

# Florida Department of Education



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

Proposed for 2012-2013

**2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

**PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS**

**School Information**

School Name: Andrew A Robinson Elementary	District Name: Duval County Public Schools (DCPS)
Principal: Crystal Lewis	Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Daniels
SAC Chair:	Date of School Board Approval:

**Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:**

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

**Administrators**

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

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)
----------	------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Principal	Crystal Lewis	<p>Education: BA-Special Education, University of North Florida 1993; Masters in Educational Leadership, University of North Florida 1995</p> <p>Professional Certificates: School Principal (All Levels) Specific Learning Disabilities (K-12)</p>	2	15	<p>2011-2012: Principal Andrew Robinson Elementary – Grade D School #262 36% Reading Mastery / 43% Math Mastery / 20% Science Mastery/ 75% Writing Mastery Master AYP: NO</p> <p>2010-2011, Principal - Grade D, school #262 60% Reading Mastery / 66% Math Mastery / 33% Science Mastery/ 80% Writing Mastery Master AYP: NO</p> <p>2009-2010: Principal of Biscayne Elementary Grade C. Reading Mastery: 67%, Math Mastery: 53%, Science Mastery: 20%, Writing Mastery: 78% AYP: 79%, Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading. Total, Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math or in Reading.</p> <p>2008-2009: Principal of Biscayne Elementary Grade C. Reading Mastery: 61%, Math Mastery: 52%, Science Mastery: 22%, Writing Mastery: 79% AYP: 87%, Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading. Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>2007-2008, Principal of Biscayne Elementary : Grade C, Reading Mastery: 67%, Math Mastery: 51%, Science Mastery: 23%, Writing Mastery: 62% AYP: 85%, All subgroups met AYP in reading. Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math.</p>
-----------	---------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

					<p>2006-2007: Principal Biscayne -Grade B, Reading Mastery: 63%, Math Mastery: 49%, Science Mastery: 17%, Writing Mastery: 84% AYP: 100%, All subgroups met AYP in both reading and math.</p> <p>2005-2006, Principal of Biscayne Elementary: Grade D, Reading Mastery: 63%, Math Mastery: 36%, Writing Mastery: 70% AYP: 87%, All subgroups met AYP in reading. Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math. 2004-2005: Grade B, Reading Mastery: 73%, Math Mastery: 48%, Writing Mastery: 79% AYP: 97%, All subgroups met AYP in reading. Economically Disadvantaged did not meet AYP in math.</p> <p>2003-2004, Principal of Biscayne Elementary: Grade C, Reading Mastery: 52%, Math Mastery: 37%, Writing Mastery: 88%. AYP: 90%, All subgroups met AYP in reading. Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>2002-2003: Principal of Fishweir Elementary: Grade A, Reading mastery: 75%, Math Mastery: 49%, Writing Mastery: 76%</p> <p>2001-2002, Principal of Fishweir Elementary: Grade A, Reading mastery: 76%, Math Mastery: 56%, Writing Mastery: 72%</p> <p>2000-2001, Principal of Fishweir Elementary: Grade B, Reading mastery: 74%, Math Mastery: 50%, Writing Mastery: 89%</p> <p>1999-2000, Principal of Fishweir Elementary: Grade A, Reading mastery: 65%, Math Mastery: 67%, Writing</p>
--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

					<p>Mastery: 68%</p> <p>1998-1999, Vice- Principal of Crystal Springs Elementary: Grade C</p>
Assistant Principal	Michelle Walsh	<p>Masters of Educational Leadership, Saint Leo University                      B.S. Elementary Education, Minor Studio Art, Certification, Elementary Ed. 1-6, ESOL Endorsement Educational Leadership (All Levels)</p>	7	2	<p><b>2011-2012: Assistant Principal – Grade D School #262</b>                      36% Reading Mastery / 43% Math Mastery / 20% Science Mastery/ 75% Writing Mastery</p> <p><b>School Instructional Coach</b>  <b>2010-2011- D, school #262</b>                      60% Reading Mastery / 66% Math Mastery / 33% Science Mastery/ 80% Writing Mastery                      Master AYP: NO</p> <p><b>School Instructional Coach</b>  <b>2009-2010- C, school #262</b>                      62% Reading Mastery / 73% Math Mastery / 24% Science Mastery                      Master AYP: NO</p> <p><b>Reading Resource Teacher</b>  <b>2008-2009-A, school # 262</b>                      66% Reading Mastery / 72% Math Mastery / 29% Science Mastery                      AYP: YES</p> <p><b>Reading Resource Teacher</b>  <b>2007-2008-C, school # 262</b>                      53% Reading Mastery / 52% Math Mastery / 18% Science Mastery                      AYP: NO</p> <p><b>Reading Resource Teacher</b>  <b>2006-2007-C, school # 262</b>                      59% Reading Mastery / 44% Math Mastery / 25% Science Mastery                      AYP: NO. The various subgroups: Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP.</p>

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

Assistant Principal	Talitha Harris	Masters of Educational Leadership, Saint Leo University	1	1	<b>2011-2012: Assistant Principal– Grade D School #262</b> 36% Reading Mastery / 43% Math Mastery / 20% Science Mastery/ 75% Writing Mastery
------------------------	----------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

### Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
--------------	------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



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

Reading	Zabrina Smith	Masters of Educational Leadership, University of Phoenix B.S. Elementary Education, Florida A&M University Professional Certifications: Elementary Ed. 1-6, ESOL Endorsement Educational Leadership (All Levels) National Board Certified in Reading/Language Arts	2	2	<p>Reading Coach 2011-2012- D, school #262 36% Reading Mastery / 43% Math Mastery / 20% Science Mastery/ 75% Writing Mastery Master AYP: NO</p> <p>RtI Resource Teacher 2010-2011- A, school #30 94% Reading Mastery / 95% Math Mastery / 81% Science Mastery/ 85% Writing Mastery Master AYP: YES</p> <p>2nd Grade Teacher 2009-2010- A, school #30 93% Reading Mastery / 90% Math Mastery / 71% Science Mastery /92% Writing Mastery AYP: NO The subgroup: Students with Disabilities did not make AYP.</p> <p>2nd Grade Teacher 2008-2009-A, school # 30 91% Reading Mastery / 90% Math Mastery / 69% Science Mastery/ 93% Writing Mastery AYP: YES</p> <p>2nd Grade Teacher 2007-2008-A, school # 30 89% Reading Mastery / 84% Math Mastery / 63% Science Mastery/ 85% Writing Mastery AYP: YES</p> <p>2nd Grade Teacher 2006-2007-A, school # 30 92% Reading Mastery / 84% Math Mastery / 63% Science Mastery/ 96% Writing Mastery AYP: YES</p>
---------	---------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Science	Tommie Mercer	Master of Secondary Education University of Phoenix B.S. Science Management University of Phoenix Professional Certifications: Biology 6-12 Middle Grades Integrated 5-9	1	1	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Science Teacher</b> 2011-2012- C, School #144 35% Reading Mastery / 39% Math Mastery / 17% Science Mastery/ 74% Writing Mastery Master AYP:
Math	Regina Rowan-Thomas		2	2	<b>Math Coach</b> 2011-2012- D, school #262 36% Reading Mastery / 43% Math Mastery / 20% Science Mastery/ 75% Writing Mastery Master AYP: NO  <b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Math Teacher</b> 2010-2011, School #15 51% Reading Mastery / 51% Math Mastery / 14% Science Mastery AYP: NO The subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not make AYP.  <b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Math Teacher</b> 2009-2010 School #15 55% Reading Mastery / 53% Math Mastery / 19% Science Mastery AYP: NO The subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not make AYP.  <b>5<sup>th</sup> Grade Science Teacher</b> 2008-2009 School #15 51% Reading Mastery / 47% Math Mastery / 31% Science Mastery AYP: NO The subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not make AYP.

**Highly Effective Teachers**

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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
1. Lead Magnet Teachers recruit during Magnet Mania and other Magnet related events that are highlighted in local media outlets	Magnet Lead	May 2013
2. The interview Committee consisting of administrators and coaches meet and interview prospective teachers. The team discusses prospective teachers that would prosper in our learning community and, after offering the teacher a position, they quickly are given a grade level mentor teacher and a grade level academic coach.	Administration and Coaches	May 2013
3. Beginning teachers fulfill the requirements of the Teacher Induction Program (MINT).	PDF, Coaches, Administration	May 2013
4. CET trained teachers attend district Mentoring Academy and use effective strategies learned with mentees	PDF and Mentors	May 2013
5. Professional Development Facilitator (PDF) provides monthly meetings and on-going support to service MINT participants and mentors.	PDF	May 2013
6. Academic Coaches provide on-going support via observations, professional trainings, co-teaching, and modeling.	Math, Science and Reading Coach	May 2013
7. 6. Weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are facilitated by coaches for all grade levels, K-5, for 90 minutes per week.	Academic Coaches	May 2013
8. 7. Mentors will meet regularly will all teachers with less than 3 completed years of experience and/or are new to our district.	Mentors	May 2013
9. 8. The principal has bi-monthly debriefings with first year teachers on Early Release Wednesdays.	Principal	May 2013

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

***Non-Highly Effective Instructors***

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Not applicable until October 2012 due the new DCPS teacher evaluation system, CAST.	NA

***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
60	13% (8)	38% (23)	38% (23)	10% (6)	38% (23)	83% (50)	6% (4)	1% (1)	25% (15)

***Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan***

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities

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

Zabrina Smith (Reading Coach)	Bryan Vernon (5 <sup>th</sup> ELA)	Mr. Vernon is a first year teacher. Ms. Smith serves as the reading coach for 3-5 teachers where she works closely during PLCs and pushes in during instructional time. She is also been accepted and is currently completing the Aspiring Leadership Academy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mentor and mentee meets biweekly to discuss evidence based strategies for each domain and their progress towards meeting the goals set fourth by the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP).</li> <li>● The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.</li> <li>● Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.</li> <li>● PDF/novice teacher meetings are the last Thursday of every month. District Cadre, Amber Pringle, will observe and work with novice teachers weekly.</li> <li>● New teachers will meet with the Principal after every Early Release training at 3:15 for a debriefing.</li> </ul>
Nicola Gibson (3 <sup>rd</sup> ELA)	Meghan Brooks (3 <sup>rd</sup> ELA)	Ms. Brooks is a first year teacher. Ms. Gibson is a veteran 3 <sup>rd</sup> grade teacher with a proven track record. She also serves as the grade level chair and is a member of the school leadership team.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mentor and mentee meets biweekly to discuss evidence based strategies for each domain and their progress towards meeting the goals set fourth by the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP).</li> <li>● The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.</li> <li>● Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.</li> <li>● PDF/novice teacher meetings are the last Thursday of every month. District Cadre, Amber Pringle, will observe and work with novice teachers weekly.</li> <li>● New teachers will meet with the Principal after every Early Release training at 3:15 for a debriefing.</li> </ul>
Melissa Urrutia (2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade Chair)	Rachel Dodds-Parimore	Mrs. Dodds is a 2 <sup>nd</sup> year 2 <sup>nd</sup> grade teacher transferring from out of district. Mrs. Urrutia is a veteran 2 <sup>nd</sup> grade teacher with a proven track record of the highest scores on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> grade. She also serves as the grade level chair and a member of the school leadership team.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mentor and mentee meets biweekly to discuss evidence based strategies for each domain and their progress towards meeting the goals set fourth by the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP).</li> <li>● The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.</li> <li>● Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.</li> <li>● PDF/novice teacher meetings are the last Thursday of every month. District Cadre, Amber Pringle, will observe and work with novice teachers weekly.</li> <li>● New teachers will meet with the Principal after every Early Release training at 3:15 for a debriefing.</li> </ul>
Erika Levesque (KG)	Fallon Hamilton (K)	Ms. Hamilton is a first year Kindergarten teacher. Ms. Levesque is a 4 <sup>th</sup> year Kindergarten teacher who is actively involved in Common Core Training and Implementation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mentor and mentee meets biweekly to discuss evidence based strategies for each domain and their progress towards meeting the goals set fourth by the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP).</li> <li>● The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.</li> <li>● Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.</li> <li>● PDF/novice teacher meetings are the last Thursday of every month. District Cadre, Amber Pringle, will observe and work with novice teachers weekly.</li> <li>● New teachers will meet with the Principal after every Early Release training at 3:15 for a debriefing.</li> </ul>

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

<p>Raquel Foxworth (EBD Site Coach)</p>	<p>Marcus White (EBD)</p>	<p>Mr. White is a first year EBD Intermediate teacher. Ms. Foxworth is a veteran ESE teacher. She now serves as the school EBD Site Coach where she supports both intermediate and primary units. She has been accepted and is completing the Aspiring Leadership Academy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mentor and mentee meets biweekly to discuss evidence based strategies for each domain and their progress towards meeting the goals set fourth by the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP).</li> <li>● The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.</li> <li>● Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.</li> <li>● PDF/novice teacher meetings are the last Thursday of every month. District Cadre, Amber Pringle, will observe and work with novice teachers weekly.</li> <li>● New teachers will meet with the Principal after every Early Release training at 3:15 for a debriefing.</li> </ul>
<p>Tommie Mercer (Science Coach)</p>	<p>Julie Mae Syquio (5<sup>th</sup> ELA / Science)</p>	<p>Ms. Syquio is a first year reading and science teacher. Mr. Mercer is the school Science Coach. He has a proven track record of high science scores in the district.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mentor and mentee meets biweekly to discuss evidence based strategies for each domain and their progress towards meeting the goals set fourth by the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP).</li> <li>● The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.</li> <li>● Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.</li> <li>● PDF/novice teacher meetings are the last Thursday of every month. District Cadre, Amber Pringle, will observe and work with novice teachers weekly.</li> <li>● New teachers will meet with the Principal after every Early Release training at 3:15 for a debriefing.</li> </ul>
<p>Angela Brown (4<sup>th</sup> Grade Chair)</p>	<p>Ellen Marini (4<sup>th</sup> Writing)</p>	<p>Ms. Marini is a 1st year teacher. Mrs. Brown serves as the grade level chair. She has taught 4<sup>th</sup> grade for numerous year with a proven track record of success in ELA and math.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mentor and mentee meets biweekly to discuss evidence based strategies for each domain and their progress towards meeting the goals set fourth by the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP).</li> <li>● The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.</li> <li>● Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.</li> <li>● PDF/novice teacher meetings are the last Thursday of every month. District Cadre, Amber Pringle, will observe and work with novice teachers weekly.</li> <li>● New teachers will meet with the Principal after every Early Release training at 3:15 for a debriefing.</li> </ul>
<p>Aunekia Bright-Westcott (K Chair)</p>	<p>Lennetta Strickland-Young (PK)</p>	<p>Mrs. Young is a first year certified PK teacher. She previously held a CDA certification and has taught PK for 1 previous year. Ms. Westcott is 4<sup>th</sup> year Kindergarten teacher with a proven track record of success on the FAIR. She is the grade level chair and also serves on the school leadership team.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mentor and mentee meets biweekly to discuss evidence based strategies for each domain and their progress towards meeting the goals set fourth by the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP).</li> <li>● The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.</li> <li>● Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.</li> <li>● PDF/novice teacher meetings are the last Thursday of every month. District Cadre, Amber Pringle, will observe and work with novice teachers weekly.</li> <li>● New teachers will meet with the Principal after every Early Release training at 3:15 for a debriefing.</li> </ul>

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

Tommie Mercer (Science Coach)	Jessica Ribeiro (5 <sup>th</sup> Science)	Mrs. Ribeiro is a first year alternative certification teacher. Mr. Mercer is the school Science Coach. He has a proven track record of high science scores in the district.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mentor and mentee meets biweekly to discuss evidence based strategies for each domain and their progress towards meeting the goals set fourth by the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP).</li> <li>● The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.</li> <li>● Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.</li> <li>● PDF/novice teacher meetings are the last Thursday of every month. District Cadre, Amber Pringle, will observe and work with novice teachers weekly.</li> <li>● New teachers will meet with the Principal after every Early Release training at 3:15 for a debriefing.</li> </ul>
Ragina Rowan-Thomas (Math Coach)	Caitlin Sweeney (3 <sup>rd</sup> Math)	Ms. Sweeney is a 2 <sup>nd</sup> year 3 <sup>rd</sup> grade teacher. This will be her first year as a departmentalized math teacher. Mrs. Thomas is the school math coach. She has a proven track record of high math scores as a classroom teacher.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mentor and mentee meets biweekly to discuss evidence based strategies for each domain and their progress towards meeting the goals set fourth by the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP).</li> <li>● The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.</li> <li>● Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.</li> <li>● PDF/novice teacher meetings are the last Thursday of every month. District Cadre, Amber Pringle, will observe and work with novice teachers weekly.</li> <li>● New teachers will meet with the Principal after every Early Release training at 3:15 for a debriefing.</li> </ul>
Zabrina Smith (Reading Coach)	Maryann Gaurnery (4 <sup>th</sup> ELA)	Ms. Gaurnery is a 2 <sup>nd</sup> year teacher in 4 <sup>th</sup> grade. Ms. Smith is the school reading coach that works with 3-5 teachers in PLCs and push-in with instruction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mentor and mentee meets biweekly to discuss evidence based strategies for each domain and their progress towards meeting the goals set fourth by the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP).</li> <li>● The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.</li> <li>● Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.</li> <li>● PDF/novice teacher meetings are the last Thursday of every month. District Cadre, Amber Pringle, will observe and work with novice teachers weekly.</li> <li>● New teachers will meet with the Principal after every Early Release training at 3:15 for a debriefing.</li> </ul>
Leslie Waddelow (1 <sup>st</sup> Grade Chair)	Shannon Higgins (1 <sup>st</sup> )	Ms. Higgins is a 2 <sup>nd</sup> year 1 <sup>st</sup> grade teachers. Mrs. Waddelow is the 1 <sup>st</sup> grade chair and a member of the school leadership team. She also serves as the school PDF.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mentor and mentee meets biweekly to discuss evidence based strategies for each domain and their progress towards meeting the goals set fourth by the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP).</li> <li>● The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.</li> <li>● Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.</li> <li>● PDF/novice teacher meetings are the last Thursday of every month. District Cadre, Amber Pringle, will observe and work with novice teachers weekly.</li> <li>● New teachers will meet with the Principal after every Early Release training at 3:15 for a debriefing.</li> </ul>

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

Gabriel McDaniel (Guidance Counselor)	Sherry Jackson (VE)	Ms. Jackson is a 2 <sup>nd</sup> year VE Resource teacher. This is her second career and she is alternative education certified. Mrs. McDaniel is a veteran School Counselor and she leads monthly MRT and weekly RtI meetings. She is also a member of the school leadership team.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mentor and mentee meets biweekly to discuss evidence based strategies for each domain and their progress towards meeting the goals set fourth by the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP).</li> <li>● The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.</li> <li>● Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.</li> <li>● PDF/novice teacher meetings are the last Thursday of every month. District Cadre, Amber Pringle, will observe and work with novice teachers weekly.</li> <li>● New teachers will meet with the Principal after every Early Release training at 3:15 for a debriefing.</li> </ul>
Courtney Warner (1 <sup>st</sup> Grade)	Sandra Rago (1 <sup>st</sup> )	Ms. Rago is a 2 <sup>nd</sup> year 1 <sup>st</sup> grade teacher. Mrs. Warner is a 4 <sup>th</sup> grade 1 <sup>st</sup> grade teacher with a proven track record on the FAIR.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The mentor and mentee meets biweekly to discuss evidence based strategies for each domain and their progress towards meeting the goals set fourth by the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP).</li> <li>● The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.</li> <li>● Time is given for feedback, coaching and planning.</li> <li>● PDF/novice teacher meetings are the last Thursday of every month. District Cadre, Amber Pringle, will observe and work with novice teachers weekly.</li> <li>● New teachers will meet with the Principal after every Early Release training at 3:15 for a debriefing.</li> </ul>



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

### Additional Requirements

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

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

Title I, Part A Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through programs such as Team Up and SES Tutoring opportunities, as well as summer school.
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D Programs for at risk students include TEAM UP and SES Tutoring for those who qualify. Other grant based programs include Real Men Wear P.I.N.K.
Title II Professional Development funds will be utilized to support Common Core Training and roll out from PK- Grade 5.
Title III
Title X- Homeless Homeless students living in shelters in our attendance zone qualify for all Title 1 services offered at the school. Services include breakfast in the classroom (BIC) , Free and Reduced lunch, and the opportunity to enroll in TEAM UP.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through additional push-in and pull-out remediation by a certified teacher during school.
Violence Prevention Programs In School Suspension included character education and prevented lessons utilizing the Second Step Bully Prevention program provided by DCPS. All book of the months imbed a specific character trait that aligns with district wide guidelines.
Nutrition Programs The school participates in the Breakfast in the Classroom (BIC) program which provides a nutritious breakfast for all students.
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

**Job Training**

Andrew Robinson is a Duval County Magnet for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). All students are provided additional resources that align with the National STEM standards, in addition to NGSS and Common Core.

**Other**

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

**June 2012**

**Rule 6A-1.099811**

**Revised April 29, 2011**

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

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school based RtI Leadership Team is comprised of the following individuals:

Crystal Lewis (Principal) provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

Talitha Harris and Michelle Walsh (Assistant Principals) assists the principal by monitoring the school-based RtI team and monitoring the implementation of intervention support and documentation.

Zabrina Smith (Reading Coach) develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Rowan-Thomas (Math Coach) develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based Describe how the school-based RtI Leadership Team functions (e.g. meeting processes and roles/functions). Describe the role of the school-based RtI Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Gabriel McDaniel (Guidance Counselor) provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, the school guidance counselor continues to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

Carol Jones (SWD LEA for the school) participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

District assigned Speech Language Pathologist participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Kelly and Walker participate in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction within the Students Taking Academic Responsibility (STAR) Program for overage students.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

<p>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?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Teachers analyze weekly data from class, district and state during weekly 90 minute PLCs.</li><li>2. Struggling students are identify with the assistance of Academic Coaches and Admin and interventions are planned.</li><li>3. Continuously struggling students are referred to the MTSS Wednesday team to problem solve and collaborate on research based next steps. The teacher brings collected data in graph form to share and discuss with the team. A monitoring date of 4-6 weeks out is set to monitor student and intervention progress.</li><li>4. Progress monitoring meeting reviews 4-6 week data and either refers the child out, continues intervention, suggest a new intervention, or refers to MRT for more testing.</li></ol>
<p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?</p> <p>The School Leadership Team leads the faculty in a review of the data and, with input from building instructional teams, develops the initial draft of the School Improvement Plan utilizing the template provided by the Department of Education. The draft SIP is then presented to the School Advisory Council for review and recommendations. The School Leadership Team finalizes the plan.</p> <p>The School Improvement Plan is the guiding document for the work of Andrew Robinson. The School Leadership Team will regularly revise and update the plan as the needs of students change throughout the school year. The plan includes a formal review process which demonstrates how the school has used MtSS/RtI to inform instruction and made mid-course adjustments as data are analyzed.</p>
<b>MTSS Implementation</b>
<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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Classroom Data Tracking Sheets: Used to monitoring weekly and cumulative assessments and to plan for FCIM lessons in individual, small and whole group. Data Tracking sheets identify the bottom quartile for the class and school.</li><li>2. Interim District Benchmark Limelight Reports: Used as beginning, mid, and end of year progress monitoring of students on individual assessed benchmarks. Target Focus Calendars are created and updated in response to data. Data is summarized Mid-year SIP and Mid-Year Stakeholders Meetings. All data is presented in graph form on the data wall.</li><li>3. FAIR Decision Tree: Used to disaggregate FAIR data to drive individual groupings of target instruction.</li><li>4. DRA 2 Focus for Instruction: Used to differentiate and plan for Guided Reading.</li><li>5. RtI Summary Sheets: Wednesday Meeting data and outcome is documented for Tier 2 and Tier 3 using a template with guiding questions.</li></ol>
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.</p> <p>RtI/MTSS Leadership Team will attend district and state trainings. Information will be disseminated through emails, PLCs, Early Release, and mentoring sessions.</p> <p>All teachers will participate in weekly 90 minute professional learning communities where data is the focus for planning, training, and instruction. Data will be disaggregated, students identified, and research based materials modeled for instruction. In addition, calibration sessions will be planned for where student work and data will be highlighted for discussion.</p> <p>The Professional Development Facilitator will plan for a RtI / MTSS book talk as an optional after school training.</p>

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

MTSS will be supported by Academic Coaches and Admin by providing weekly feedback from classroom walk-throughs, PLCs, and informal CAST observations. Effective practices with researched based materials will be modeled during PLCs and class time. Scaffolding methods such as modeling, co-teaching, and “piggy-backing” will be utilized until each teacher is effective with Tier 1, 2 and 3 practices and resources. A resource will be compiled with all the school resources available for each content area and tier as guide for teachers. A check out system will be created to monitored purchased resources to ensure the researched based materials stay complete from year to year.

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

#### *Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)*

##### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

Principal: Crystal. Lewis  
Assistant Principal: Michelle Walsh  
Assistant Principal: Talitha Harris  
Reading Coach: Zabrina. Smith  
Math Coach: Regina. Rowan-Thomas  
Science Coach: Tommie Mercer  
Team Up Director: Natalie Sheppard

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The Literacy Leadership Team meets weekly after school to analyze school, grade level, classroom, and individual student data collected weekly from ALL teachers in ALL content areas. This data is desegregated and trends are analyzed. Subgroups and learning gains are tracked and interventions put into place and monitored as needed. All Literacy Leadership takes an active role in performing Classroom Walk-Throughs, modeling, training, and debriefing with ALL content area teachers to increase learning gains across content areas. Mrs. Lewis monitors EBD and STAR, Ms. Harris and Mrs. Walsh monitor Kindergarten, first, and second grades. Mrs. Thomas and Ms. Smith monitor third, fourth, and fifth grades. Mr. Mercer monitors fifth grade science. Mrs. Sheppard monitors Team Up after school program usages.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

For the 2012 and 2013 school year, increasing proficiency while maintaining student learning gains will be the primary focus for student and school improvement. All teachers will be trained and monitored on effective Tier 1 Core Instructional Practices that match the rigor of Common Core and 2.0 content expectations. To support the process, all teachers will attend and actively participate in weekly 90 minute grade level PLCs, early release trainings, and modeling by coaches. Our main goal is for Tier 1 instruction is to be consistent, rigorous, and explicit across content areas so that 80% of all students are responding to instruction that is aligned to the content standards and the school and district reading / language arts philosophy.

3-5 teachers will be taking through an explicit training where unpacking each benchmark of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and understanding the FCAT specifications will be the primary focus in order to align Core Teaching Practices.

### ***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.*

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

### *\*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.

Andrew Robinson Elementary Schools has a Pre-Kindergarten program, which prepares 4 year olds to transition successfully to Kindergarten. The VPK program has adopted the Houghton Mifflin Florida Reading Series which aligns with the Florida VPK standards and the building blocks for primary reading instruction. In a partnership with the Early Learning Coalition and the Read It Forward Jax! VPK reading program encourages families to read with their children to increase their understanding of literacy concepts that prepare them for academic success as they transition into kindergarten. VPK students are given the opportunity to go on field trips to broaden their world experiences. Before students enter Kindergarten, they are assessed using the Houghton Mifflin Early Growth Indicators Benchmark Assessment and the State VPK Assessment three times a year.

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

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Reading Goals**

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

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>	1a.1. Teachers are not effectively analyzing benchmark and FAIR data to guide core instruction or small group interventions.	1a.1. Provide teachers with professional development on how to access, analyze, interpret and use data appropriately to guide core and small group instruction	1a.1. Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/ State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team	1a.1. Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks	1a.1. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports		



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

<u>Reading Goal #1a:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
66% (214/324) of all 3-5 students will score at level 3 on the SSS component of the FCAT Reading as defined by the 2012-2013 Adequate Yearly Progress benchmarks set forth by NCLB.							
	11% (36/324)	13% (42/324)					
		1a.2. Teachers do not understand the FCIM process and how it lends itself to instruction	1a.2. All teachers will receive professional development on the FCIM process and how to effectively implement it during literacy block using Common Core Standards.	1a.2. Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team	1a.2. Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks	1a.2. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports	

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

		1a.3. Many teachers are not analyzing and utilizing FAIR data to effectively differentiate instruction.	1a.3. All teachers will attend one ninety minute PLC's per week in order to gain knowledge on appropriate strategies to use to differentiate instruction based on FAIR results	1a.3. Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team	1a.3. Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks	1a.3. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports	
<b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b>	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #1b:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> NA					
	NA	NA					
		1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	
		1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.</b></p>	<p>2a.1. Teachers need continued in-depth professional development in the implementation of reading enrichment strategies.</p>	<p>2a.1. Conduct professional development on the appropriate use of supplemental materials, effective instructional activities for use with leveled classroom libraries, nonfiction texts, and the integration of other content areas</p>	<p>2a.1. Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team</p>	<p>2a.1. Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks</p>	<p>2a.1. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports</p>		
<p><b>Reading Goal #2a:</b> 26% (85/324) of all 3-5 students will score at or above a level 4 on the SSS component of the FCAT Reading to meet the 93% of all 3-5 students who need to score at or above a level 3 as defined by the 2012-2013 Adequate Yearly Progress benchmarks set forth by NCLB.</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**

	17% (56/324)	19% (62/324)					
		2a.2. Lack of instructional rigor in primary and intermediate classes, which include differentiated instruction and documented RtI support.	2a.2. Utilize weekly PLCs and bi-weekly Early Release times to provide training on differentiated instruction and the RtI process with corresponding data collection.	2a.2. Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team	2a.2. Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks	2a.2. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports	
		2a.3 Teachers' have limited knowledge of the reading content and how to effectively teach it across other content areas to enrich high performing students	2a.3 Teachers will receive professional development on small group reading strategies, content base guided reading, and content base instruction through planning and the coaching cycle.	2a.3 Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team	2a.3 Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks	2a.3 FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports	

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

<p><b>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b></p>	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.		
<p><u>Reading Goal #2b:</u> NA</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> NA</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> NA</p>					
	NA	NA					
		2b.2.	2b2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	
		2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	
<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		

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

<p><b>3a. FCAT 2.0:</b>  <b>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>3a.1. Teachers are not consistently implementing differentiation strategies during the literacy block.</p>	<p>3a.1. Teachers will receive professional development to effectively analyze data and implement differentiated instruction (e.g., learning centers, small group, and guided reading) to address individual student needs during the literacy block.</p>	<p>3a.1. Literacy Leadership Team          Reading Coach          District/State Reading Coach          MTSS Leadership Team          Academic Awareness Team</p>	<p>3a.1. Weekly mini-assessments,          Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments          Write score          District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR          Lesson Plans          Classroom Walkthroughs          Data Notebooks</p>	<p>3a.1. FAIR Report          Classroom Walkthroughs          Data Notebooks          Lesson Plans          Accelerated Reader Report          Compose Odyssey          FCAT Explore Reports          Student Portfolio          CAST          Inform Reports</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #3a:</u>          71% (155/218) of all 3-5 students will make learning gains on the SSS component of the FCAT Reading as defined by the 2012-2013 Adequate Yearly Progress benchmarks set forth by NCLB.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>. 64% (140/218)</p>	<p>71% (155/218)</p>					
		<p>3a.2. Teachers' lacks the ability to appropriately identify complex text using Common Core Standards.</p>	<p>3a.2. Teachers will receive ongoing professional development on Common Core Standards and give strategies on how to identify complex text.</p>	<p>3a.2. Literacy Leadership Team          Reading Coach          District/State Reading Coach          MTSS Leadership Team          Academic Awareness Team</p>	<p>3a.2. Weekly mini-assessments,          Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments          Write score          District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR          Lesson Plans          Classroom Walkthroughs          Data Notebooks</p>	<p>3a.2. FAIR Report          Classroom Walkthroughs          Data Notebooks          Lesson Plans          Accelerated Reader Report          Compose Odyssey          FCAT Explore Reports          Student Portfolio          CAST          Inform Reports</p>	

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

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

		3a.3. Teachers lack of knowledge of how to integrate reading in all content areas	3a.3. All teachers will attend a ninety minute PLC's once a week to gain knowledge on how to appropriately integrate reading in all content areas.	3a.3. Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team	3a.3. Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks	3a.3. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports	
<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> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> NA					
	NA	NA					
		3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	

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

		3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>	4a.1. Many of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> grade teachers are not able to effectively work with students needing phonics and phonemic awareness.	4a.1. Teachers will receive professional development on how to use the FAIR toolkit to provide additional instruction necessary to improve student reading skills.	4a.1. Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team	4a.1. Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks	4a.1. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports		
<b>Reading Goal #4a:</b> 81% (56/68) of all 3-5 students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the SSS component of the FCAT Reading as defined by the 2012-2013 Adequate Yearly Progress benchmarks set forth by NCLB.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	73% (50/68)	81% (56/68)					



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

		4a.2. Teachers do not fully understand the gradual release process.	4a.2. Teachers will receive professional development on as well as have the gradual release process model for them.	4a.2. Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team	4a.2. Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks	4a.2. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports	
<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> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> NA					
		4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	

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

		4b.3	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<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>	64% of all students were non proficient on the NGSSS component of Reading FCAT.	57% of all students will be non proficient on the NGSSS component of Reading FCAT.	50% of all students will be non proficient on the NGSSS component of Reading FCAT.	43% of all students will be non proficient on the NGSSS component of Reading FCAT.	36% of all students will be non proficient on the NGSSS component of Reading FCAT.	29% of all students will be non proficient on the NGSSS component of Reading FCAT.
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u>  Reduce the number non proficient students by 7% a year of five consecutive years.							
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.Black: Teachers lack knowledge and training in RtI process and FCIM.</p>	<p>5B.1. Teachers will work on developing Focus Calendars and Focus lessons designed by the teachers in conjunction with the Reading coach based on a review of previous assessments where students were struggling and plan for RtI small group instruction, and whole group lessons.</p>	<p>5B.1. Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team</p>	<p>5B.1. Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks</p>	<p>5B.1. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports</p>		
<p><b>Reading Goal #5B:</b>  The subgroup of Black non-proficient students will be reduced by 7% to give a total of 62% (195/314).</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>Black: 69% (217/314)</p>	<p>Black: 62% (195/314)</p>					

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

		5B.2. Some teachers are not incorporating appropriate content-specific vocabulary instruction.	5B.2. School-based coaches will provide support for individual teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate content-specific vocabulary	5B.2. Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team	5B.2. Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks	5B.2. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<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 #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	

**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>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5D.1. Classroom teachers and Exceptional Education teachers are not properly communicating and using IEP goals to service SWD students with the most effective strategies and resources.	5D.1. Training will be provided for all faculty and staff on understanding of IEPs and appropriate tools, strategies, and resources available through the district and school.	5D.1. Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team District ESE Staff Guidance Counselor	5D.1. RtI and MRT Meetings Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks	5D.1. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports		
<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>  86% (28/32) of all 3-5 SWD students will score at or above level 3 on the SSS component of the FCAT Reading as defined by the 2012-2013 Adequate Yearly Progress benchmarks set forth by NCLB.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	96% (30/32)	86% (28/32)					
		5D.2. Exceptional Education teachers are not following the NGSSS with Access Points through the utilization of available specialized curriculum with fidelity.	5D.2. School-based coaches will support the exceptional education teachers through the coaching model to implementing effective instructional strategies during daily instruction with adopted resources available.	5D.2. Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team District ESE Staff	5D.2. MRT and RtI meetings Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks	5D.2. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports	
		5D.3. The VE Resource Teachers struggle with having a deep understanding of standards (NGSS and Common Core) at all levels PK-5 to appropriately plan and service all assigned students.	5D.3. The VE Resource Teachers will receive professional development in the content area on multiple grade levels as well as utilize appropriate accommodation strategies with SWD population by attending protocol training at the district level.	5D.3. District ESE Staff Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team	5D.3. Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks	5D.3. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>5E.1. Teachers lack the ability to create a variety of entry points to ensure that student differing abilities, strengths, and needs are all taken into consideration.</p>	<p>5E.1. Provide professional development on the importance of conducting and understanding students' learning and thinking styles surveys</p>	<p>5E.1. Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team</p>	<p>5E.1. Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks</p>	<p>5E.1. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5E:</u>  Total Free and Reduced 89% (288 Students)</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>79% (227/288)</p>	<p>71% (205/288)</p>					
		<p>5E.2. Most teachers are not analyzing data to effectively differentiate instruction.</p>	<p>5E.2 Collaborate with teachers to assist them in analyze student data and develop differentiated instruction (e.g., learning centers and small group guided reading) to address individual student needs.</p>	<p>5E.2. Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team</p>	<p>5E.2. Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks</p>	<p>5E.2. FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports</p>	

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

		5E.3 Teachers are not consistently implementing differentiation strategies during the literacy Block	5E.3 Teachers will receive professional development on how to effectively analyze data and consistently implement differentiated instruction (e.g., learning centers and small group guided reading) to address individual student needs.	5E.3 Literacy Leadership Team Reading Coach District/State Reading Coach MTSS Leadership Team Academic Awareness Team	5E.3 Weekly mini-assessments, Biweekly Progress Monitoring Assessments Write score District Reading Interim Benchmark/FAIR Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks	5E.3 FAIR Report Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Accelerated Reader Report Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Reports Student Portfolio CAST Inform Reports	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

**Reading 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



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

Book Jam	4-5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	Christy Handly Reading Coach	Reading coach, 4 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> grade teachers	August 1	Classroom Walk-through	State Coach Reading Coach Administration
Data Analysis Lesson Planning Focus Calendar	3 <sup>rd</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	State Coach Holli & Reading Coach Zabrina	3 <sup>rd</sup> , 4 <sup>th</sup> , 5 <sup>th</sup> ELA teachers Reading Coach (PLC)	Every Tuesday	Data Notebook, Oncourse lesson plans posted weekly	State Coach Reading Coach
FAIR Data Analysis/ Common Core Standards	3 <sup>rd</sup> – 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	State Coach Holli & Reading Coach Zabrina	3 <sup>rd</sup> , 4 <sup>th</sup> , 5 <sup>th</sup> ELA teachers Reading Coach (PLC)	Every Tuesday	Data Notebook, Oncourse lesson plans posted weekly	State Coach Reading Coach Administration
Brain Compatible Teaching	k-5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	Marcia Tate	K-5 <sup>th</sup> Grade teachers, Coaches, and Administration	Saturday, October 6, 2012	Classroom Walk-through	State Coach Reading Coach Administration

**Reading 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			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Accelerated Reader	AR encourages substantial differentiated reading practice to create strong readers. Based on each student’s independent reading level, AR helps teachers set personalized goals for each student, and select books that are difficult enough to keep students challenged, but not too difficult to cause frustration.	Title 1	\$4,067.10
Interactive Learning(Digital Lessons	Interactive SMART Board lesson (Reading)		\$19.99
<b>Subtotal:\$4,087.09</b>			
Professional Development			

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

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Brain Compatible Teaching	Through 10 interactive modules, teachers will learn about the research behind brain-compatible teaching and develop their own concrete strategies that can be applied immediately in your classroom.	Title 1	2,000
<b>Subtotal:2000</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:\$6,087.09</b>			

*End of Reading Goals*

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

**Elementary School Mathematics Goals**

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

<b>Elementary Mathematics 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 mathematics.</b>	1a.1. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of the core math program and the math workshop model	1a.1. Teachers will participate in professional development provided by the school and district in order to implement the core math program using the math workshop model with fidelity.	1a.1. Principal, District and School-Based Coaches	1a.1. Focus Walks, Lesson Plans Board Configurations	1a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric		
<u>Mathematics Goal #1a:</u>  66% (214/324) of all students grades 3-5 will score a level 3 on the NGSS component of the Math FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	43% (139/324)	48% (194/345)					
		1a.2. Many teachers are not creating daily lessons that follow an instructional delivery model that includes explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice, and independent practice as well as a lesson	1a.2. Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Supplemental instruction is provided in addition to core instruction.	1a.2. Principal Math Coach Rtl Team	1a.2. Grade level and Rtl team will review results of common assessments data bi-weekly to determine progress toward benchmark.	1a.2. Common assessments tied to Next Generation Math Standards administered weekly.	
		1a.3. Student data is not being used for ongoing progress monitoring.	1a.3. School-based Math Coach and District Math Coach will collaborate to provide teachers with professional development that focuses on using data (benchmarks and weekly assessments) to monitor student progress and using that data to make accommodations in instruction that meets the needs of individual students.	1a.3. Principal, Math Coach, and District Math Coach	1a.3. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plans, Monitoring Forms	1a.3. Diagnostic assessments, FCIM assessments, End-of-Unit assessments, and district benchmark assessments that are aligned with the Next Generation Math Standards	

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

<b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #1b:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	NA	NA					
		1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	
		1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>2a.1. Scaffolding, pacing, prompting and probing techniques are not used when asking questions designed to promote higher-order thinking.</p>	<p>2a.1. The district instructional mathematics specialist and school-based mathematics coach will collaborate to develop and implement professional development to design higher-order questioning and discourse for daily instruction</p>	<p>2a.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, District and School-Based Coaches</p>	<p>2a.1. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations Lesson Plans</p>	<p>2a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric Interim District Benchmarks FCIM Mini-Assessments</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #2a:</u>  27% (88/324) of all students in grades 3-5 will score at or above level 4 on the NGSS component of the Math FCAT.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>14% (46/324)</p>	<p>16% (52/324)</p>					

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

		<p>2a.2.</p> <p>Teachers are not identifying learning styles for use in developing appropriate instructional strategies to meet the needs of all students.</p>	<p>2a.2.</p> <p>School-based academic coaches will work in collaboration with teachers through professional learning communities to create lesson plans that address individual student's learning styles during math instruction.</p>	<p>2a.2.</p> <p>Principal, Assistant Principals, School-based Academic Coaches, Teachers</p>	<p>2a.2.</p> <p>Focus Walks, Lesson Plans</p>	<p>2a.2.</p> <p>DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric Interim District Benchmarks FCIM Mini-Assessments</p>	
		<p>2a.3</p> <p>Teachers are not utilizing student data to effectively provide enrichment activities for all students</p>	<p>2a.3</p> <p>School-based math coach and district math coach will provide professional development for teachers on using data to plan appropriate enrichment activities for all students in the form of extension lesson utilizing performance based tasks.</p> <p>The school-based math coach will facilitate analysis of student data during common planning time.</p>	<p>2a.3</p> <p>Principal, Assistant Principals, Math Coach, and District Math Coach</p>	<p>2a.3</p> <p>Focus Walks, Lesson Plans</p>	<p>2a.3</p> <p>DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric Interim District Benchmark FCIM Mini-Assessments</p>	
<p><b>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b></p>							

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #2b:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	
		2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b>	3a.1. Most teachers are not analyzing student work to effectively differentiate instruction for all students.	3a.1. School coaches will collaborate with teachers during PLCs to analyze student work and develop math strategies and lessons that meet the needs of individual students.	3a.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, School-Based Coaches Teachers District Math Coaches State Math Specialist	3a.1. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plans Classroom Observations	3a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric Interim District Benchmark FCIM Mini-Assessments		



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

<u>Mathematics Goal #3a:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
70% (227/324) of all 3-5 students will make learning gains.							
	58% (189/324)	64% (208/324)					
		3a.2. Student data is not being used on a regular basis to monitor student progress.	3a.2. School based math coach will collaborate with teachers to provide professional development focused on using student data to monitor student progress and modify instruction based on that data.	3a.2. Principal, Assistant Principals Math Coach Teachers District Math Coaches State Math Specialist	3a.2. Focus Walks, Lesson Plans	3a.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric Interim District Benchmark FCIM Mini-Assessments	
		3a.3. Some teachers are unfamiliar with the test item specifications, tested benchmarks and content limits for FCAT 2.0	3a.3. District and School-based Coaches will provide professional Development on FCAT Test Item Specification, tested benchmarks, and content limits for the FCAT 2.0	3a.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, District Coaches, School-based Coaches District Math Coaches State Math Specialist	3a.3. Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review	3a.3. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric Interim District Benchmark FCIM Mini-Assessments	
<b>3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b>							

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #3b:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA							
	NA	NA					
		3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	
		3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	4a.1. Teachers are not effectively implementing differentiated instructional strategies during the math block	4a.1. School based math coach will plan, develop and implement lessons with teachers that address individual student needs through the Intensive Coaching Model.	4a.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, School-Based Coach Teachers	4a.1. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plans Classroom Observations	4a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric  Math Assessments  District Math Benchmark Assessment		

**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>					
70% (42/60) of all 3-5 students will make learning gains.							
	59% (36/60)	65% (39/60)					
		4a.2. Many of the students lack the pre-requisite math skills that are needed to be successful.	4a.2. Through the use of vertical team planning, teachers will provide students with skills necessary to be proficient in math.	4a.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, School-Based Coach Teachers	4a.2. PLC Vertical Team Meetings Learning Schedules	4a.2. Student portfolios Math Assessments FCIM Data	
		4a.3 Teachers do not have a clear understanding of the FCIM process and therefore FCIM is not being implemented on a daily basis.	4a.3. Admin, district and state support staff, school based coaches will provide training on the FCIM process and will assist teachers in developing monthly FCIM calendars to show student weaknesses.	4a.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, District and School-based Coaches District Based	4a.3. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Classroom Observations, Monthly FCIM Calendars FCIM Monitoring Forms	4a.3. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric District Math Benchmark Assessment FCIM Assessments	

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

<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.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #4b:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> NA					
	NA	NA					
		4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	
		4b.3	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	

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

<p><b>5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b></p>	<p><b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b></p>	<p>67% (217/324) of all students were non proficient on Math FCAT.</p>	<p>60% (194/324) of all students will be non proficient on Math FCAT.</p>	<p>53% (172/324) of all students will be non proficient on Math FCAT.</p>	<p>46% (149/324) of all students will be non proficient on Math FCAT.</p>	<p>39% (126/324) of all students will be non proficient on Math FCAT.</p>	<p>32% (104/324) of all students will be non proficient on Math FCAT.</p>
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u>  Reduce the number of non proficient students by 7% a year over five consecutive years.</p>							
<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 subgroup:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		

**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. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of explicit math instruction.</p>	<p>5B.1. School-based coaches will provide support for individual teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate content-specific common lessons that include appropriate content-specific math instruction</p>	<p>5B.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, District and School-based Coaches</p>	<p>5B.1. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review, Classroom Observations, DA instructional Review Indicators Rubric</p>	<p>5B.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric Math Assessments District Math Benchmark Assessment</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u></p> <p>The subgroup of Black non-proficient students will be reduced by 7% to give a total of 56% (176/315).</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
<p><i>Enter</i></p>	<p>63% (199/315)</p>	<p>56% (176/315)</p>					
	<p>Black:</p>	<p>Black:</p>					

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

		5B.2. Most teachers are not incorporating effective problem-solving strategies during daily mathematics instruction.	5B.2. The school-based coaches will provide professional development during common planning time on the effective use of problem-solving tools/strategies.	5B.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, District and School-based Coaches	5B.2. Lesson Plans Classroom Observations	5B.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric  District Math Benchmark Assessment  enVisions Topic Assessments	
		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 mathematics.</b>	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> NA					
	NA	NA					

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

		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5D.1. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of explicit math instruction activities.	5D.1. School-based coaches will provide support for individual teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate content-specific common lessons that include appropriate content-specific math instruction content.	5D.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, District and School-based Coaches	5D.1. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review, Classroom Observations, DA instructional Review Indicators Rubric	5D.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric  Math Assessments  District Math Benchmark Assessment		



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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance*</u>					
Reduce the percent of SWD student not making satisfactory progress to 44% (18/32)							
	56% (18/32)	50% (16/32)					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>5E.1. Teachers do not have a clear understanding of the FCIM process and therefore FCIM is not being implemented on a daily basis.</p>	<p>5E.1. The district and state support staff, principal, and school based coaches will provide training on the FCIM process and will assist teachers in developing monthly FCIM calendars that incorporate the gradual release model.</p>	<p>5E.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, District and School-based Coaches District and State Coaches</p>	<p>5E.1. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Classroom Observations, Monthly FCIM Calendars FCIM Monitoring Forms</p>	<p>5E.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric  District Math Benchmark Assessment  FCIM Assessments</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u>  Reduce the number of non proficient Economically Disadvantaged students to 64% (187/288).</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>72% (206/288)</p>	<p>64% (187/288)</p>					

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

		<p>5E.2.</p> <p>Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of explicit math instruction.</p>	<p>5E.2</p> <p>School-based coaches will provide support for individual teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate content-specific common lessons that include appropriate content-specific math instruction.</p>	<p>5E.2.</p> <p>Principal, Assistant Principals, District and School-based Coaches</p>	<p>5E.2.</p> <p>Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review, Classroom Observations, DA instructional Review Indicators Rubric</p>	<p>5E.2.</p> <p>DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric Math Assessments District Math Benchmark Assessment</p>	
		<p>5E.3</p> <p>Student data is not being used to monitor student progress.</p>	<p>5E.3</p> <p>School-based coaches will provide support for individual teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate content-specific common lessons that include appropriate content-specific math instruction.</p>	<p>5E.3</p> <p>Principal, Assistant Principals, District and School-based Coaches</p>	<p>5E.3</p> <p>Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review</p>	<p>5E.3</p> <p>Diagnostic assessments, FCIM assessments, End-of-Unit assessments, and district benchmark assessments that are aligned with the Next Generation Math Standards</p>	

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

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

**Mathematics Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</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 (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Web based resources: FCAT Explorer, Gizmos, Compass Odyssey, enVision online resources, Pearson Limelight and Inform.	K-5 Math	Math Coach and Lead Math Teachers	PLC/ School wide	August- June Early release Wednesdays/ Biweekly PLC's per Grade level /per week	Walk through, post conferencing, assessment data, modeling of lessons, classroom visits	Administration and leadership team
Content focus and Alignment of assessments with math benchmarks. Differentiated Instruction	K-5 Math	Math Coach and Lead Math Teachers	PLC/ grade level	August- June Early release Wednesdays/ Bi-weekly PLC's per grade level /per week	Walk through, post conferencing, assessment data, modeling of lessons, classroom visits	Administration and leadership team

**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
Create Math Assessment for students and progress monitor students	Quantiles	Title 1	\$3,500.00
FL Math Library	Student math libraries for each classroom	Title 1	\$8,000.00
<b>Subtotal: \$11,500</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:11,500.</b>			

*End of Mathematics Goals*

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

**Elementary and Middle School Science Goals**

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

<b>Elementary and Middle Science 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 science.</b>	1A.1. Teacher's lack the in depth content knowledge which hinders student performance.	1A.1. All Science teachers will attend one ninety minute PLC per grade level / per week with the coach to gain content knowledge in order to be a subject matter expert.	1A.1. State Science Specialist, Science Coach and AP's	1A.1. Focus walks/classroom observations	1A.1. FCIM Assessment data Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Student Portfolio IBA's LSA's		
<u>Science Goal #1A:</u> A minimum of 35% of grade 5 students will score Level 3 on the Science FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

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

	11%(11/96)	13% (13/96)					
		1A.2. Students lack background knowledge in Science.	1A.2. Utilize RTI to identify students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment. During PLCs assist teachers with planning and imbedding reading strategies to access and understand complex science text.	1A.2. Science Coach, AP's Instructional Reading and Data Coaches	1A.2. Review student grouping charts frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of the students based on the assessments	1A.2. FCIM Assessment data Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans Compose Odyssey FCAT Explore Student Portfolio	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>							
<u>Science Goal #1B:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	NA	NA					
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b></p>	<p>2A.1 Ensuring that science components (the 5 E's Planning model, NGSS, and core curriculum) are implemented with fidelity across all grade levels to decrease the number of students needing additional interventions and remediation.</p>	<p>2A1 <b>Tier 1:</b> All students will participate in weekly inquiry based learning, hands-on laboratory experiments following the district's scope and sequence pacing guide and the Five E's Planning Model. Lab activities weekly and use a common lab report format to document hands-on investigations.</p>	<p>2A1 District and State Science Specialist, Science Coach, and AP's</p>	<p>2A1 Focus walks/classroom visits will be conducted by the administrative team and Science Coach will push into 5<sup>th</sup> grade classrooms</p>	<p>2A1 FCIM Assessment data Classroom Walkthroughs Data Notebooks Lesson Plans FCAT Explore Student Portfolio IBA's LSA's</p>		



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

<p><b>Science Goal #2A:</b> A minimum of 15% of grade 5 students will score Level 4 or 5 on the Science FCAT.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	7% (7/96)	8% (8/96)					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
<p><b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</p>	1.1.	1.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
<p><b>Science Goal #2B:</b> NA</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	NA	NA					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	

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

		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--

*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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Creating lesson plans releasing the 5 E's model	5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	State Coach Kris Henderson Science Coach Tommie Mercer	Science Coach 5 <sup>th</sup> grade teachers	Every Tuesday	Classroom Walk-through	State Coach Science Coach Administration
Higher Questioning: Webb's Depth of Knowledge Item Specifications /Content	5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	State Coach Kris Henderson Science Coach Tommie Mercer	Science Coach 5 <sup>th</sup> grade teachers	Every Tuesday	Classroom Walk-through	State Coach Science Coach Administration
Integration of STEM lessons	5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	State Coach Kris Henderson Science Coach Tommie Mercer	Science Coach 5 <sup>th</sup> grade teachers	Every Tuesday	Classroom Walk-through	State Coach Science Coach Administration

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

Data Analysis Lesson Planning Focus Calendar	5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	State Coach Kris Henderson Science Coach Tommie Mercer	Science Coach 5 <sup>th</sup> grade teachers	Every Tuesday	Data Notebook, Oncourse lesson plans posted weekly	State Coach Science Coach Administration
FAIR Data Analysis/ Common Core Standards	5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	State Coach Holli & Reading Coach Zabrina Science Coach Tommie Mercer	3 <sup>rd</sup> , 4 <sup>th</sup> , 5 <sup>th</sup> ELA and Science teachers Reading Coach (PLC)	Every Tuesday	Data Notebook, Oncourse lesson plans posted weekly	State Coach Reading Coach Science Coach Administration

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

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

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

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

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

*End of Science Goals*

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

**Writing Goals**

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

<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		
<b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>	1A.1. Teachers lack the Knowledge and understanding of how to score a piece of writing at the level and rigor of the state as defined on the Florida Writing 2.0 rubric.	1A.1. Whole Staff Calibration of Anchor Papers in order to build understanding across content areas.	1A.1. AP Walsh, Literacy Leadership Team	1A.1. PLC Calibrations Classroom Walk-Throughs Student Revised and Scored Work Teacher Conferencing documentation and feedback	1A.1. Write Score Reports Limelight Reports Student Polished Work with Grading Rubrics		

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

<p><u>Writing Goal #1A:</u> 100% (103/103) of all 4th grade students will score at or above a level 3 on the SSS component of the FCAT Writing. 78% of all 4<sup>th</sup> grade students will score at or above a level 4 on the SSS component of the FCAT Writing.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>75% (78/103) of all 4<sup>th</sup> grade students were at or above a Level 3.</p>	<p>83% (86/103) of all 4<sup>th</sup> grade students score at or above a Level 3.</p>					
		<p>1A.2. Teachers are not coordinating with the reading teacher in order to connect reading and writing and do not understand Common Core Standards.</p>	<p>1A.2. Teachers will take part in weekly 90 minute PLCs that will focus on the reciprocal nature of reading and writing. They will learn to connect authentic and complex literature to the instruction of daily writing with emphasis on standards from the Common Core Standards.</p>	<p>1A.2. Classroom Teacher, Literacy Leadership Team, State and District Coaches</p>	<p>1A.2. Lesson Plans Classroom Observations and Walk-Throughs PLC Discussions Students Work Data Notebooks Conference Logs</p>	<p>1A.2. Write Score Reports Limelight Reports</p>	

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

		1A.3. Students lack the understanding of how to produce a piece of writing that meets the standard.	1A.3. Common Core Standards will be utilized to develop Teaching/Learning Rubrics to assist students in student understanding what is expected of a writing piece that meets that standards.	1A.3. Academic Coaches, State and District Coaches	1A.3. Walk-Throughs, PLC Calibrations Student Revised Works, Conference Logs, Grading Rubrics	1A.3. Benchmark Results	
		1A. Teachers struggles with planning for whole day content area instruction that includes writing integration.	PLCs will focus on Lesson Study utilizing student data to drive instruction.	Admin, State and District Coaches	Lesson Observations, OnCourse Lesson Plans	Student Writing Portfolios, Data Notebooks	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b>	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1		
<u>Writing Goal #1B:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	NA	NA					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	



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

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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Lucy Calkin Writing Training	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	Lucy Calkin	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade EIA and AP Walsh	September 15 <sup>th</sup>	Classroom Instructional Observations, Lesson Plans, Student Work	Administration, Lead Literacy Team
District Writing Training at North Shore	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	Distict	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA and AP Walsh	September 7 <sup>th</sup>	Classroom Instructional Observations and Walk-Throughs, Lesson Plans, Student Work	Administration, Lead Literacy Team
Calibrating Writing to FCAT 2.0 Specifications	Writing	Admin, Coaches	School-Wide	Weekly PLCs	Student Scored Work, Writing Conference Logs	Administration, Lead Literacy Team

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Steck Vaughn Elements of Vocabulary	Explicit Grade Level Vocabulary program	Title 1	1,500
<b>Subtotal: 1,500</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Write Score, LLC	Professional Writing Analysis and Scoring Company	Title 1	1,654.62
<b>Subtotal: 1,654.62</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:</b>			

*End of Writing Goals*

**Attendance Goal(s)**

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (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**

<p><b>1. Attendance</b></p>	<p>1.1. Parents are not notifying the school with address and number changes.</p>	<p>1.1. Send home an attendance letter each progress report to all students who have missed or been tardy more than three days by mid quarter and require parents to sign notice of a meeting to be held at the school to inform parents of the impact tardies and absenteeism has on student learning.</p>	<p>1.1. Attendance clerk and MTSS Team</p>	<p>1.1. Baseline data will be collected at the beginning of the school year. Monthly data checks will be conducted in effort to determine effectiveness.</p>	<p>1.1. Data comparison</p>		
<p><u>Attendance Goal #1:</u>  Based upon the 2011-2012 school years attendance rate of 95%, the school will increase the daily average attendance rate by three percentage points (96%).</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p>					
	<p>95% (308/324)</p>	<p>96% (312/324)</p>					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>					

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

	257	232					
	<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>					
		1.2. Many parents are not aware of DCPS attendance, tardy, and early release policies.	1.2. Parents will be informed of DCPS attendance , tardy, and early checkout policies at orientation, open house, family connections nights, and parent workshops. Flyers and letters will be sent home to inform them of these policies in Tuesday Communication Folders.	1.2. CRT, Admin, Guidance Counselor, Parental Involvement Coordinator (PIC), Parent Liaison, and classroom teachers	1.2. Monitor checkout and tardy logs. Baseline data will be collected at the beginning of the school year. Monthly data checks will be conducted in effort to determine effectiveness.	1.2. Oncourse reports and data comparison	
		1.3. Teachers are not notifying parents via phone or agenda regarding excessive absences and tardies.	1.3. Provide professional development to instructional staff regarding the expectation of DCPS policies and parent.	1.3. Office Staff, Parent Liaison, Parental Involvement Coordinator, ISSP Part Time Facilitator.	1.3. Monitor attendance, periodically review parent communication logs	1.3. Analyze data and trends to determine the effectiveness of staff education	

**Attendance Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning</b>						
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

<b>Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
<b>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</b>	<b>Grade Level/ Subject</b>	<b>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</b>	<b>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</b>	<b>Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</b>	<b>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</b>	<b>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</b>
Parent Communication and the district attendance and tardy policy.	pre-k through 5	Parental Involvement Coordinator and Parent Liaison	School-wide	Monthly	Instructional staff; Office staff; contact logs	Principal, Assistant Principals, and Guidance Counselor

**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			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

<p><b>1. Suspension</b></p>	<p>1.1. Students not aware of expectations in the classroom and common areas of the schools</p>	<p>1.1. Re-implement Foundations for common area expectations/ behaviors and train the 23 new teachers to our staff on the basics of CHAMPS for classroom / instructional expectations/ behaviors. As students are sent to an AP with a referral, AP will include some counseling with student to minimize repeat offenders as much as possible.</p>	<p>1.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional coaches, and Guidance Counselor.</p>	<p>1.1. Observation of students and classes in common areas and in their classrooms during instruction.</p>	<p>1.1. Students adhering to expectations used in CHAMPS for any instructional activity.</p>		
<p><u>Suspension Goal #1:</u> To reduce the number in and out of school suspensions from the 2011-12 school year by 20% (228/285). In selected cases of discipline we will use ISSP instead of OSSP where appropriate. This will lead to a higher number of ISSP's.</p>	<p><u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>					

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

	146	131					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	146	131					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	139	125					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	139	125					
		1.2. Students are not aware of expectations in the classroom and common areas of the school.	1.2. Proactive approach with students to reinforce school dress/appearance code as well as reinforcing behavioral expectations through the use of CHAMPS with every activity during the school day.	1.2. Admin, Instructional coaches, and Foundations Team (School Couture)	1.2. Observation of students and classes in common areas and in their classrooms during instruction.	1.2. Students adhering to Expectations used in CHAMPS for any instructional activity.	
		1.3. 14 new teacher to the faculty, 8 of which are first year teachers.	1.3. Host a District Wide CHAMPS training to provide convenience for first year and new teachers to the district.	1.3. District MINT Cadre, Admin, PDF, and Academic Coaches	1.3. Observation of students and classes in common areas and in their classrooms during instruction.	1.3. Students adhering to expectations used in School Wide Discipline Plan. CHAMPS Sign-In Sheet	



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

**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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Train Teachers on Foundations/CHAMPS	PK-5	Admin, Academic Coaches, District Personnel, Foundations Team	School Wide	Early Release	Daily Classroom Observations and Visits	Admin, Academic Coaches, MINT Cadre

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

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

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

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:</b>			

*End of Suspension Goals*

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

**Dropout Prevention Goal(s)**

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

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

<b>Dropout Prevention Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention</b>						
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. Dropout Prevention</b>							
<u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
	NA	NA					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Dropout Prevention Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through</b>						

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

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

<b>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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

**Dropout Prevention Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

*End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*

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

**Parent Involvement Goal(s)**

**Upload Option-**For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.

**Online Template-** For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

<b>Parent Involvement Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement</b>						
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>	1.1. Time and Scheduling of events	1.1. Provide multiple sessions on the same topic to fit with parents varying schedules and responsibilities.	1.1. Admin, Academic Coaches, Parental Involvement Coordinator, Parent Liaison	1.1. Attendance, Agendas, Event Calendar	1.1. Sign-In Sheets, Workshop Evaluation Forms		
<u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> To increase parental involvement by twenty-five percent during the 2012-2013 school year.	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
	16% (118/740)	20% (148/740)					

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

		1.2.Limited knowledge about the district curriculum, FCAT expectations and procedures, school and district sponsored activities for parents and students.	1.2.In addition to monthly Tuesday Folder Calendars, updated marquee, the parent liaison and Parental Involvement Coordinator will use a phone campaign to reach out personally to parents prior to school sponsored events.	1.2. Admin, Parent Involvement Coordinator, and Parent Liaison	1.2. Anecdotal notes from phone contact, Increased Parental Involvement in the Title Parent Involvement Center	1.2. Sign-In Sheets, Agendas, Workshop Evaluation Forms	
		1.3.Limited number of male role models for students	1.3.Real Men Wear P.I.N.K. program	1.3.Principal, Parent Liaison, Mr. S, Thompkins, W. Jackson	1.3.The attendance, grades, behavior, and school involvement will be monitored for the students the impacted by this program.	1.3. Compiled Component Data from mentor logged hours and events.	

**Parent Involvement 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 professional development or PLC activity.</p>							
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Building Ties between home and school	PK-5	Parent Involvement Coordinator, Parent Liaison	School Wide	Quarterly at Early Release Trainings	Evaluation and Surveys	



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

**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
Kindle E Readers and Books	Electronic Readers	Title 1 Parental Involvement Funds	1,000
<b>Subtotal:1,000</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Storeroom orders for Parent Make & Take Workshop supplies		Title Parent Involvement Funds	460.00
<b>Subtotal: 460.00</b>			
<b>Total:1,460.00</b>			

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

<b>STEM Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>STEM Goal #1:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**STEM Professional Development**

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

**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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

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

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

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

**Additional Goal(s)**

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

<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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		
<b>1. Additional Goal</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<b>Additional Goal #1:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

**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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

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

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

*End of Additional Goal(s)*



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

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

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$ 4,087.09</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$11,500</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total: 3,154.62</b>
<b>Civics Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>U.S. History Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$1,450.</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>CTE Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total:</b>

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

<b>Grand Total: \$20,191.71</b>
---------------------------------

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

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

**Differentiated Accountability**

**School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance**

Please choose the school’s DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under “Default value” header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an “x” in the box.)

<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.

- 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 SAC will be working on ways to support the overarching theme for the next several years “Blast off to College Preparation”. Andrew Robinson is a Science, Mathematics, and Pre-Engineering magnet and we are in the process of reculturalization to give our students a better chance of preparing for and achieving entrance into a college at the end of their K-12 academic career. SAC will try to increase the parental and community involvement in conjunction with the school’s Marketing Committee.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
We will use these funds to ensure that each student receives a student planner to assist them in organizing their student work requirements, thereby giving them a better chance of success in accomplishing their learning assignments and goals.	1928.00

**June 2012**

**Rule 6A-1.099811**

**Revised April 29, 2011**

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