

Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

Name of School:

Area:

North

Sea Park Elementary

Principal:

Area Superintendent:

Dr. Ronald Bobay

Ena A. Leiba

SAC Chairperson:

Catherine Bloom

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

Sea Park staff and community will work collaboratively to provide an enriched environment where every child can strive for academic excellence to meet the rigor of the 21st Century.

Vision Statement:

Sea Park Elementary personnel are committed to providing quality education that will engage all students in taking ownership in using higher order skills in order to reach their full potential.

Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

Sea Park Elementary FCAT data for the past three years yield the following proficiency scores:

% at Proficiency

Subject	2010	2011	2012
Reading	89	92	75
Math	80	91	64
Writing	79	83	64
Science	71	78	65

Three-year data analysis revealed a significant decrease in the percent of students who were proficient in all content areas on the 2012 FCAT. This decrease may be in correlation to the new cut scores that were implemented last year. Our math and writing scores decreased significantly: math by 25% and writing by 19%. Reading and science declined by 13% respectively.

% Making Gains

Subject	2010	2011	2012
Reading	70	79	79
Math	67	81	65

In regard to the percent of students making annual learning gains, there has been steady growth in the area of reading over a three year period. In the area of math, there was a 15% decline in the percent of students making gains between 2011 and 2012. However, there was marked improvement (9%) from 2010 to 2011 in the area of math.

Lowest 25% Making Gains

Subject	2010	2011	2012
Reading	55	57	70
Math	53	84	52

In examining data regarding the lowest 25%, a 13% increase was noted in the area of reading gains (from 57% in 2011 to 70% in 2012). We are attributing this increase to the work our collaborative teams did mentoring and monitoring our lowest 25%. There was a 32% decline in math gains for the lowest 25% (from 84% in 2011

to 52% in 2012), making this a significant area of focus for us this year.

% of Level 4 and 5

Subject	2010	2011	2012
Reading	59%	42%	45%
Math	51%	47%	38%
Science	21%	33%	33%

Upon further review of the data, it was determined that 45% of students who participated in the 2012 FCAT Reading assessment scored at Levels 4 and 5. This is a slight increase from 2011 when 42% of students scored at Levels 4 and 5. In the area of math, only 38% of students scored at Levels 4 and 5 which is a 9% decrease from 2011. On FCAT 2012 science, 33% of fifth-grade students scored at Levels 4 and 5. We will continue to work on increasing the percent of students scoring at Levels 4 and 5 by improving staff development offerings and teachers' professional practices in all content areas.

Level 1 %

Subject	2010	2011	2012
Reading	9	7	8
Math	11	5	13
Science	8	7	13

Level 1 data indicates an inconsistent trend in reducing the amount of students scoring at Level 1 in reading, math, and science. It is also important to note that based on 2012 FCAT data, 19% of students scored at Level 2 in reading and 25% scored Level 2 in math. Our goal is to reduce the number of students scoring at Levels 1 and 2 and increase the amount of students scoring at Levels 3-5. Thirty-five percent of fifth-grade students scored at Levels 1 and 2 on the 2012 Science FCAT assessment. In the area of science, our focus will be on decreasing the number of students scoring at Levels 1 and 2 by increasing the hands-on, minds-on approach in science lessons in all classrooms.

In fall of the 2011-2012 school year, 76% of first-time kindergarten students demonstrated readiness by scoring 80% or better on the 2011 Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener. (FLKRS)

FAIR data from 2011, AP3, indicates that 88% of kindergartners were in the High Success Zone in Probability of Reading Success and in 2012 90% scored in the High Reading Success Zone. On the 2011 Fair AP3, 52% of First Graders were in the High Success Zone in PRS, and in 2012 80% High Success Zone in PRS. On the 2011 FAIR AP3 data, 47% of 2nd graders were in the High Success Zone in PRS and in 2012 only 37% were in the High Success Zone in PRS. At a minimum, Sea Park K-2 students are expected to increase the percentage of students scoring in the High Success Zone for AP3 in 2013, to 80% or better in each grade level (K – 2) on the FAIR assessment.

--

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

Last school year, interventions were provided to students in the areas of reading and math by classroom teachers with the assistance of the ESE resource teacher as well as activity teachers. According to classroom walkthrough data, a limited amount of differentiated instruction was taking place in classrooms. A need for the incorporation of instructional strategies to prepare students for college and career/21st Century was also noted, generating the list of strategies for the teacher survey referred to below.

During the 2011-2012 school year, Sea Park Elementary expanded its implementation of Professional Learning Communities. Teacher leaders and administration participated in training during the summer of 2010 and the district’s director of staff development presented training to teachers on PLCs in 2012. Additional training and implementation will continue during the 2012-2013 school year.

Currently at Sea Park Elementary, our PLCs meet bi-monthly during the teachers’ planning time. The time is usually used to discuss student data, share strategies, and develop and progress monitor MTSS groups. This ensures that teachers are utilizing BEST practices and various strategies for different types of learners, as Marzano's research indicates.

At the PLC bi-monthly meetings, we discuss best practices in all content areas, as well as look at student performance on assessments. Our subject-area contacts attend district-level meetings regarding curriculum. The strategies learned are shared with all teachers during PLC meetings and faculty meetings.

During the summer of 2012, administrators and teacher leaders attended Common Core State Standards training in addition to training on Creating a High Performance Learning Culture. During preplanning, a CCSS overview began the implementation process, and small groups (K-2 and 3-6 respectively) met to review the math implementation with the District Math Resource Teacher. The Reading Coach provided an in-depth review of the six shifts and teachers brainstormed ways to accomplish each shift within their classrooms. Materials such as “The Common Core Lesson Book” were purchased for teachers to assist with implementation as well.

During the 2012-2013 school year our goal is to assist teachers in the full implementation of the Common Core State Standards by providing professional development in high-order questioning, differentiated instruction, student engagement, summarizing, vocabulary in context, non-linguistic representations, setting objectives and providing feedback, writing across the content areas, and incorporation of increased amounts of informational text. Teachers are in the process of completing a survey to choose their top three strategies of interest. This data, along with classroom walkthrough data, will drive our School Improvement Plan barriers and action steps.

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

Research regarding differentiated instruction indicates that teachers must provide students with choice,

flexibility, on-going assessment, and creativity in differentiating the concepts being presented. According to Tomlison (Hall, Strangman & Meyer, 2003), three components should be differentiated in classrooms: CONTENT (elements and materials used in reaching learning goals and in teaching concepts, principles, and skills that students will learn), PROCESS (how you will teach the content, flexible groups, or whole-group discussion of content or small or paired groups; groups are not fixed), and PRODUCTS (students are allowed choices in products or final assessments which should offer a variety of ways for expression, degree of difficulty, and types of evaluation).

In order for students to learn to think critically and be prepared for college and career, teachers must utilize **high-level questioning** and classroom activities. Research Scientist, Norman L. Webb’s research regarding the complexity or depth of understanding, was the springboard for “Webb’s **Depth of Knowledge**” or “DOK”. He identifies four distinct DOK levels: Level 1 which includes basic recall of facts, concepts, information or procedures; Level 2 which includes the engagement of mental processing beyond a habitual response; Level 3 which includes strategic thinking requiring a higher level of thinking; and Level 4 which includes extended thinking, requiring complex reasoning, planning, developing, etc.

The research conducted by Marzano, Pickering and Pollock (2001) identifies instructional strategies that have a high probability of enhancing student achievement for all students in all subject areas at all grade levels. There are 9 high yield strategies that have a strong effect on student’s achievement. Some of these research-based strategies may show between a 34-45 percentile gains. From these nine strategies the research suggests that questioning accounts for almost 80% of what occurs in a classroom. The research also indicates that student centered instruction, teaching of **critical thinking skills**, management techniques used and curriculum are necessary components for effective classroom pedagogy. Effective teachers tend to utilize different strategies with different types of learners, whereas ineffective teachers did not use different strategies based on the students' needs. (*Classroom Instruction that Works, Marzano, Pickering, Pollock 2001*)

According to Max Thompson, there are five evidence-based strategies that should be used in every lesson: 1) **extending thinking strategies**, 2) summarizing, 3) vocabulary in context, 4) advance organizers, 5) non-verbal representations. This research is based upon studies conducted between 1998 and 2001 by Dr. Robert Marzano as Director of the Mid-Contentment Regional Educational Lab (McREL).

Some teachers are utilizing *some* of these research-based strategies, however, a need for a more consistent and pervasive utilization across all classrooms at Sea Park is our goal for the 2012-2013 school year.

CONTENT AREA:

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

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

All teachers will focus their **standards-based instruction** on utilizing **differentiated instruction** in order to increase student achievement in all content areas.

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

<i>Barrier</i>	<i>Action Steps</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Timetable</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>In-Process Measure</i>
1. Standards are not consistently posted and/or not evident to students school-wide.	1. Provide teachers with an example of Common Board Configuration for standards and discuss classroom expectations.	Administration Teachers	October 2012		Faculty Meeting Agenda CWT Data
2. Limited use of <i>differentiated instruction</i> with a focus on <i>high-order/quality questioning</i> .	2. Provide professional development, resources, and models in regard to <i>differentiated instruction</i> , with a focus on <i>high order/quality questioning</i> .	Administration District Personnel Reading Coach Teacher Leaders	August 2012 October 2012 November 2012 February 2013 March 2013	\$500.00	Training Agendas Sign-In Sheets Purchase Order CWT Data

<p>3. Assistance needed with transitioning from NGSSS and traditional instructional practices, to full integration of the CCSS and best instructional practices.</p>	<p>3. Provide professional development, resources, and models.</p> <p>Professional Development/ PLCs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District Math Resource Teacher PD August 2012 ● District Writing Resource Teacher PD October 2012 ● District Reading Resource Teacher PD November 2012 ● BEST Reviews/Reminders <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Developing Number Concepts</i> ● <i>Good Questions for Math Teaching</i>, Sullivan ● <i>How Children Learn Number Concepts</i>, Richardson ● <i>Quality Questioning Booklets</i> ● CPALMS Website ● <i>The Common Core Lesson Book</i> ● <i>The Art and Science of Teaching</i>, Marzano ● <i>“Comprehension That Works”</i> ● <i>“Teach Like a Champion”</i> ● <i>BEST Posters</i> ● <i>Education City</i> online math program <p>Models:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Model Classroom Videos ● Number Talks Videos ● Peer Observations 	<p>Administration Reading Coach Teacher Leaders District Staff BEST Cadre Teachers</p>	<p>September 2012 – May 2013</p>	<p>\$1,500.00</p>	<p>Faculty Meeting Agendas Training Agendas CWT Data Purchase Orders</p>
<p>4. Decline in FCAT math scores, most significant for the Lowest 25%.</p>	<p>4. Increase daily math interventions and implement “<i>Do the Math</i>” pilot math intervention program.</p>	<p>Resource Teacher Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>October 2012 – May 2013</p>	<p>\$1,000.00</p>	<p>Progress Monitoring Data</p>

5. Need for parent awareness of shift to CCSS in order to support student learning at home.	5. Provide information for parents by offering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● FCAT Science Night ● FCAT 2.0/CCSS Parent Night ● Parent Leadership Meeting ● Newsletters ● School/District Website ● SAC Meetings 	District Staff Administration Reading Coach Teacher Leaders	September 2012 – May 2013		Agendas Newsletters
6. Declining number of GSP and Level 4 and 5 students.	6. Research and implement strategies to increase the number of GSP students and Level 4 and 5 students.	Administration GSP Teacher Teachers	October 2012 – February 2013		Faculty Meeting Agendas Emails Meeting Agendas

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

<p>Qualitative: During Classroom Walkthroughs, administration will be looking for the following practices to be utilized with fidelity in classrooms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The objective/essential question will be posted visually. The objective will also be evident to students when students are asked, “What are you learning?” ● Small-group, differentiated instruction will also be evident during classroom walkthroughs, and lesson plans will reflect differentiated lesson plans. ● Webb’s DOK Levels will be posted and teachers (and students) will be asking high-level questions and be participating in high-level activities/lessons. ● BEST posters will be posted in classrooms, and the learning cycle will be utilized in presenting instruction. <p>Quantitative: 75% of teachers will demonstrate</p>
--

evidence of implementation of the following

professional practices:

- Aligned, standards-based instruction
- Small-group, differentiated instruction in reading and math
- High-order/quality questioning
- BEST instructional model utilized

Evidenced by:

- Teacher PGP self-reflection (qualitative)
- Teacher PGP outcome measures (quantitative)
- Classroom walkthrough data (quantitative)
- Teacher survey (qualitative)

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

Quantitative:

- **FCAT Reading:**
 - 75% (128 students) to 78% (133 students) scoring at **Level 3** or above
 - 45% (77 students) to 47% (80 students) scoring at **Levels 4 and 5**
 - 70% (20 students) to 79% (22 students) of the **Lowest 25%** making annual learning gains
 - 26% (45 students) to 21% (36 students) of students scoring at **Levels 1 and 2**
 - **AMO Subgroups (percent at proficiency):**
 - **WHITE:** 79% (99 students) to 86% (108)students
 - **HISPANIC:** 58% (8 students) to 78% (11 students)

- **SWD:** 32% (9 students) to 57% (17 students)
- **FRL:** 64% (42 students) to 70% (46 students)

- **FCAT Math:**

- 64% (109 students) to 67% (115 students) scoring at **Level 3** or above
- 37% (63 students) to 40% (68 students) scoring at **Levels 4 and 5**
- 52% (15 students) to 62% (18 students) of the **Lowest 25%** making annual learning gains
- 36% (62 students) to 31% (53 students) of students scoring at **Levels 1 and 2**
- **AMO Subgroups** (*percent at proficiency*):
 - **WHITE:** 69% (86 students) to 78% (98) students
 - **HISPANIC:** 42% (6 students) to 67% (9 students)
 - **SWD:** 29% (8 students) to 48% (14 students)
 - **FRL:** 51% (34 students) to 64% (42 students)

- **FCAT Science:**

- 38%(16 students) to 30%(13 students) of students scoring at **Levels 1 and 2**
- 62% (26 students) to 70% (29 students) scoring at **Level 3** or above
- 33% (14 students) to 40%(17 students) scoring at **Levels 4 and 5**

Qualitative:

- The majority of students will be aware of learning objectives in the classroom (during CWTs)
- Students will report a clearer understanding of math and reading concepts due to differentiated instruction and high-order questioning/activities (student surveys)

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

1. Reading Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1.		
Strategy(s): 1.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	75%=128 students	78%=133 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	NA	NA

<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>45%=77 students</p>	<p>47%=80 students</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p> <p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>69%=19 students</p>	<p>79%=22 students</p>
<p>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</p> <p>Baseline data 2010-11:</p>		
<p>Student subgroups by ethnicity making satisfactory progress in reading :</p> <p style="text-align: right;">White:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Black:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Hispanic:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Asian:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">American Indian:</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for current level of performance</p> <p>79%=99 students</p> <p>58%=8 students</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance</p> <p>86%=108 students</p> <p>78%=11 students</p>
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>		

Students with Disabilities (SWD) making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	32%=9 students	57%=17 students
Economically Disadvantaged Students making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	64%=42 students	70%=46 students

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
The New 90-Minute Reading Block	October 2012	Classroom Walkthrough Data Review of Teacher Lesson Plans
Common Core State Standards ELA Implementation and Unpacking	August 2012 – May 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Data Review of Teacher Lesson Plans Review of DRA Data in A3 for K-2
Thinking Maps Training/Update	October 2012 November 2012	Classroom Walkthrough Data Observation Data
Quality Questioning Training	November 2012 – March 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Data Review of Teacher Lesson Plans Review of DRA Data in A3 for K-2 and FCAT Data for 3-6

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 50%	Lack of personnel who speak home language.	Coordinate weekly visits with Itinerant Teacher. Recommend ELL teachers utilize appropriate ELL accommodations to assist with language acquisition.	ESOL Contact ESOL Teacher Itinerant Teacher

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 50%	Lack of comprehension skills due to language acquisition	Utilize daily " <i>Learning Today</i> " online program. Intervention with Itinerant Teacher on Mondays of each week.	ESOL Contact ESOL Teacher
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing: 50%	Previous writing system utilized symbols.	Distribute word-to-word dictionaries for student use across all content areas.	ESOL Contact ESOL Teacher Media Teacher

1. Mathematics Goal(s):	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. Students perform at a wide range of levels in the area of math.		
Strategy(s): 1. Utilize differentiated math instruction (small, flexible groups) in order to meet the mathematics needs of all learners.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	64%=109 students	67%=115 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	NA	NA

<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Declining numbers of students scoring at Levels 4 and 5 on the FCAT Math Assessment.</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Employ high-order mathematics questioning/activities to stimulate critical thinking in order to better prepare students for FCAT Math 2.0 2013.</p>	37%=63 students	40%=68 students
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	NA	NA
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	NA	NA
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): Limited amount of time to provide math intervention for students in the lowest 25%.</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Arrange the school schedule to allow for extra time and/or additional staff to assist with daily math intervention.</p>	52%=15 students	62%=18 students
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	NA	NA
<p>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</p> <p>Baseline Data 2010-11:</p>		
<p>Student subgroups by ethnicity :</p> <p>White:</p> <p>Black:</p> <p>Hispanic:</p> <p>Asian:</p> <p>American Indian:</p>	<p>69%=86 students</p> <p>42%=6 students</p>	<p>78%=98 students</p> <p>67%=9 students</p>
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) making satisfactory progress in Mathematics</p>		
<p>Students with Disabilities (SWD) making satisfactory progress in Mathematics</p>	29%=8 students	48%=14 students

Economically Disadvantaged Students making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	51%=34 students	64%=42 students
--	-----------------	-----------------

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Implementing the CCSS in Math K-2, 3-6	August 2012	Classroom Walkthrough Data Review of Teacher Lesson Plans
Do the Math Intervention Program	September 2012	ESE Resource Lesson Plans Do the Math Progress Monitoring Tools
Quality Questioning Training	November 2012 – March 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Data Review of Teacher Lesson Plans Review of DRA Data in A3 for K-2 and FCAT Data for 3-6
Training on Differentiated Instruction During the Math Block	November 2012 – March 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Data Review of Teacher Lesson Plans Review of DRA Data in A3 for K-2 and FCAT Data for 3-6
PLC Utilizing Number Talks Book and Videos	October 2012-May 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Data Math DRA Scores
Thinking Maps Training	November 2012	Classroom Walkthrough Data
CCSS Video Clips to Open Faculty Meetings	October 2012-May 2013	Classroom Walkthrough Data Review of Teacher Lesson Plans
Peer Classroom Observations	October 2012-May 2013	Observation Documentation Peer Observation Schedules

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s):		
Strategy(s): 1.		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	64%=21 students	70%=23 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	NA	NA

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Increasing numbers of students scoring at Levels 1 and 2, and decreasing numbers of students scoring at Levels 4 and 5 in Science. Strategy(s): 1. Increase the use of informational text during both reading and science instruction in order to increase student proficiency in the area of Science.	Level 1 and 2: 38%=16 students Level 4 and 5: 33%=14 students	30%=13 students 40%=17 students
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:	62%=26 students	70%=29 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	NA	NA
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	33%=14 students	40%=17 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading	NA	NA

Additional Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
---------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	---------------------------------------

<p>Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:</p> <p>Goal 1: Reduce the number of students scoring at Levels 1 and 2 on the FCAT Reading Assessment by 5%, taking us from 26% (45 students) to 21% (36 students).</p> <p>Goal 2: Reduce the number of students scoring at Levels 1 and 2 on the FCAT Math Assessment by 5%, taking us from 36% (62 students) to 31% (53 students).</p>	<p>Limited amount of time and personnel to provide reading and math intervention to students.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen Tier 1 instruction through professional development. 2. Provide time in the schedule for consistent Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading and math instruction outside the core reading and math blocks. 3. Combine TDT and IPST meetings once per month to address students in the Lowest 25%. 	<p>Administration Reading Coach CCSS Launch Team Teacher Leaders Classroom Teachers Volunteers</p>
---	---	---	--

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

<p>MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and its role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)</p> <p>Sea Park MTSS Leadership Team are: Ena Leiba, Principal Angie Lizek, Literacy Coach Linda Collins, ESE Teacher Heidi Babin, Counselor Samantha Alison, Assistant Principal Dan Hicks, School Psychologist Lisa Payne, Staffing Specialist</p> <p>The Sea Park MTSS Leadership team provides teachers with an updated overview of the MTSS process. The team meets on a bi-weekly basis to discuss teachers' concerns about struggling students, both academic and/or behavioral. The team identifies the students' strengths, interests, and weaknesses. Baseline data that has been collected from the entire class/grade level is used to determine if a gap exists and the interventions that should be implemented. Once it is determined that students need interventions, then a Tier II plan using research-based intervention will be developed to include how long the intervention will be in place, and how the students' progress will be measured. After several weeks of interventions in Tier II, the students who do not adequately respond would be eligible for additional testing and Tier III individualized, intensive interventions targeted at skill deficits. All decisions related to the MTSS process are determined by the team. The MTSS Leadership Team continues to meet as needed to develop/modify materials and training to support teachers in the MTSS process.</p>

The MTSS Team assists in the selection of research-based intervention strategies that is shared with teachers during Kid Talk and PLCs. The team helps to monitor and recommend strategies to ensure the success of students as we work through the MTSS process and during the implementation of the goals set forth in the School Improvement Plan. The Reading Coach and administrators work together to review data and trends to determine predictors of success. The team provides valuable data and input to the SAC in the development of the school improvement plan.

The Student Desk Top Data System, AS400, and A3 Vision are used to monitor and input student data. From this data, students' progress can be tracked, the results analyzed, and interventions implementation documented on each tier level. A PMP is created and monitored for students performing below grade level or who have scored level 1 on FCAT. Parent meetings and other pertinent student data will also be documented in A3. The PMRN will also be utilized to access student reading data.

Teachers and administrators utilize data binders and data notebooks to document and monitor student progress. Regular data team meetings are held to discuss students and appropriate interventions to implement. A majority of Sea Park students are considered to be Tier I students. There are some Tier II and several Tier III students. Most of our Tier III students are ESE students with IEPs. Students, who are in Tier II and III, receive more intensive intervention and monitoring to address areas of concern. We have a .80 reading coach who is instrumental in assisting classroom teachers with administering assessments, using the data to make instructional decisions and identifying effective strategies.

An intervention block has been built into the master schedule, however, classroom walkthroughs and observations indicate that not all teachers are effectively using the time to reach all students. We are having discussions about what the interventions should look like, what the documentation should look like as well as providing support to teachers during the intervention time period. This year our goal is to continue to use the Continuous Improvement Cycle along with the implementation of Marzano's and Max Thompson's strategies to monitor effective MTSS strategies for students.

The IPST will meet monthly with grade level teams to monitor and provide additional support for students that are in need. Teacher teams will also continue to meet monthly at "Data Talk" meetings to track student progress and review intervention strategies.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

Sea Park Elementary provides a variety of opportunities to promote volunteerism in our school. Parents work to assist with classroom activities and with beautification of school grounds in conjunction with Keep Brevard Beautiful projects. The School Advisory Council and PTO are active organizations that promote and facilitate school-wide events that offer various opportunities for parents to volunteer. Sea Park Elementary offers many opportunities to involve parents.

These events include:

SAC, PTO, Fall Carnival, Room Parents, co-sponsoring Odyssey of the Mind teams, volunteering in classrooms, field trip opportunities (such as Lagoon Quest), Winter Dance, Volunteer Orientation, Volunteer Appreciation Dinner, Open House, volunteering in the Book Fair, Fine Night, Field Day event, assisting with picture day and vision and hearing, School Beautification Club, musical presentation, Jr. Apple Corp Volunteers, FCAT Science Night, FCAT information night and school enrichment club activities such as Math Club, Book Bash, and Student Council.

In addition, members of the Satellite Beach Women's Club and Trinity Presbyterian Church tutor students who are having difficulty in reading and math. This is the 8th year of this partnership with the SBWC. Parents and community members are also invited to participate in our Patriot's Day and Veterans Day observances. Parents are encouraged to sign up to volunteer for field trips, special events at the school, and to assist in the classroom. With 100% of our teachers trained to utilize Edline/GradeQuick to communicate with parents/guardians about their students' progress, we are making every effort to ensure parents in grade K-6 have activated their accounts. This effort increases communication and involvement between parents and teachers as evidenced by Edline Parent Utilization Reports and comments on the parent survey. In the past, individual teachers and guidance counselors provide "homework help" and "study skills" information to students and parents. This year we will shift our efforts to offer more school-wide assistance in these areas.

Our goal is to continue to offer opportunities for parents and community leaders to volunteer in our school to maximize students' academic performance.

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

A 2008 study conducted by the Rodel Community Scholars at Arizona State University indicated that attendance rate is important because students are more likely to succeed in academics when they attend school consistently. It is difficult for the teacher and the class to build their skills and progress if a large number of students are frequently absent. In addition to falling behind in academics, students who are not in school on a regular basis are more likely to get into trouble with the law and cause problems in their communities. (School Attendance Issues: Issues to Consider, www.greatschools.org)

Sea Park's attendance average for 2012 was 94.96%. This is below the district average of 95.48%. The data also revealed that Sea Park students had an average of 1.02% of excused absences and average of 4.02% unexcused absences. This is in comparison to the district's excused absence average of 1.61% and 2.90% unexcused absences.

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the average attendance rate from 94.96% to 96% and to decrease the amount of unexcused absences from 4.02% to 3.0%. Tardiness is also an area of concern at Sea Park. To address the excessive absences and tardy issues, we will put an incentive program in place to recognize the classes that have the lowest percent of absenteeism and tardiness each nine week period. Special awards will be given to students at our semester award ceremony for excellent attendance.

SUSPENSION:

Sea Park’s suspension data indicates a total of seven (7) suspension incidences during the 2011-2012 school year. Of the seven, one student was a repeat offender. Therefore there were six students suspended during the 2011-2012 school year.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

NA

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

At Sea Park Elementary, we are implementing the CCSS in grades K-2 and will be transitioning students in grades 3-6 to CCSS over the next 2 years. The CCSS is aligned with college and career expectations and include rigorous content and application of knowledge through high-order skills.

Our rising 6th grade students and their parents are invited to meet with guidance counselors at the Feeder Middle School prior to students entering 7th grade to discuss career options.