

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: Pine View Elementary School | District Name: Pasco County |
| Principal: Judith Cosh | Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino |
| 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) |
|---------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Principal | Judith Cosh | BS, MA Educational Leadership, Certification ESOL | 1.5 | 7 | 2011-2012- A, 82% proficient in reading, 79% proficient in math, 82% proficient in writing, 69% making learning gains in reading, 70% making learning gains in math |
| Assistant Principal | Traci Hemingway | BS, MA Elementary Ed/ Educational Leadership, MA Reading K-12, Certification ESE, Certification ESOL | 5 | 2 | 2011-2012- A, 82% proficient in reading, 79% proficient in math, 82% proficient in writing, 69% making learning gains in reading, 70% making learning gains in math |

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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) |
|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| K-12 Literacy Coach | Lacey Kwasnicki | Masters/Reading K-12 | 2 | 2 | 2011-2012- A, 82% proficient in reading, 79% proficient in math, 82% proficient in writing, 69% making learning gains in reading, 70% making learning gains in math |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Highly Effective Teachers

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date |
|--|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Utilize a thorough screening/interview process. | Administration | End of 2013 year |
| 2. Provide a professional learning environment in which staff is trained, coached and supported. | Literacy Coach/Administration | End of 2013 year |
| 3. Provide weekly grade level planning sessions with coaching and support. | Grade Level Team Leaders, Literacy Coach/Administration | End of 2013 year |
| 4. | | |

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

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 56 | 4% (2) | 54% (30) | 23% (13) | 20% (11) | 34% (19) | 100% (56) | 5% (3) | 2% (1) | 56 |

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|-----------------|------------------|---|---|
| Marla Connick | Kristine Mullins | A teacher who could support her throughout the year | Weekly planning, provide support and feedback ongoing, coaching |
| Morgan Alparone | Diane Epifanio | A teacher who could support her throughout the year | Weekly planning, provide support and feedback ongoing, coaching |

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

| | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Madison Stariniari | Jessica Gladden | A teacher who could support her throughout the year | Weekly planning, provide support and feedback ongoing, coaching |
| | | | |
| Veronica Emma | Kelli Boyers | A teacher who could support her throughout the year | Weekly planning, provide support and feedback ongoing, coaching |
| Christine Reed | Kathleen Zuziak | A teacher who could support her throughout the year | Weekly planning, provide support and feedback ongoing, coaching |
| Holly Vandiver | Karen Bailey | A teacher who could support her throughout the year | Weekly planning, provide support and feedback ongoing, coaching |

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Judith Cosh – Principal, Traci Hemingway – Assistant Principal, Lacey Kwasnicki – Literacy Coach, Lynn Roth – Psychologist, Anjanette Todd – Guidance Counselor, Michelle Mitchell – Staffing and Compliance Teacher, Christie Stewart - Speech/Language Pathologist, Casey Vierra – School Nurse, Kelly Boyers – RtI teacher, Tina Porche – 1st Grade Teacher, Robin Lash – 4th Grade Teacher

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?

As our school enters Year Two of the MTSS process, the school-based MTSS Leadership team will continue to assess the needs of the our school, learn more information about the MTSS framework through the district wide training opportunities, and continue to strive to achieve a consensus among the leadership team to put MTSS into place. We will begin TBIT meetings with all grade levels twice a month. During this phase, effective use of data will continue to be central to the development of action plans and in obtaining measureable benchmarks of progress for all Core subjects. The MTSS leadership team will work closely with the grade level teams to evaluate their progress, adjust practices based on the evaluation and monitor changes to ensure sustainability of MTSS across the grade levels. During the TBIT meetings, grade level liaisons will facilitate discussions around Tier I and II interventions. The MTSS leadership team will meet after each TBIT meeting to debrief and discuss implications for the grade levels.

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?

Our goal is to assist our TBIT facilitators to be skilled in data based decision-making using summative assessments. The grade level teachers will implement lesson plans that are standards-based and followed best practices. Throughout the school year, the MTSS team will monitor the progress of the all the classes in regards to the progress the students are making towards our school's improvement goals and objectives.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Formative and summative student assessment data is available to instructional staff members through Pasco Star, PMRN, and CORE K12. Data reviews will take place three times a year with each grade level to monitor instructional practices across all core subjects and discuss implications of the planning process in regards to the data shared.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

We continue to focus on the Problem-Solving Process as we work towards building consensus across all the grade levels, our MTSS team, as well as our facilitator team. The MTSS team, along with the grade level teachers will meet twice a month. The MTSS team will participate in district training sessions throughout the school year to continue to learn about the problem solving and response to intervention process.

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.

We will continue to focus on the Problem-Solving Process as we build consensus across all grade levels and our MTSS team. The MTSS team, along with the grade level teachers will meet twice a month. The MTSS team will participate in district training sessions throughout the school year to learn about the problem solving and response to intervention process.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Judith Cosh – Principal, Traci Hemingway – Assistant Principal, Tina Porche – 1st Grade Teacher, Robin McNickle – Kindergarten Teacher, Kristine Mullins – 5th Grade Teacher, Diane Epifanio – 2nd Grade Teacher, Karen Bailey – 3rd Grade Teacher, Robin Lash – 4th Grade Teacher, Aimee Carter – 5th Grade Teacher, Kelli Boyers – RtI Teacher, Lacey Kwasnicki – Literacy Coach

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

Meeting once a month to discuss literacy instruction related to Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and the upcoming Common Core.

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

In our efforts for teachers to discover how students see themselves as readers, teachers will continue to focus on matching students to text. Teachers will become skillful at infusing feedback strategies and selecting a quality text to match the purpose of the shared reading lesson. The LLT members will develop a feedback rubric to analyze student responses and teacher actions. Utilizing the backwards-planning model related to literacy instruction, teams will focus on the instructional practices (setting purpose, active engagement, and reflection).

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

| Reading Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. | 1A.1. Students are not being provided immediate feedback related to their literacy learning. | 1A.1. Ongoing professional development for teachers to develop an understanding of how to generate immediate feedback to learners during shared reading. | 1A.1. Administration, Professional Learning Community Leaders, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, classroom teachers | 1A.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 1A.1. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments, Feedback Rubric, Data | | |
| <u>Reading Goal #1A:</u> We will have 25% of our 3 rd , 4 th , and 5 th grade students scoring a level 3. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | Grade 3 – 14% (19/132) Grade 4 – 22% (27/122) Grade 5 27% (35/ 128) | Grade 3 – 25% Grade 4 – 25% Grade 5 – 25% | | | | | |
| | | 1A.2. Students not transitioning skills from whole group instruction into their independent reading. | 1A.2. Teachers will individually conference with students and provide on the spot feedback. | 1A.2. Administration, Professional Learning Community Leaders, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, classroom teachers | 1A.2. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 1A.2. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments, Feedback Rubric, Data | |
| | | 1A.3. Teachers lack the knowledge of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the need for increased rigor and complex texts. | 1A.3. Teachers will actively participate in professional development centered on the CCSS. They will acquire new knowledge and refine understanding by participating in collaborative activities and conversations through whole group as well as small grade level groups. | 1A.3. Literacy Coach Administration | 1A.3. Structured coaching/mentoring to monitor effectiveness | 1A.3. Reflections, discussions, observations and lesson plans, MMH Assessments, FAIR, FCAT | |
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | | |
| <u>Reading Goal #1B:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | |
| | | 1B.3 | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | |

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

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| 2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading. | 2A.1. Students not being provided immediate feedback related to their literacy learning. | 2A.1. Ongoing professional development for teachers to develop an understanding of how to generate immediate feedback to learners during shared reading. | 2A.1. Administration, Professional Learning Community Leaders, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team | 2A.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 2A.1. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments, Feedback Rubric, Data | | |
| <u>Reading Goal #2A:</u> We will have 60% of our 3 rd , 4 th , and 5 th grade students scoring at least a level 4 or 5. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>Grade 3 – 52% (69/132) Grade 4 – 56% (68/122) Grade 5 – 45% (58/128)</i> | <i>Grade 3 – 60% Grade 4 – 60% Grade 5 – 60%</i> | | | | | |
| | | 2A.2. Students not transitioning skills from whole group instruction into their independent reading. | 2A.2. Teachers will individually conference with students and provide on the spot feedback. | 2A.2. Administration, Professional Learning Community Leaders, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, classroom teachers | 2A.2. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 2A.2. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments, Feedback Rubric, Data | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | 2A.3 Students are not extending and refining their knowledge through research and inquiry projects. | 2A.3 Teachers will incorporate the MMH research and inquiry projects. | 2A.3 Administration, Professional Learning Community Leaders, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, classroom teachers | 2A.3 Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 2A.3 FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments, Data | |
| 2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | | |
| <u>Reading Goal #2B:</u> N/A | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | |
| | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | |

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

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|-------|--|
| 3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. | 3A.1. Interventions given to students outside the context of the classroom using different resources. | 3A.1. Improve the core instruction through the use of ongoing assessments and embed the differentiated interventions into the instruction. | 3A.1. Classroom teachers, Literacy Coach | 3A.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 3A.1. Ongoing progress monitoring, FAIR | | |
| <u>Reading Goal #3A:</u> There will be a 5% increase in the number of students making learning gains in fourth and fifth grade. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 63% (156/249) of our 4 th and 5 th grade students made learning gains in reading. | 68% of our 4 th and 5 th grade students will make learning gains in reading. | | | | | |
| | | 3A.2. | 3A.2. | 3A.2. | 3A.2. | 3A.2. | |

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | |
| 3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | | |
| <u>Reading Goal #3B:</u> N/A | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | |
| | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | |

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

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 | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | 4A.1. Teachers not identifying which students in their class fall into this category. | 4A.1. Using Pasco Star/Esembler, teachers will identify which students in fourth and fifth grade make up the lowest 25% learning gains. | 4A.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers | 4A.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 4A.1. Quarterly Data Reviews, ongoing monitoring, FAIR | | |
| Reading Goal #4A: <i>We will have a 5% increase in the lowest 25% of fourth and fifth graders making learning gains</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 50% (41/82) of our lowest 25% of 4 th and 5 th grade made learning gains in reading. | We will have at least 55% of our lowest 25% of 4 th and 5 th grade will make learning gains in reading. | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| | | 4A.2. Student not able to independently select a just right text. | 4A.2. Teacher development in instructing students on how to pick "good fit" books. | 4A.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers | 4A.2. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 4A.2. Ongoing monitoring through weekly conferencing | |
| | | 4A.3. Schedules did not allow time for teachers to conference with students | 4A.3. Weekly conferencing using text dependent questioning | 4A.3. Administration, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers, Special Area Teachers | 4A.3. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 4A.3. Ongoing monitoring through weekly conferencing | |
| 4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | | |
| <u>Reading Goal #4B:</u> N/A | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 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), identify reading and mathematics | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| performance target for the following years | | | | | | | |
| 5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Baseline data 2010-2011 | 74% of our 3 rd , 4 th , and 5 th grade students were proficient on the Reading section of the FCAT. | 78% of our 3 rd , 4 th , and 5 th grade students will be proficient on the Reading section of the FCAT. | 81% of our 3 rd , 4 th , and 5 th grade students will be proficient on the Reading section of the FCAT. | 83% of our 3 rd , 4 th , and 5 th grade students will be proficient on the Reading section of the FCAT. | 85% of our 3 rd , 4 th , and 5 th grade students will be proficient on the Reading section of the FCAT. | 87% of our 3 rd , 4 th , and 5 th grade students will be proficient on the Reading section of the FCAT. |
| <u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> By June 2013, the percentage of non-proficient students in reading during the 2010-2011 SY will decrease by 3% from 18% to 17%. The goal for the 2016-2017 school year will be an overall decrease in non-proficient students of 50%. | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | 5B.1. Teachers not identifying the students in their class who fall into this category. | 5B.1. Using Pasco Star/Esembler, teachers will identify which Hispanic students are in their third, fourth and fifth grade classes | 5B.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, classroom teachers | 5B.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 5B.1. Quarterly Data Reviews, ongoing monitoring, FAIR | | |

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

| Reading Goal #5B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| <i>We will have a 10% increase in number of Hispanic students scoring in the proficient range.</i> | | | | | | | |
| | Hispanic: 60% (46/77) scored at or above grade level in reading | Hispanic: 70% will score at or above grade level in reading | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. Student not able to independently select a just right text. | 5B.2. Teacher development in instructing students on how to pick "good fit" books. | 5B.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, classroom teachers | 5B.2. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 5B.2 Ongoing monitoring through weekly conferencing | |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> | <p>5C.1. Teachers not identifying which students in their class fall into this category.</p> | <p>5C.1. Using Pasco Star/Esembler, teachers will identify which students in fourth and fifth grade make up the lowest 25% learning gains.</p> | <p>5C.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers</p> | <p>5C.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities</p> | <p>5C.1. Quarterly Data Reviews, ongoing monitoring, FAIR</p> | | |
| <p><u>Reading Goal #5C:</u> <i>We will have a 5% decrease in number of Hispanic students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</i></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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| | 40% (31/77) of our Hispanic students in grades 3, 4, and 5 did not make satisfactory progress in reading. | No more than 35% of our Hispanic students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will fall into the not making progress category | | | | | |
| | | 5C.2. Student not able to independently select a just right text. | 5C.2. Teacher development in instructing students on how to pick "good fit" books. | 5C.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, classroom teachers | 5C.2. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 5C.2. Ongoing monitoring through weekly conferencing | |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | 5D.1. Teachers not identifying which students in their class fall into this category. | 5D.1. Using Pasco Star/Esembler, teachers will identify which students in fourth and fifth grade make up the lowest 25% learning gains. | 5D.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers | 5D.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 5D.1. Quarterly Data Reviews, ongoing monitoring, FAIR | | |

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

| Reading Goal #5D: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <i>We will have a 5% decrease in number of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading.</i> | | | | | | | |
| | 57% (16/28) of our students with disabilities were not making satisfactory progress in reading. | No more than 52% of our students with disabilities will fall into the not making satisfactory progress category in reading. | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. Student not able to independently select a just right text. | 5D.2. Teacher development in instructing students on how to pick "good fit" books. | 5D.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, classroom teachers | 5D.2. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 5D.2. Ongoing monitoring through weekly conferencing | |
| | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | |

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

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. | 5E.1. Teachers not identifying which students in their class fall into this category. | 5E.1. Using Pasco Star/Esembler, teachers will identify which students in fourth and fifth grade make up the lowest 25% learning gains. | 5E.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers | 5E.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 5E.1. Quarterly Data Reviews, ongoing monitoring, FAIR | | |
| <u>Reading Goal #5E:</u> <i>We will have a 5% decrease in number of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 43% (61/141) of our economically disadvantaged students were not making satisfactory progress in reading. | No more than 38% of our economically disadvantaged students will fall into the not making satisfactory progress category in reading. | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | 5E.2. Student not able to independently select a just right text. | 5E.2. Teacher development in instructing students on how to pick "good fit" books. | 5E.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, classroom teachers | 5E.2. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 5E.2. Ongoing monitoring through weekly conferencing | |
| | | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | |

Reading Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring |
| Common Core State Standards | K-5, reading | Lacey Pelham, K12 Literacy Coach | All instructional staff | Bi-Monthly-whole group Weekly-grade level teams | Individualized coaching sessions, school walk-throughs | Lead Literacy Team, Administration, Literacy Coach |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| CELLA Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|------|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. | 1.1. Limited access to resources | 1.1. Supplemental Language learning software usage (Rosetta Stone) | 1.1. Classroom Teacher, ESOL Instructional Assistant, ESOL Resource Teacher | 1.1. Student data from CELLA Student data from language learning software | 1.1. CELLA, FCAT, CORE k12, MMH Unit Assessments | |
| CELLA Goal #1: <i>We will have a 5% increase in number of ELL students scoring in the proficient range in listening and speaking on the CELLA.</i> | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: | | | | | |
| | 56% (14/25) of our ELL students were proficient in Listening and Speaking on the CELLA. | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|------|
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading. | 2.1. Limited access to resources | 2.1. Supplemental Language learning software usage (Rosetta Stone) | 2.1. Classroom Teacher, ESOL Instructional Assistant, ESOL Resource Teacher | 2.1. Student data from CELLA Student data from language learning software | 2.1 CELLA, FCAT, CORE k12, MMH Unit Assessments | |
| CELLA Goal #2: We will have a 5% increase in the number of ELL students scoring in the proficient range on the reading CELLA. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: | | | | | |
| | 40% (10/25) of our ELL students were proficient in reading on the CELLA. | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

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

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|------|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. | 2.2. Limited access to resources | 2.2. Supplemental Language learning software usage (Rosetta Stone) | 2.2. Classroom Teacher, ESOL Instructional Assistant, ESOL Resource Teacher | 2.2. Student data from CELLA Student data from language learning software | 2.2. CELLA, Florida Writes, MMH unit writing prompts and process writes | |
| <u>CELLA Goal #3:</u> We will have a 5% increase in the number of ELL students scoring proficient in writing on the CELLA. | <u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing:</u> | | | | | |
| | 20% of our ELL students scored proficient in writing on the CELLA. | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

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

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

| Elementary Mathematics Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. | 1A.1. Lack of standards driven instruction. | 1A.1. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning using the backwards-planning model. | 1A.1. Administration, Grade Level Team Leaders | 1A.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 1A.1. Lesson Plans, Chapter Tests, Progress Reviews, CORE K-12 | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A: We will have a 5% increase in the number of students scoring a level 3 in math on the FCAT. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 24% (92/378) of students scored a level 3 in math on the FCAT | At least 29% of students will score a level 3 in math on the FCAT | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | |
| | | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | |
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u> N/A | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | |
| | | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics. | 2A.1. Lack of standards driven instruction. | 2A.1. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning using the backwards-planning model. | 2A.1. Administration, Grade Level Team Leaders | 2A.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 2A.1. Lesson Plans, Chapter Tests, Progress Reviews, CORE K-12 | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u> We will have a 5% increase in the number of students scoring a level 4 or higher in math on the FCAT. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 68% (257/378) of students scored a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT. | At least 73% of our students will score a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT. | | | | | |
| | | 2A.2. Lack of extending and refining lessons. | 2A.2. Teachers and Instructional Staff will be trained on the implementation of the Sunshine Math Enrichment Program | 2A.2. Math Representative, Administration | 2A.2. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 2A.2. Lesson Plans, Chapter Tests, Progress Reviews, CORE K-12 | |
| | | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | |
| 2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | | |

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

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

| <u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#2B:</u> | <u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|--|---|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | |
| | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | |

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

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. | 3A.1. Lack of standards driven instruction. | 3A.1. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning using the backwards-planning model. | 3A.1. 3 Administration, Grade Level Team Leaders | 3A.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 3A.1. Lesson Plans, Chapter Tests, Progress Reviews, CORE K-12 | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u> We will have a 5% increase in the number of students making learning gains in math on the FCAT. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 61% (152/248) of our 4 th and 5 th grade students made learning gains in math on the FCAT. | We will have at least 66% of the students making learning gains in math on the FCAT. | | | | | |
| | | 3A.2. Lack of a math committee | 3A.2. At least one grade level representative will be on the Math Literacy Committee (MLT) that will meet once a month | 3A.2. Administration, MLT Facilitator | 3A.2. Data analysis during MLT meetings | 3A.2. Lesson plans, Chapter Tests, MLT meetings, Progress Reviews, CORE K-12 | |
| | | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | |
| 3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | | |

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

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

| <u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#3B:</u> | <u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|--|---|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | |
| | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | |

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

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 | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. | 4A.1. Lack of standards driven instruction. | 4A.1. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning using the backwards-planning model. | 4A.1. Administration, Grade Level Team Leaders | 4A.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 4A.1. Lesson Plans, Chapter Tests, Progress Reviews, CORE K-12 | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u> We will have a 5% increase in the number of students making learning gains in math on the FCAT. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 61% (152/248) of our 4 th and 5 th grade students in the lowest quartile made learning gains. | 64% of our 4 th and 5 th grade students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains | | | | | |
| | | 4A.2. Lack of a math committee | 4A.2. At least one grade level representative will be on the Math Literacy Committee (MLT) that will meet once a month | 4A.2. Administration, MLT Facilitator | 4A.2. Data analysis during MLT meetings | 4A.2. Lesson plans, Chapter Tests, MLT meetings, Progress Reviews, CORE K-12 | |
| | | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| <p>4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p> | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #4B:</u> N/A</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p> | <p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | | 4B.2. | 4B.2. | 4B.2. | 4B.2. | 4B.2. | |
| | | 4B.3. | 4B.3. | 4B.3. | 4B.3. | 4B.3. | |

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

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

| Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
|--|--------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Baseline data 2010-2011 | 68% of our 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students were proficient on the Math FCAT. | 71% of our 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students will be proficient on the Math FCAT. | 74% of our 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students will be proficient on the Math FCAT. | 76% of our 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students will be proficient on the Math FCAT. | 79% of our 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students will be proficient on the Math FCAT. | 82% of our 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students will be proficient on the Math FCAT. |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> By June 2013, the percentage of non-proficient students in math during the 2010-2011 SY will decrease by 3% from 25% to 24%. The 2016-2017 school year goal will be an overall decrease in non-proficient students of 50%. | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> | <p>5B.1. Lack of standards driven instruction.</p> | <p>5B.1. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning using the backwards-planning model.</p> | <p>5B.1. Administration, Grade Level Team Leaders</p> | <p>5B.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities</p> | <p>5B.1. Lesson Plans, Chapter Tests, Progress Reviews, CORE K-12</p> | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> <i>We will have a 10% increase in number of Hispanic students scoring in the proficient range.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>Hispanic: 45% (35/77) ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in math.</p> | <p>At least 55% of our Hispanic ELL students will make satisfactory progress in math.</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>5B.2. Teachers not identifying the students in their class who fall into this category.</p> | <p>5B.2. Using Pasco Star/Esembler, teachers will identify which students in third, fourth and fifth grade make up the Hispanic population of their class</p> | <p>5B.2. Administration, classroom teachers</p> | <p>5B.2. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities</p> | <p>5B.2. Quarterly Data Reviews, ongoing monitoring, CORE K-12</p> | |
| | | <p>5B.3.</p> | <p>5B.3.</p> | <p>5B.3.</p> | <p>5B.3.</p> | <p>5B.3.</p> | |

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

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 5C.1. Lack of standards driven instruction. | 5C.1. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning using the backwards-planning model. | 5C.1. Administration, Grade Level Team Leaders | 5C.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 5C.1. Lesson Plans, Chapter Tests, Progress Reviews, CORE K-12 | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> <i>We will have a 10% increase in number of ELL students scoring in the proficient range.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 53% (41/77) of our ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in math. | At least 63% of our ELL students will make satisfactory progress in math. | | | | | |
| | | 5C.2. Teachers not identifying the students in their class who fall into this category. | 5C.2. Using Pasco Star/Esembler, teachers will identify which students in third, fourth and fifth grade make up the Hispanic population of their class | 5C.2. Administration, classroom teachers | 5C.2. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 5C.2. Quarterly Data Reviews, ongoing monitoring, CORE K-12 | |
| | | 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 | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 5D.1. Lack of standards driven instruction. | 5D.1. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning using the backwards-planning model. | 5D.1. Administration, Grade Level Team Leaders | 5D.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 5D.1. Lesson Plans, Chapter Tests, Progress Reviews, CORE K-12 | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u> <i>We will have a 10% increase in number of SWD students scoring in the proficient range.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 54% (15/28) of our SWD did not make satisfactory progress in math. | At least 64% of our SWD will make satisfactory progress in math. | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. Teachers not identifying the students in their class who fall into this category. | 5D.2. Using Pasco Star/Esembler, teachers will identify which students in third, fourth and fifth grade make up the Hispanic population of their class | 5D.2. Administration, classroom teachers | 5D.2. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 5D.2. Quarterly Data Reviews, ongoing monitoring, CORE K-12 | |
| | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|--|--|
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|--|--|

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | | | | |
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 5E.1. Lack of standards driven instruction. | 5E.1. Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning using the backwards-planning model. | 5E.1. Administration, Grade Level Team Leaders | 5E.1. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 5E.1. Lesson Plans, Chapter Tests, Progress Reviews, CORE K-12 | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5E:</u> <i>We will have a 10% increase in amount of economically disadvantaged students scoring in the proficient range.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 49% (69/140) of our economically disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in math. | At least 59% of our economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math. | | | | | |
| | | 5E.2. Teachers not identifying the students in their class who fall into this category. | 5E.2. Using Pasco Star/Esembler, teachers will identify which students in third, fourth and fifth grade make up the Hispanic population of their class | 5E.2. Administration, classroom teachers | 5E.2. Data analysis during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | 5E.2. Quarterly Data Reviews, ongoing monitoring, CORE K-12 | |
| | | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | |

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Mathematics Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Sunshine Math Enrichment | K-5 | Math Rep. | Team Leaders, Instructional Assistants | September 2011 | Lesson plans, Grade Level Planning, Coaching | Math Rep. |
| Backwards Planning | K-5 | Literacy Coach | Classroom Teachers, Literacy Coach, RtI Teacher, ESE Teacher | Weekly | Lesson plans, Grade Level Planning, Coaching | Team Leaders, Administration, Literacy Coach |
| | | | | | | |

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

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| Elementary and Middle Science Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. | 1A.1. Lack of instructional resources to aid in teaching the new standards. | 1A.1. To have all instructional staff utilize the new science series (Fusion) that aligns to our standards. We will also implement a Science Lab where students are given the opportunity to perform experiments based on the standards. | 1A.1. Classroom teachers, Administration | 1A.1. Progress Monitoring, grade level planning time | 1A.1. CORE K-12 Science (grades 2-5), Fusion chapter tests | | |

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

| <u>Science Goal #1A:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| <i>We will have a 10% increase in number of 5th grade students scoring a level 3 in science.</i> | | | | | | | |
| | 35% (44/127) of our 5 th grade students scored a level 3 on the FCAT in science. | At least 45% of our 5 th grade students will score a level 3 on the FCAT in science. | | | | | |
| | | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | |
| | | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | |
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | | |
| <u>Science Goal #1B:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | |
| | | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|-------|--|
| 2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science. | 2A.1. Lack of instructional resources to aid in teaching the new standards. | 2A.1. To have all instructional staff utilize the new science series (Fusion) that aligns to our standards. We will also implement a Science Lab where students are given the opportunity to perform experiments based on the standards. | 2A.1. Classroom teachers, Administration | 2A.1. Progress Monitoring, grade level planning time | 2A.1. CORE K-12 Science (grades 2-5), Fusion chapter tests | | |
| <u>Science Goal #2A:</u> <i>We will have a 10% increase in number of 5th grade students scoring a level 4 or 5 in science.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 28% (36/127) of our 5 th grade students scored a level 4 or 5 in science. | At least 38% of our 5 th grade students will score a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT in science. | | | | | |
| | | 2A.2. | 2A.2. | 2A.2. | 2A.2. | 2A.2. | |
| | | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| 2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | | |
| Science Goal #2B: N/A | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | |
| | | 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

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring |
| Get Fused Planning | K-5 | Grade Level Liaison | Class Teachers | August – May | Lesson Plans, walkthroughs | Science Rep., Grade Level Liaison, 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 |
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| N/A | | | |

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

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

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

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

| Writing Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. | IA.1. Inconsistent use of MMH writing rubric to provide students feedback. | IA.1. Implementation of the MMH writing curriculum and use of the 6-point rubric. | IA.1. Classroom Teacher, Literacy Coach, Administration | IA.1. Analyze data during our Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | IA.1. Observation, Treasure Writing Rubric | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p><u>Writing Goal #1A:</u> <i>We will have a 3% increase in the number of fourth grade students scoring proficiency in writing.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>90% (108/119) of our 4th grade students were proficient in writing.</p> | <p>At least 93% of our 4th grade students will be proficient in writing.</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>1A.2. Teachers lack the knowledge of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the need for increased rigor and writing across the curriculum.</p> | <p>1A.2. Teachers will actively participate in professional development centered around the CCSS. They will acquire new knowledge and refine their understanding by participating in collaborative activities and conversations.</p> | <p>1A.2. Administration Literacy Coach</p> | <p>1A.2. Structured coaching/mentoring to monitor effectiveness</p> | <p>1A.2. Observations, MMH Writing Assessments Pine View Writes, FCAT Writes</p> | |
| | | <p>1A.3.</p> | <p>1A.3.</p> | <p>1A.3.</p> | <p>1A.3.</p> | <p>1A.3.</p> | |
| <p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</p> | <p>1B.1.</p> | <p>1B.1.</p> | <p>1B.1.</p> | <p>1B.1.</p> | <p>1B.1.</p> | | |
| <p><u>Writing Goal #1B:</u> N/A</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p> | <p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | | 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

Writing Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| How to implement MMH Writing | K-5 | Literacy Coach | Classroom Teachers | October-May | Coaching, Sharing writing samples during PLC's, Grade Level Planning | Classroom Teacher, Literacy Coach, administration |
| How to use the MMH scoring Rubric | K-5 | Literacy Coach | Classroom Teachers | October-May | Coaching, Sharing writing samples during PLC's, Grade Level Planning | Classroom Teacher, Literacy Coach, administration |

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Attendance Goal(s) | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>1. Attendance</p> | <p>1.1. Lack of progress monitoring of attendance data.</p> | <p>1.1. Teachers will monitor daily attendance and will call home to inquire about excessive absences or tardies. If needed, the teachers will notify the social worker with all students who continue to have excessive absences or tardies.</p> | <p>1.1. Classroom Teacher, Social Worker, Data Entry</p> | <p>1.1. Progress monitor monthly attendance reports</p> | <p>1.1. esembler, TERMS</p> | | |
| <p><u>Attendance Goal #1:</u> <i>We will have a 10% decrease in the number of students with excessive absences and tardies.</i></p> | <p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>The average daily attendance was 95% (694/728)</i></p> | <p><i>We would expect that 97% of our students will attend school regularly</i></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> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>5% (37/728) of our students had 10 or more absences</i></p> | <p><i>10% or less of our students will have 10 or more absences</i></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| | <u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Tardies (10 or</u> <u>more)</u> | <u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Tardies (10 or</u> <u>more)</u> | | | | | |
| | <i>2% (11/728) of our students had 10 or more absences</i> | <i>10% or less of our students will have 10 or more absences</i> | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Attendance Professional Development

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| | PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring |
| Attendance Procedure Expectations Reviewed | K-5 | Administration and Data Entry | Classroom Teachers | August | Review Attendance monthly | Classroom Teachers, Data Entry, Social Worker |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Suspension Goal(s) | Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1. Suspension | 1.1. Lack of consistent school wide expectations. | 1.1. Develop a set of school wide core beliefs that all students and staff will follow. | 1.1. Whole Faculty | 1.1. Student motivation committee will meet monthly to review the number and type of office referrals to problem solve areas of concern | 1.1. TERMS, Pasco Star | | |
| <u>Suspension Goal #1:</u> Reduce the total number of suspensions by 10%. | <u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u> | | | | | |
| | 9% (6/68) referrals resulted in In-School Suspensions | No more than 8% referrals resulting in In-School Suspensions. | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> | | | | | |
| | 9% (4/68) referrals resulted in In-School Suspensions | No more than 8% referrals resulting in In-School Suspensions. | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| | 6% (4/68) referrals resulted in Out-Of-School Suspensions | No more than 5% referrals resulting in Out-Of-School Suspensions. | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u> | | | | | |
| | 6% (4/68) referrals resulted in Out-Of-School Suspensions | No more than 5% referrals resulting in Out-Of-School Suspensions. | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. Lack of school wide positive behavior system | 1.2. Develop a PBS committee that will meet once a month | 1.2. PBS Facilitator, Administration | 1.2. Student motivation committee will meet monthly to review the number and type of office referrals to problem solve areas of concern | 1.2. TERMS, Pasco Star | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Suspension Professional Development

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| | PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring |
| PBS – Positive Behavior Support | K-5 | Administration and PBS Coach | PVES Staff | August - May | Monthly Committee Meeting | Administration |

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

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

End of Suspension Goals

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

| Parent Involvement Goal(s) | Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1. Parent Involvement | 1.1. Lack of parent notification system other than Connect ED. | 1.1. School wide mass email system will be put into place. | 1.1. Technology Specialist and Principal Secretary | 1.1. Monitor sign in sheets for each parent night. | 1.1. Sign In sheets, Parent Survey | | |
| <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> <i>There will be a 15% increase in the total population who will attend various curriculum and family nights.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> | | | | | |
| | 30% of our families participated in events | 45% of our families will participate in events | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. Lack of information shared with families about the event | 1.2. Connect ED messages sent, flyers explaining the events sent home as well as placed in the newsletter | 1.2. Administration, Technology Specialist, Principal Secretary | 1.2. Monitor sign in sheets for each parent night. | 1.2. Sign In sheets, Parent Survey | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

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

Parent Involvement Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--|--|---|---|---|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Parent Volunteer Orientation | K-5 | Administration and Volunteer Coordinator | All Stakeholders (Parents and Teachers) | September | Monitor amount of parent involvement on family events | Administration and School Secretary |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

| STEM Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|------------------|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| <p>STEM Goal #1:</p> <p>During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase awareness of the STEM initiative by offering teachers opportunities to participate in monthly discussions and training sessions related to lesson ideas and activities involving Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics.</p> | <p>1.1. Lack of awareness about the STEM initiative.</p> | <p>1.1. Teachers will participate in monthly training sessions to build awareness of STEM Education.</p> | <p>1.1. Science Representative, Math Committee Chair, and Administration</p> | <p>1.1. Administration will monitor lesson plans and conduct walkthroughs</p> | <p>1.1. FCAT</p> |

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Please provide the total budget from each section. | |
| Reading Budget | Total:0.00 |
| CELLA Budget | Total:0.00 |
| Mathematics Budget | Total:0.00 |
| Science Budget | Total:0.00 |
| Writing Budget | Total:0.00 |
| Civics Budget | Total:0.00 |
| U.S. History Budget | Total:0.00 |
| Attendance Budget | Total:0.00 |
| Suspension Budget | Total:0.00 |
| Dropout Prevention Budget | Total:0.00 |
| Parent Involvement Budget | Total:0.00 |
| STEM Budget | Total:0.00 |
| CTE Budget | Total:0.00 |
| Additional Goals | Total:0.00 |
| | |

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

Grand Total:0.00

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.)

| School Differentiated Accountability Status | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <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. |
| SAC members will meet regularly to discuss school improvement, review the results of grade level common assessments, provide recommendations to the school for safety concerns, monitor the school's progress in attaining goals set out in the SIP, prepare and distribute information to parents and public |

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

| Describe the projected use of SAC funds. | Amount |
|--|---------|
| Subs for administering FAIR to all K-2 classes | 2210.00 |
| | |
| | |