations	
<b>4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #4b:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	
<b>5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>						
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u>							
<i>DATA forthcoming from the DOE of Florida</i>							
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**

<p><b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>5B.1.Black: only 48% proficient Ramping students up quickly to remediate the skills they haven't mastered and covering grade level specific work</p>	<p>5B.1. Implement use of Gizmos to assist in math instruction</p>	<p>5B.1. Math Interventionist and Math teachers</p>	<p>5B.1. Strategy charts, classroom walkthrough, lesson plans, student work, &amp; student dialogue</p>	<p>5B.1. Classroom walkthrough</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u>  <i>64% (43 of 108) of the students will achieve mastery level 3 or above for Math on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>White: Black:48% Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p>White: Black: 64% Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>					
		<p>5B.2 Complex mathematical situations are difficult to solve for some students.</p>	<p>5B.2. Students will use Destination Success to build remediate grade level content not mastered.</p>	<p>5B.2. Math Interventionist and Math teachers</p>	<p>5B.2. Monitoring of student performance via reports generated from Inform and Insight</p>	<p>5B.2. Student reports</p>	

**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		
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
	N/A	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 subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
	N/A	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 subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5E.1. Students haven't mastered prerequisite skills in order to be successful at applying on grade level skills	5E.1. Small group Instruction on specific skills at least 3 times per week	5E.1. Principal , Math Interventionist and Math Teachers	5E.1. Monitoring of student performance via data notebooks; classroom walkthroughs; lesson plans	5E.1. Progress Monitoring Assessments/Benchmarks		
<u>Mathematical Goal #5E: 61% (66 of 108) of the students will achieve mastery for Reading on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0.</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	46% ( 25 of 61) students scored a Level 3 or higher in Reading on the 2012 administration of FCAT 2.0	61% (66 of 108) of the students will score a Level 3 or higher in Reading on the 2013 of FCAT 2.0.					

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

		5E.2. Ramp up students quickly to remediate the skills they haven't mastered and covering grade level	5E.2. Students will use Destination Success to build remediate grade level content not mastered.	5E.2. Principal , Math Interventionist and Math Teachers	5E.2. Monitoring of student performance via reports generated from Limelight	5E.2. Student reports	
		5E3. Complex mathematical situations are difficult to solve for some students	5E.3 Implement use of Gizmos to assist in math instruction	5E.3 Principal , Math Interventionist and Math Teachers	5E.3 Strategy charts, classroom walkthrough, lesson plans, student work, & student dialogue	5E.3 Classroom walkthrough	

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

**Mathematics Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated and Tiered Instruction-small groups	K-5 Math Teachers	Principal and Math Interventionist	All teachers	PLC-common planning weekly ; Early Release (every 2 weeks)	Classroom walkthroughs, classroom observations	Principal
Using Data to Plan and Implement Strategic Lessons	K-5 Math Teachers	Principal and Math Interventionist	All teacher	PLC-common planning weekly ; Early Release (every 2 weeks)	Classroom walkthroughs, classroom observations	Principal

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

**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
IXL.com	Web based program to provide reinforcement of math strategies	Title I Funds	1,500.00
<b>Subtotal: \$1,500.00</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:\$1,500.00</b>			

*End of Mathematics Goals*

**Elementary and Middle School Science Goals**

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

<b>Elementary and Middle Science Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme</b>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

	nt						
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		
<b>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b>	1A.1. Students lack the prerequisite knowledge of some science concepts.	1A.1. Every grade level will implement the science curriculum with fidelity. Teachers will deliver content through the 5 E’s model.	1A.1. Principal and Teachers	1A.1. Effectiveness will be determined by students’ mastery of grade level content.	1A.1. Classroom observations, lesson plans and student work (science journals and/or science portfolios)		
<b>Science Goal #1A:</b> <i>35% of the students will score a Level 3 on the science portion of FCAT 2.0 2013.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>24% (10 of 40) of the students scored a Level 3 on the science portion of FCAT 2.0 2012.</i>	<i>35% (12 of 34) of the students will score a Level 3 on the science portion of FCAT 2.0 2013.</i>					
		1A.2. Students are unfamiliar with the scientific process.	1A.2. Every grade level will complete grade level specific, hands-on activities during science instruction.	1A.2. Principal and Teachers	1A.2. Effectiveness will be determined by the students’ ability to demonstrate the scientific process on all grade levels.	1A.2. Classroom observations, lesson plans and student work (science journals and/or science portfolios)	

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

		1A.3. Students are unfamiliar with science vocabulary.	1A.3. Incorporate science based literature during reading instruction.	1A.3. Principal and Teachers	1A.3. Effectiveness will be determined by the students' use of science vocabulary during classroom lessons and discussions. In addition, students should be able to grasp science concepts more quickly because schema has been built during reading instruction.	1A.3. Classroom walkthroughs, science journals, and lesson plans	
<b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.		
<u>Science Goal #1b:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	N/A	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 group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b>	2A.1. Students lack experiences with science experiments.	2A.1. Students will use Gizmos by all intermediate classrooms.	2A.1. Principal and Teachers	2A.1. Effectiveness will be determined by the students' ability to discuss and show mastery of content presented via Gizmo software.	2A.1. Classroom discussions, student work and reports generated from Gizmo		
<u>Science Goal #2A:</u> <i>12% (4 of 34) of the students will score at or above a Level 4 on the science portion of FCAT 2.0 2013.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	10% (4 of 40) of the students scored at or above a Level 4 on the science portion of FCAT 2.0 2012.	12% (4 of 34) of the students will score at or above a Level 4 on the science portion of FCAT 2.0 2013.					
		2A.2. Students lack experiences with hands-on science experiments.	2A.2. Intermediate classrooms will conduct experiments 1-2 times per week. Delivery method of 5 E's.	2A.2. Principal and Teachers	2A.2. Effectiveness will be determined by the students' ability to complete science experiments and conclude scientific principles as result of the experiments.	2A.2. Classroom discussions, science experiment logs, and lesson plans	
		2A.3. Students have difficulty reading and comprehending what is being asked on science assessments	2A.3. Intermediate reading teachers will use authentic nonfiction literature for reading lessons. They will introduce vocabulary and discuss content. In addition, teachers will provide students with strategies to assist them when reading informational texts that are difficult for them to understand.	2A.3. Principal and Teachers	2A.3. Effectiveness will be determined by the students' ability to perform at an above proficient level on a consistent basis.	2A.3. Common assessments and science benchmark assessments	
<b>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>	2b.1.	2b.1.	2.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.		
<u>Science Goal #2b:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	N/A	N/A.					

*End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals*

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

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Hands-On Science Activities	K-5	Instructional Coach and Teacher Leaders	Primary Teachers/Intermediate Teachers	Early Release	Classroom observations, lesson plans, and science journals/ portfolios	Principal
Teaching Science Content in Reading	3 <sup>rd</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> Reading Teachers	Principal and Instructional Coach	3 <sup>rd</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading Teachers	Early Release	Classroom observations, classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans	Principal

**Science Budget**

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

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$0</b>			

*End of Science Goals*

**Writing Goals**

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

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



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

<p><b>1a. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.5 and higher in writing.</b></p>	<p>1A.1.Students use simplistic language which prevents them from demonstrating a mature command of grade level language on FCAT Writes.</p>	<p>1A.1.Teachers will implement strategies learned in training to teach children to increase their use of mature language while writing.</p>	<p>1A.1.Principal, Reading Coach, and Reading Interventionist</p>	<p>1A.1. Effectiveness of this strategy will be determined by the students' ability to apply skills learned naturally in their writing.</p>	<p>1A.1. Student work, lesson plans, and common assessments</p>		
<p><u>Writing Goal #1A:</u>  <i>66% (25 of 38) of the students will score at or above a Level 3.5 on the FCAT Writes.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>62% (18 of 28) of the students scored at or above a Level 3 on the FCAT Writes.</i></p>	<p><i>66% (25 of 38) of the students will score at or above a Level 3.5 on the FCAT Writes.</i></p>					
		<p>1A.2. Students need additional exposure to quality literature to know what good writing looks and sounds like.</p>	<p>1A.2. Teachers will use award winning literature (Touchtone texts) to model author's crafts for students.</p>	<p>1A.2. Principal, Reading Coach, and Reading Interventionist</p>	<p>1A.2. Effectiveness of this strategy will be determined by the students' ability to transfer knowledge gained in lessons about author's crafts into their writing.</p>	<p>1A.2.Student work, lesson plans, and common assessments</p>	
		<p>A.3. Writing needs to have a school-wide focus.</p>	<p>1A.3. Throughout the school year, we will hold writing competitions with writing topics surrounding a central topic.</p>	<p>1A.3. Principal, Reading Coach, and Reading Interventionist</p>	<p>1A.3. Effectiveness of this strategy will be determined by having a school-wide writing community.</p>	<p>1A.3.Student work, lesson plans, and common assessments</p>	
<p><b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b></p>	<p>1b.1.</p>	<p>1b.1.</p>	<p>1b.1.</p>	<p>1b.1.</p>	<p>1b.1.</p>		
<p><u>Writing Goal #1b:</u> N/A</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	N/A	N/A					
--	-----	-----	--	--	--	--	--

**Writing Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring
Using Authentic Literature during Writers Workshop	K-5 Teachers	Reading Coach	All grade levels	Early Release	Classroom observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work	Principal, Reading Interventionist, and Reading Coach
Writing Coaching Cycle	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teachers	Principal and Reading Coach	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> grade writing teachers	Ongoing biweekly, meetings from September 2012-March 2013	Classroom observations, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work	Principal, Reading Interventionist, and Reading Coach

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

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

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

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Write Score	Provide non-bias score on student papers	Title I Funding	\$500.00
<b>Subtotal:500.00</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:\$500.00</b>			

*End of Writing Goals*

**Attendance Goal(s)**

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

<b>Attendance Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</b>						
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		

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

<b>1. Attendance</b>	1.1. Many of the students missing school are kindergarten children which aren't under the jurisdiction of compensatory school attendance	1.1. Conference with kindergarten parents concerning the importance of daily attendance	1.1. CRT, Guidance Counselor, and Principal,	1.1. Teacher conference logs, reduction in kindergarten attendance	1.1. OnCourse system		
<u>Attendance Goal #1:</u> <i>96% (240 of 250) of the students will attend school on a daily basis.</i>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
	<i>93%(235 of 250) of the students will attend school on a daily basis.</i>	<i>96% (240 of 250) of the students will attend school on a daily basis.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	<i>7% (14 of 250) of the students will miss 10 or more days of school</i>	<i>4% (8 of 250) of the students will miss 10 or more days of school</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	<i>12% of the students had more than 10 tardies</i>	<i>9% of the students will have less than 10 tardies</i>					
		1.2. AIT process is lengthy	1.2. Refer habitual offender early to prevent absences	1.2. Truany Officer, CRT, Guidance Counselor, & Principal	1.2. Documentation from AIT process and follow with parent	1.2. OnCourse	
		1.3. Many parents do not send in documentation of absent to alert as excused	1.3. Reward students with perfect attendance each quarter	1.3. CRT and Principal	1.3. Documentation from AIT process and follow with parent of necessary documentation for absentee	1.3. Oncourse	

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

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance Intervention Process	ALL	Guidance Counselor	K – 5 Teachers	2 <sup>nd</sup> quarter	OnCourse reports	Truancy Officer, Guidance Counselor, CRT

**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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Rewards for perfect Attendance	Ribbons and certificates for quarterly awards	Instructional Materials	500.00
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:\$500.00</b>			

*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)).

<b>Suspension Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension</b>						
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		

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

1. Suspension	1.1 Chronic discipline problems of multiple Class II offenses	1.1.Refer students and parents to Arlington Full Service for additional behavioral assistance.	1.1.Principal and Guidance Counselor	1.1.Effectiveness of the strategy will be determined by the number of chronic discipline problems decreasing.	1.1.Discipline data and Arlington Full Service referrals		
<i>There will be less than 5% (13) of our students that will receive out of school suspensions this school year.</i>	<u>2012 Total Number of ISP's</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of ISP's</u>					
	<i>There were 26 incidents that warranted in-school suspension in 2012</i>	<i>There will be 20 or less incidents that warrant in-school suspension in 2013</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	<i>There were 18 children that were in-school suspension in 2012</i>	<i>There will be 15 or less students in in-school suspension in 2013</i>					
	<u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	<i>There were 54 incidents that warranted Out of school suspension in 2012</i>	<i>There will be 50 or less incidents that warrant Out of school suspension in 2013</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	<i>There were 29 children that were out-school suspension in 2012</i>	<i>There will be 25 or less students that will warrant out-school suspension in 2013</i>					

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

		1.2. Some students exhibit inappropriate behaviors due to situations beyond their control.	1.2. Students will be assigned mentors within the school to talk to about things that are concerning them.	1.2. Principal, and Guidance Counselor	1.2. Determined by a decrease in the number of discipline referrals by students who habitually receive referrals.	1.2. Mentoring logs and student discipline data	
		1.3. Many students exhibit inappropriate behaviors because they are angry.	1.3. The guidance counselor will work with a small group of students (per grade level) who have anger management issues.	1.3. Principal and Guidance Counselor	1.3. Decrease in the number of discipline referrals by students who habitually receive referrals the guidance counselor.	1.3. Classroom observations by teachers and discipline data	

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring
CHAMPS models	All	Foundations Team	Representatives from each grade level/departments	Quarterly	Surveys and discipline data	Foundations Team & Principal

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			



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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$0</b>			

*End of Suspension Goals*

**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)).

<b>Parent Involvement Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement</b>						
-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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		
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b> <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<i>Schools' Title I Parental Involvement Plan will also be uploaded to state DOE website.</i>	<u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Parent Involvement Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development</b>						
---------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

<p><b>(PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</p>							
	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 and Schedules (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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

**Additional Goal(s)**

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	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**

<b>1. Additional Goal</b>	1.1. According to Climate survey of parents and students 30% (11 of 39) of parents are neutral about bus transportation and 3% (3 of 39) are unsatisfied with the services	1. Provide parents with bus stop tips to reinforce with their child; Have bus drivers assign seats when necessary.	1.1. Principal and Bus Liaison	1.1. Monitor amount of bus referrals and dialogue with bus drivers about student behavior while on the bus.	1.1. Climate survey of parents and students		
<b>Additional Goal #1:</b> <i>75% (31 of 41) Parents will be satisfied with bus transportation</i>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
	<i>69% (27 of 39) Parents are satisfied with bus transportation</i>	<i>75% (31 of 41) Parents will be satisfied with bus transportation</i>					

**Additional Goals Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total:\$6,500.00</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$1,500.00</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total:\$500.00</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total:\$500.00</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total:\$ 0</b>

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

<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total:\$4,000.00</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total: \$0</b>
	<b>Grand Total:\$13,000.00</b>

**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.)

<b>School Differentiated Accountability Status</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

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

**School Advisory Council (SAC)**

*SAC Membership Compliance*

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

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

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 focus for SAC will be our school increasing the number of children who are proficient in reading, math and science. In addition, we will focus on incentives for all children exhibiting a years growth. The will work to help us gain and maintain a dedicated business partner. In addition, they will support the school by assisting the Parental Involvement Activities to increase the involvement of families. This continues to be a struggle for our school.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Incentives for students participating in these activities	\$1000.00
Snacks for after school tutoring	\$200.00