

# Florida Department of Education



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

**Proposed for 2012-2013**

**2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

**PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS**

**School Information**

School Name: SEVEN OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	District Name: Pasco
Principal: Mrs. BJ Smith	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: Mrs. Dionne Parks	Date of School Board Approval: TBA

**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**

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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	Mrs. BJ Smith	B.S. Ed. Music M. Ed. Guidance and Counseling Educational Leadership	7	25	2011-2012 Grade: A, AMO (2016-17: 6 yrs) Increase Rdg by 7% & Math by 10% 2010-2011 Grade: A, AYP: Yes, 100% 2009-2010 Grade: A, AYP: No, 92% 2008-2009 Grade: A, AYP: Yes, 100% 2007-2008 Grade: A, AYP: No, 92% 2006-2007 Grade: A, AYP: Yes, 100% 2005-2006 Grade: A, AYP: Prov., 97%
Assistant Principal	Mrs. Tiffany Gocsik	Primary Ed. K-3 Elementary Ed. 1-6 M. Ed. Educational Leadership	1	1	2011-2012 Grade: A, AMO (2016-17: 6 yrs) Increase Rdg by 7% & Math by 10% 2010-2011 Grade: A, AYP: Yes, 100%

## 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)
Reading	Margaret Flanders	B.S. Ed M. Ed. Reading	5	3	2011-2012 Grade: A, AMO (2016-17: 6 yrs) Increase Rdg by 7% & Math by 10% 2010-2011 Grade: A, AYP: Yes, 100% 2009-2010 Grade: A, AYP: No, 92% 2008-2009 Grade: A, AYP: Yes, 100% 2007-2008 Grade: A, AYP: No, 92%

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Technology	Susan Thomas	B.S. Elementary Ed 1-6	0	3	N/A
Media	Charla Palmer	Media Specialist Elementary Education K-6	5	3	2011-2012 Grade: A, AMO (2016-17: 6 yrs) Increase Rdg by 7% & Math by 10% 2010-2011 Grade: A, AYP: Yes, 100% 2009-2010 Grade: A, AYP: No, 92% 2008-2009 Grade: A, AYP: Yes, 100% 2007-2008 Grade: A, AYP: No, 92% 2006-2007 Grade: A, AYP: Yes, 100%

**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. The Literacy Coach will facilitate a monthly meeting for new teachers to discuss challenges and concerns. Teachers will be given the opportunity to choose topics of discussion during these meetings.	Literacy Coach	April 2013

***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
6% (5/77) Instructional Staff are teaching out of field.	The teachers who are currently teaching out of field are taking classes offered by the district to complete their endorsements throughout the school year.

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

***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
77	5% (4)	47% (36)	39% (30)	9% (7)	34% (26)	100% (77)	8% (6)	4% (3)	35% (27)

***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
Stephanie Huff	Megan Bender	Grade Level or Special Area	Meet monthly for coaching with Mentor Meet with Literacy Coach as needed
Shanna Brady	Felicia Burt	Grade Level or Special Area	Meet monthly for coaching with Mentor Meet with Literacy Coach as needed
Chris Klein	Theresa Pekarek	Grade Level or Special Area	Meet monthly for coaching with Mentor Meet with Literacy Coach as needed
Chris Klein	Kari Pomeranke	Grade Level or Special Area	Meet monthly for coaching with Mentor Meet with Literacy Coach as needed
TBD	Erin Buskey	Grade Level or Special Area	Meet monthly for coaching with Mentor Meet with Literacy Coach as needed

**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

Maria Bianchi: School Nurse  
Nancy Catania: School Social Worker  
Sharon Coler: ESOL Teacher  
Natalie Ferrera: Guidance Counselor  
Margaret Flanders: Literacy Coach  
Tiffany Gocsik: Assistant Principal  
Stephanie Huff: Third Grade Teacher  
Ashley Justice: Speech Pathologist  
Chris Klein: Second Grade Teacher  
Kenneth Kleier: Support Facilitation  
Susan Larkin: Guidance Counselor  
Kelly Laukat: Fourth Grade Teacher  
Karen Mulford: Fifth Grade Teacher  
Kyle Popkave: Psychologist  
Audrey Sebastian: Support Facilitation  
Kristina Shiamone: Second Grade Teacher  
BJ Smith: Principal  
Lori Spiegel: Kindergarten Teacher  
Donna Steen: Staffing/Compliance Teacher  
Erica Walchak: Support Facilitation  
Samantha Weitort: First 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?

The RtI Team meets monthly and reviews progress monitoring data, plans for school based teacher trainings on the PS/RtI process, moderates collaborative and progress monitoring grade level sessions and provides support in planning, delivering and documenting intervention strategies at all grade levels.

**June 2012**

**Rule 6A-1.099811**

**Revised April 29, 2011**

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

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The RtI Leadership Team, as a result of their data analysis and study of the academic problems and possible solutions, is able to clearly identify the areas of strength and focus attention in the SIP on those areas that require improvement and suggest the intervention that will be most effective. They will help facilitate the scheduling of SBIT and TBIT meetings and coordinate the involvement of specialists when needed. They will monitor and provide input for strategies/interventions for students and determine their effectiveness. They will provide support, resources, and progress monitoring tools.

### 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.

The Florida Assessment in Reading Test (FAIR)  
The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Tests in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science (FCAT 2.0)  
HMH Go-Math Pre and Post Tests  
MacMillan McGraw-Hill Treasures Unit Assessment (Grades 1-5)  
MacMillan McGraw-Hill Running Records (Grades 1-5)  
MacMillan McGraw-Hill Writing Rubric (Grades K-5)  
Core K12 Math and Science Assessments

The data is managed through the Florida's Progress and Reporting Network (PMRN), through Seven Oaks Student Data Base, Core K12, and through Pasco's Student Testing and Assessment Reports System (STAR).

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The RtI Leadership Team will continue to provide monthly opportunities for PLC (grade level) discussions/trainings on the PS/RtI process, provide modeling sessions, and group and individual support wherever there is need. In addition, the team will specifically train at least one member from each team in order to be "on the site" support/facilitator.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

MTSS will be supported through:

- \*providing time in the schedule for specific interventions
- \*providing training to instructional assistants to implement interventions
- \*regularly scheduled TBIT meetings by grade level on a rotation schedule facilitated by members of the RtI Leadership Team



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

### *Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)*

#### School-Based Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Leadership Team (PLC Leaders):

Shanna Brady  
Alice Chandler  
Karen DiBrango  
Margaret Flanders  
Tiffany Gocsik  
Steph Huff  
Katie Kennedy  
Chris Klein  
Kate Krause  
Kari Pomerence  
Kristin Rose  
Kristina Shiamone  
Erin Sizemore  
BJ Smith  
Lori Spiegel

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

The LLT (PLC Leadership Team) meets monthly and determines through data analysis, staff needs assessments and observational tools in the areas needed for professional staff development. The LLT provides teachers with the essential knowledge base, the opportunities to support, model and practice their skills in order to insure the transfer of learning for our students' optimum success. The School Improvement Plan goals are the guiding document for this work group.

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

To insure that all teachers are provided with the knowledge and support essential for the consistent, highest quality implementation of all the instructional routines embedded in the Common Core Standards in all curriculum areas.

To design and implement a plan to extend and refine teachers' ability to deliver instruction that ensures the best practices in reading and writing across all curriculum areas and the complexity of all comprehension strategies.

**June 2012**

**Rule 6A-1.099811**

**Revised April 29, 2011**

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

**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]).

<b>Reading Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>	1A.1. Expected level is that 80% of learners in all grades to be at the proficient level.	1A.1. Coaching opportunities will be used to promote these best practices.	1A.1. Coaching Team	1A.1. Formative assessments will be given to determine student progress throughout the school year. Progress monitoring will occur at beginning, middle, and end of year to determine the need to regroup students in reading to meet the needs of the learners. Reading assessments will be administered and analyzed to assess student learning gains in reading. Best practices will be embedded in Learning Focused Strategies.	1A.1. Student learning in reading will be monitored through PMRN/FAIR and progress monitoring meetings. MMH and TRIUMPHS assessments results will also be used to determine student learning gains and needs.		
<b>Reading Goal #1A:</b> <i>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT in Reading will increase by 7%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
	<i>25% (106) of students in grades 3-5 score Level 3 on FCAT.</i>	<i>32% of students in grades 3-5 will score Level 3 on FCAT.</i>					

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

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

		1A.2.	1A.2. Individual student conferences to monitor independent reading and application of comprehension strategies will be held bi-weekly. Student goal setting will be included and discussed during student/teacher conferences.	1A.2. Classroom teachers	1A.2. Progress monitoring, student conference logs, and formal/informal observations.	1A.2. Performance tasks, conference logs, Core K-12 MMH assessments, rubrics, and FAIR	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b>	1B.1. Individual behaviors and cognitive levels of students	1B.1. Teacher will lead students through prescribed curriculum with use of visuals, repetition, and assistive technology through whole group and small group instruction.	1B.1. Self Contained ASD Classroom Teachers	1B.1. Informal and formal observations, progress monitoring through PCI, MeVile to WeVile tracking charts for completion of units, and Program Progress Charts completed based on individual student worksheets	1B.1. The BRIDGE (measures the foundations of reading at BOY, MOY, and EOY) and the Intervention Planning tool (overview of indicators of growth in reading one time quarterly)		
<u>Reading Goal #1B:</u> <i>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4, 5, or 6 on the 2013 FAA in Reading will increase by 6%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
	<i>40% (2) of students scored at Levels 4, 5, or 6 in reading.</i>	<i>46% (3) of students scored at Levels 4, 5, or 6 in reading.</i>					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	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**

<p><b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b></p>	<p>2A.1.</p>	<p>2A.1. Differentiated practice that extends students’ comprehension and ability to apply strategies. The “Daily Five” will be part of every students’ reading instruction.</p>	<p>2A.1. Administrative team, classroom teachers, and Literacy Coach</p>	<p>2A.1. Formative assessments will be given to determine student progress. Progress monitoring, three times a year (BOY, MOY, EOY), will determine the need to regroup students in reading to meet the needs of all types of learners. Reading assessments will be administered and analyzed to assess students learning gains in reading. Strategies will be adjusted when students are not making the expected gains. Differentiated instructional best practices will be embedded in Learning Focused Strategies.</p>	<p>2A.1. Progress monitoring in reading through PMRN/FAIR and data analysis meetings. MMH Unit results will also be used to determine individual student learning gains.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #2A:</u>  <i>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT in Reading will increase by 7%.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>52% (225) of students in grades 3-5 score Level 4 or 5 on FCAT.</i></p>	<p><i>59% of students in grades 3-5 will score a Level 4 or 5 on FCAT.</i></p>					
		<p>2A.2.</p>	<p>2A.2. Individual student conferences to monitor independent reading and application of comprehension strategies will be held bi-weekly. Student goal setting will be included and discussed in student/ teacher conferences.</p>	<p>2A.2. Classroom teachers</p>	<p>2A.2. Progress monitoring, student conference logs, formal/informal observations.</p>	<p>2A.2. Performance tasks, conference logs, Core K-12 MMH assessments, rubrics, and FAIR</p>	
		<p>2A.3.</p>	<p>2A.3. Focus will be on the gradual release of responsibility model: “I do”, “We do”, “You do it together”, and “You do it alone.”</p>	<p>2A.3. Classroom teachers</p>	<p>2A.3. Progress Monitoring</p>	<p>2A.3. Reading Unit Assessments</p>	

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

		2.A.4. Guided Practice, student engagement and summarizing opportunities need to increase.	2.A.4. Through weekly Professional Learning Community meetings, teachers will enhance their knowledge of the practical uses of strategies to increase student engagement, distributed guided practice and summarizing.	2.A.4. PLC Leaders, Literacy Coach, and Administration	2.A.4. Unit Plans, PLC Grade Level Discussions, and Informal/Formal Observations	FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments, and Informal Observations	
		2.A.5.	2.A.5. Teachers will receive training in developing metacognitive readers. Students will be asked to think aloud during guided reading, apply the reading strategies, and discuss them during individual student conferences. Students will explain and write about their thinking during reading.	2.A.5. Administration, Literacy Coach, PLC Leaders	2.A.5. Administration and PLC Team will conduct informal observations to determine the release of responsibility in developing metacognition with students.	2.A.5. Informal observation tool	
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>	2B.1. Individual behaviors and cognitive levels of students	2B.1. Teacher will lead students through prescribed curriculum with use of visuals, repetition, and assistive technology through whole group and small group instruction.	2B.1. Self Contained ASD Classroom Teachers	2B.1. Informal and formal observations, progress monitoring through PCI, MeVile to WeVile tracking charts for completion of units, and Program Progress Charts completed based on individual student worksheets	2B.1. The BRIDGE (measures the foundations of reading at BOY, MOY, and EOY) and the Intervention Planning tool (overview of indicators of growth in reading one time quarterly)		
<b>Reading Goal #2B:</b> <i>The percentage of students scoring a Level 7 or above on the 2013 FAA in Reading will increase by 20%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>0% (0) students scored at Level 7 or above in reading.</i>	<i>20% (1) student will score at Level 7 or above in reading.</i>					

**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		
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>	3A.1.	3A.1. All classroom teachers will implement 90 minutes of uninterrupted reading instruction that includes explicit instruction, guided reading, literacy centers, and independent reading on a daily basis. The "Daily Five" will be part of the students' instruction.	3A.1. Literacy Coach, Teachers, and Administrative Team	3A.1. Formative assessments will be given to determine student progress. Progress monitoring, three times a year (BOY, MOY, EOY), will determine the need to regroup students in reading to meet the needs of all types of learners. Reading assessments will be administered and analyzed to assess students learning gains in reading. Strategies will be adjusted when students are not making the expected gains. Differentiated instructional best practices will be embedded in Learning Focused Strategies.	3A.1. Progress monitoring in reading through PMRN/FAIR and data analysis meetings. MMH and TRIUMPHS assessment results will also be used to determine individual student learning gains.		
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u> <i>The percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase by 4% as demonstrated on the 2013 FCAT in Reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>87% (373) of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains in reading.</i>	<i>91% of students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains in reading.</i>					



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

		3A.2. Dialogue between teacher and learners needs to increase.	3A.2. Individual student conferences to monitor independent reading and application of comprehension strategies will be held bi-weekly. Student goal setting will be included and discussed in student/teacher conferences.	3A.2. Classroom teachers	3A.2. Progress monitoring, student conference logs, and formal/informal observations.	3A.2. Performance tasks, conference logs, Core K-12 MMH assessments, rubrics, and FAIR	
		3A.3. Limited scaffolding used to ensure success across the curriculum.	3A.3. Focus will be on the gradual release of responsibility model: "I do", "We do", "You do it together", and "You do it alone."	3A.3. Classroom teachers	3A.3. Progress Monitoring	3A.3. Reading Unit Assessments and Benchmark Assessments	
		3.A.4. Guided Practice, student engagement and summarizing opportunities need to increase.	3.A.4. Through weekly Professional Learning Community meetings, the teachers will enhance their knowledge of strategies to increase student engagement, distributed guided practice and summarizing.	3.A.4. PLC Leaders, Literacy Coach, and Administration	3.A.4. PLC Grade Level Discussions	3.A.4. FAIR, MMH and TRIUMPHS assessments	
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>	3B.1. Individual behaviors and cognitive levels of students	3B.1. Teacher will lead students through prescribed curriculum with use of visuals, repetition, and assistive technology through whole group and small group instruction.	3B.1. Self Contained ASD Classroom Teachers	3B.1. Informal and formal observations, progress monitoring through PCI, MeVile to WeVile tracking charts for completion of units, and Program Progress Charts completed based on individual student worksheets	3B.1. The BRIDGE (measures the foundations of reading at BOY, MOY, and EOY) and the Intervention Planning tool (overview of indicators of growth in reading one time quarterly)		
<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u> <i>The percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase by 25% as demonstrated on the 2013 FAA in Reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	<i>25% (1) of the students made a learning gain in reading.</i>	<i>50% will make learning gains in reading.</i>					
--	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

**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		
<b>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>	4A.1.	4A.1. All classroom teachers will implement 90 minutes of uninterrupted reading instruction that includes explicit instruction, guided reading, literacy centers, and independent reading with fidelity on a daily basis. The "Daily Five" will be part of the students' instruction.	4A.1. Literacy Coach, Teachers, and Administrative Team	4A.1. Formative assessments will be given to determine student progress. Progress monitoring, three times a year (BOY, MOY, EOY), will determine the need to regroup students in reading to meet the needs of all types of learners. Reading assessments will be administered and analyzed to assess students learning gains in reading. Strategies will be adjusted when students are not making the expected gains. Differentiated instructional best practices will be embedded in Learning Focused Strategies.	4A.1. Progress monitoring in reading through PMRN/FAIR and data analysis meetings. MMH and TRIUMPHS assessment results will also be used to determine individual student learning gains.		
<b>Reading Goal #4A:</b> <i>Learning gains in reading will increase for students in the lowest 25% by 7%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>48% (205) of students in the lowest quartile of grades 3-5 made learning gains in reading.</i>	<i>55% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading.</i>					

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

		4A.2. Dialogue between teacher and learners needs to increase.	4A.2. Individual student conferences to monitor independent reading and application of comprehension strategies will be held bi-weekly. Student goal setting will be included and discussed in student/teacher conferences.	4A.2. Classroom teachers	4A.2. Progress monitoring, student conference logs, and formal/informal observations.	4A.2. Performance tasks, conference logs, Core K-12 MMH assessments, rubrics, and FAIR	
		4A.3. Limited scaffolding used to ensure success across the curriculum.	4A.3. Focus will be on the gradual release of responsibility model: "I do", "We do", "You do it together", and "You do it alone."	4A.3. Classroom teachers	4A.3. Progress Monitoring	4A.3. Reading Unit Assessments and Benchmark Assessments	
		4.A.4. Guided Practice, student engagement and summarizing opportunities need to increase.	4.A.4. Through weekly Professional Learning Community meetings, the teachers will enhance their knowledge of strategies to increase student engagement, distributed guided practice and summarizing.	4.A.4. PLC Leaders, Literacy Coach, and Administration	4.A.4. PLC Grade Level Discussions	4.A.4. FAIR, MMH and TRIUMPHS assessments	
<b>4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>	4B.1. Individual behaviors and cognitive levels of students	4B.1. Teacher will lead students through prescribed curriculum with use of visuals, repetition, and assistive technology through whole group and small group instruction.	4B.1. Self Contained ASD Classroom Teachers	4B.1. Informal and formal observations, progress monitoring through PCI, MeVile to WeVile tracking charts for completion of units, and Program Progress Charts completed based on individual student worksheets	4B.1. The BRIDGE (measures the foundations of reading at BOY, MOY, and EOY) and the Intervention Planning tool (overview of indicators of growth in reading one time quarterly)		
<u>Reading Goal #4B:</u> <i>Learning gains in reading will increase for students in the lowest quartile by 17%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	<i>33% (1) of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in reading.</i>	<i>50% of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains in reading.</i>					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

**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	
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b> 85% of our students in grades 3-5 were proficient in reading.	We will increase proficiency in reading in grades 3-5 by 2% which will equal 87%.	We will increase proficiency in reading in grades 3-5 by 1% which will equal 88%.	We will increase proficiency in reading in grades 3-5 by 1% which will equal 89%.	We will increase proficiency in reading in grades 3-5 by 1% which will equal 90%.	We will increase proficiency in reading in grades 3-5 by 1% which will equal 91%.	We will increase proficiency in reading in grades 3-5 by 1% which will equal 92%.
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u>  <i>Our students in grades 3-5 will increase proficiency in reading by 7% over the next six years (2016-2017) to reduce the achievement gap.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5B.1. Limited vocabulary	5B.1. Teachers will implement previewing activities with vocabulary prior to lessons and scaffold instruction with the use of visual aids, manipulatives, graphic organizers and modeling.  Access to language development resources such as dictionaries, books, thesaurus, etc.	5B.1. Classroom Teachers and ESOL Resource Teachers	5B.1. Teacher completes informal and formal observations of students, weekly assessments, summarizing activities, and Teacher observations by administration	5B.1. CELLA, FCAT, Weekly/Unit Assessments given by classroom teacher		



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

Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<p><i>Hispanic students in grades 3-5 will increase proficiency in reading: Grade 3 by 1%, Grade 4 by 3%, and Grade 5 by 1% as measured on the 2012-2013 FCAT.</i></p>							
	<p><i>11% of Hispanic students in grade 3 were nonproficient in reading. 27% of Hispanic students in grade 4 were nonproficient in reading. 12% of Hispanic students in grade 5 were nonproficient in reading.</i></p>	<p><i>Grade 3 will decrease nonproficiency in reading to 10%, grade 4 will decrease to 24%, and grade 5 will decrease to 11% as measured by the 2012-2013 FCAT.</i></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		
<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> n/a	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	n/a	n/a					
		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 reading.</b>	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		

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

<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>n/a</i>							
	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>					
		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 reading.</b></p>	<p>5.E.1. Guided Practice, home activities for additional practice, student engagement and summarizing opportunities need to increase.</p>	<p>5.E.1. Through weekly Professional Learning Community meetings, the teachers will enhance their knowledge of strategies to increase student engagement, assign meaningful and differentiated homework, distributed guided practice in class and at home, and summarizing in class.</p>	<p>5.E.1. PLC Leaders, Literacy Coach, and Administration</p>	<p>5.E.1. PLC Grade Level Discussions</p>	<p>5.E.1. FAIR, MMH and TRIUMPHS assessments</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5E:</u> <i>Students who are economically disadvantaged in grades 3-5 will increase proficiency in reading: Grade 3 by 1%, Grade 4 by 3%, and Grade 5 by 2% as measured on the 2012-2013 FCAT.</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**

	<i>8% of Economically Disadvantaged students in grade 3 were nonproficient in reading, 32% in grade 4 were nonproficient in reading, and 22% in grade 5 were nonproficient in reading.</i>	<i>Grade 3 will decrease nonproficiency in reading to 7%, grade 4 will decrease to 29%, and grade 5 will decrease to 20% as measured by the 2012-2013 FCAT.</i>					
		5E.2. Limited parent involvement	5E.2. Teachers will work in grade level teams to establish creative ways to get the parents more involved in their child's home activities and make the home/school connection. Parent/Teacher conferences held more frequently with Tier II and III students.	5E.2. Classroom teachers	5E.2. Data Reviews, TBIT, SBIT, Grade Level Discussions	5E.2. FAIR, MMH, and TRIUMPHS assessments as well as parent contact logs and forms.	

**Reading 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
	Text Complexity and Individual Student Conferencing	Grades K-5	Literacy Coach	School Wide	Weekly	Conference Logs, Assignments, Formal Feedback, and Observations	M. Flanders, T. Gocsik, BJ Smith

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

Common Core Standards	Grades K-5	Curriculum and Instruction Department & Literacy Coach	School Wide	Weekly	Assignments, Formal Feedback, and Observations	M. Flanders, T. Gocsik, BJ Smith

**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
Student Assessments: Show What You Know	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Florida Assessment Guide: Show What You Know	District Instructional Media Center (DIMC)	\$2010.00
<b>Subtotal: \$2010.00</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$2010.00</b>			

*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]).

<b>CELLA Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition</b>					
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	
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>	1.1. Lack of background knowledge	1.1. Teachers will implement previewing activities with vocabulary prior to lessons and scaffold instruction with the use of visual aids, manipulatives, graphic organizers and modeling.	1.1. Classroom Teachers and ESOL Resource Teachers	1.1. Teacher completes informal and formal observations of students, weekly assessments, summarizing activities, and Teacher observations by administration	1.1. CELLA, FCAT, Weekly/Unit Assessments given by classroom teacher	
<b>CELLA Goal #1:</b> <i>The students scoring proficient in listening/speaking will increase by 16% as demonstrated on the 2012-2013 CELLA.</i>	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</b>					
	<i>65% (50) students in grades K-5 scored proficient in listening and speaking.</i>					
		1.2. Limited vocabulary	1.2. Teachers will implement previewing activities with vocabulary prior to lessons and scaffold instruction with the use of visual aids, manipulatives, graphic organizers and modeling.  Access to language development resources such as dictionaries, books, thesaurus, etc.	1.2. Classroom Teachers and ESOL Resource Teachers	1.2. Teacher completes informal and formal observations of students, weekly assessments, summarizing activities, and Teacher observations by administration	1.2. CELLA, FCAT, Weekly/Unit Assessments given by classroom teacher

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

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

		1.3 Limited resources of personnel within native languages and scheduling conflicts with ELL Resource teacher and/or Instructional Assistant	1.3 Teachers will provide students will access to language development tools such as dictionaries, books, thesaurus, computer translations, and Rosetta Stone (language acquisition technology). Teachers will work with other teachers in classroom areas to pair students with similar backgrounds for additional support.	1.3 Classroom Teachers, ESOL Resource Teachers and Instructional Assistants	1.3 Teacher completes informal and formal observations of students, weekly assessments and conferences, and daily work assignments	1.3 CELLA, FCAT, Weekly Assessments given by teacher
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	
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>	2.1. Lack of background knowledge	2.1. Teachers will implement previewing activities with vocabulary prior to lessons and scaffold instruction with the use of visual aids, manipulatives, graphic organizers and modeling.	2.1. Classroom Teachers and ESOL Resource Teachers	2.1. Teacher completes informal and formal observations of students, weekly assessments, summarizing activities, and Teacher observations by administration.	2.1. CELLA, FCAT, Weekly/Unit Assessments given by classroom teacher	
<u>CELLA Goal #2:</u>  <i>Students scoring proficient in reading will increase by 16% as demonstrated on the 2012-2013 CELLA.</i>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u>					
	<i>40% (31) students in grades K-5 scored proficient in reading.</i>					

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

		2.2. Limited vocabulary	2.2. Teachers will implement previewing activities with vocabulary prior to lessons and scaffold instruction with the use of visual aids, manipulatives, graphic organizers and modeling.  Access to language development resources such as dictionaries, books, thesaurus, etc.	2.2. Classroom Teachers and ESOL Resource Teachers	2.2. Teacher completes informal and formal observations of students, weekly assessments, summarizing activities, and Teacher observations by administration.	2.2. CELLA, FCAT, Weekly/Unit Assessments given by classroom teacher
		2.3 Limited resources of personnel within native languages and scheduling conflicts with ELL Resource teacher and/or Instructional Assistant	2.3 Teachers will provide students will access to language development tools such as dictionaries, books, thesaurus, computer translations, and Rosetta Stone (language acquisition technology). Teachers will work with other teachers in classroom areas to pair students with similar backgrounds for additional support.	2.3 Classroom Teachers, ESOL Resource Teachers and Instructional Assistants	2.3 Teacher completes informal and formal observations of students, weekly assessments and conferences, and daily work assignments	2.3 CELLA, FCAT, Weekly Assessments given by teacher

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	
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>	3.1. Lack of background knowledge	3.1. Teachers will implement previewing activities with vocabulary prior to lessons and scaffold instruction with the use of visual aids, word lists, graphic organizers and modeling of proper sentence structure.	3.1. Classroom Teachers and ESOL Resource Teachers	3.1. Teacher completes informal and formal observations of students, teacher/student conferencing about writing topics and assignments	3.1. CELLA, FCAT Writes, weekly writing assignments given by classroom teacher	

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

<p><b>CELLA Goal #3:</b> <i>Students scoring proficient in writing will increase by 16% as demonstrated on the 2012-2013 CELLA.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u></p>					
	<p><i>47% (36) students in grades K-5 scored proficient in writing.</i></p>					
		<p>3.2. Limited vocabulary</p>	<p>3.2. Teachers will implement previewing activities with vocabulary prior to lessons and scaffold instruction with the use of visual aids, word lists, graphic organizers and modeling of proper sentence structure. Access to language development resources such as dictionaries, books, thesaurus, etc.</p>	<p>3.2. Classroom Teachers and ESOL Resource Teachers</p>	<p>3.2. Teacher completes informal and formal observations of students, teacher/student conferencing about writing topics and assignments.</p>	<p>3.2. CELLA, FCAT Writes, Weekly writing assignments given by classroom teacher</p>
		<p>3.3 Limited resources of personnel within native languages and scheduling conflicts with ELL Resource teacher and/or Instructional Assistant</p>	<p>3.3 Teachers will provide students will access to language development tools such as dictionaries, books, thesaurus, computer translations, and Rosetta Stone (language acquisition technology). Teachers will work with other teachers in classroom areas to pair students with similar backgrounds for additional support.</p>	<p>3.3 Classroom Teachers, ESOL Resource Teachers and Instructional Assistants</p>	<p>3.3 Teacher completes informal and formal observations of students, weekly assessments and conferences, and daily work assignments</p>	<p>3.3 CELLA, FCAT, Weekly Assessments given by teacher</p>

**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			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$0.00</b>			

*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]).

<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. Consistent and pervasive implementation of the math series aligned with the district’s curriculum maps will be used with fidelity.	1A.1. Teachers will administer a beginning of the year benchmark assessment from Go Math! Florida as well as the Core K-12 to identify areas of proficiency, deficiency, or remediation. Direct instruction in math will be provided daily for a minimum of 60 minutes which includes whole group, small group with flexible groupings, and independent math centers from series. Classroom instruction will be differentiated and scaffolded through the “I do”, “We do”, “You do it together”, and “You do it alone”.	1A.1. Classroom teachers, Administrative team, District support, RtI team, PLC Leaders, and Math Liaisons.	1A.1. Progress Monitoring data meetings, PLC (grade level) meetings, and RtI meetings	1A.1. Benchmark assessments, Core K-12 assessments, Unit plans and assessments (Chapter Tests)		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
<i>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT in Math will increase by 7%.</i>							
	<i>33% (144) of students in grades 3-5 scored Level 3 on FCAT.</i>	<i>40% of students in grades 3-5 will score Level 3 on FCAT in math.</i>					
		1A.2. Limited practice and summarizing strategies to ensure student understanding throughout lessons.	1A.2. Teachers will provide additional practice and consistent summarizing activities to check for student understanding throughout lessons.	1A.2. Classroom teachers	1A.2. Progress Monitoring, TBITs, SBITs, Summarizing activities	1A.2. Summarizing activities, mid chapter checkpoints, chapter tests, Core K-12, Benchmark assessments	
		1A.3. Limited use of manipulatives and technology to provide student understanding of skill.	1A.3. Teachers will increase opportunities for students to use manipulatives and technology during math instruction.	1A.3. Classroom teachers	1A.3. Progress Monitoring, TBITs, SBITs, Summarizing activities	1A.3. Summarizing activities, mid chapter checkpoints, chapter tests, Core K-12, Benchmark assessments	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>	1B.1. Individual behaviors and cognitive levels of students guide the differentiated instruction while grouping students according to academic need.	1B.1. Teachers will differentiate math instruction based on individual student levels as reflected on the Access Point Progress Monitoring tool (standards).	1B.1. Self Contained Classroom ASD Teacher	1B.1. Informal and formal observations based on individual student portfolios, Progress Monitoring tool for specific grade level Access Points for individuals	1B.1. Access Point Progress Monitoring Tool for Math which ties directly to the standards (BOY, MOY, and EOY)		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>				
<i>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4, 5, or 6 on the FAA in math will increase by one student or 20%.</i>						
	<i>20% (1) student scored at Level 4, 5, or 6 in math.</i>	<i>40% (2) students will score at Level 4, 5, or 6 in math as demonstrated on the 2012-2013 FAA.</i>				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>	2A.1. Students not provided with extending and refining opportunities to differentiate instruction for individual learning needs.	2A.1. Teachers will administer a beginning of the year benchmark assessment from Go Math! Florida as well as the Core K-12 to identify areas of proficiency, deficiency, or remediation. Direct instruction in math will be provided daily for a minimum of 60 minutes which includes whole group, small group with flexible groupings, and independent math centers from series. Classroom instruction will be differentiated and scaffolded through the "I do", "We do", "You do it together", and "You do it alone".	2A.1. Classroom teachers, Administrative team, District support, RtI team, PLC Leaders, and Math Liaisons.	2A.1. Progress Monitoring data meetings, PLC (grade level) meetings, and RtI meetings	2A.1. Benchmark assessments, Core K-12 assessments, Unit plans and assessments (Chapter Tests)		



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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
<i>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT in Math will increase by 7%.</i>							
	<i>39% (170) of students in grades 3-5 score Level 4 or 5 on FCAT.</i>	<i>46% of students in grades 3-5 will score a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT.</i>					
		1A.2. Limited summarizing strategies to ensure student understanding throughout lessons.	2A.2. Teachers will provide consistent summarizing activities to check for student understanding throughout lessons.	2A.2. Classroom teachers	2A.2. Progress Monitoring, TBITs, SBITs, Summarizing activities	2A.2. Summarizing activities, mid chapter checkpoints, chapter tests, Core K-12, Benchmark assessments	
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>	2B.1. Individual behaviors and cognitive levels of students guide the differentiated instruction while grouping students according to academic need.	2B.1. Teachers will differentiate math instruction based on individual student levels as reflected on the Access Point Progress Monitoring tool (standards).	2B.1. Self Contained Classroom ASD Teacher	2B.1. Informal and formal observations based on individual student portfolios, Progress Monitoring tool for specific grade level Access Points for individuals	2B.1. Access Point Progress Monitoring Tool for Math which ties directly to the standards (BOY, MOY, and EOY)		

**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>					
<i>The percentage of students scoring at or above Level 7 in math on the FAA will increase by one student or 20%.</i>							
	<i>0% (0) of the students scored at Level 7 or above in math.</i>	<i>20% (1) student will score at or above Level 7 in math as demonstrated on the FAA.</i>					

**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>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>3A.1. Consistent and pervasive implementation of the math series aligned with the district's curriculum maps will be used with fidelity.</p>	<p>3A.1. Teachers will administer a beginning of year benchmark assessment from Go Math! Florida as well as Core K-12 to identify targeted areas of instruction. Direct instruction in math will be provided for a min. of 60 minutes daily to include whole group, small group with flexible groupings, and independent math centers. Differentiated instruction will be provided to meet the needs of all learners through individual assignments and small groups based on formative and summative assessments. Data will determine appropriate interventions for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.</p>	<p>3A.1. Classroom teachers, Administrative team, District support, RtI team, PLC Leaders, and Math Liaisons.</p>	<p>3A.1. Progress Monitoring data meetings, PLC (grade level) meetings, RtI meetings, and lesson plans.</p>	<p>3A.1. Benchmark assessments, Core K-12 assessments, Unit plans and assessments (Chapter Tests), progress monitoring chart</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u>  <i>The percentage of students making learning gains in math will increase by 6% as demonstrated on the 2013 FCAT in Math.</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**

	<i>74% (319) of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains in math.</i>	<i>80% of students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains in math.</i>					
		3A.2. Limited practice and summarizing strategies to ensure student understanding throughout lessons.	3A.2. Teachers will provide additional practice and consistent summarizing activities to check for student understanding throughout lessons.	3A.2. Classroom teachers	3A.2. Progress Monitoring, TBITs, SBITs, Summarizing activities	3A.2. Summarizing activities, mid chapter checkpoints, chapter tests, Core K-12, Benchmark assessments	
		3A.3. Limited use of manipulatives and technology to provide student understanding of skill.	3A.3. Teachers will increase opportunities for students to use manipulatives and technology during math instruction.	3A.3. Classroom teachers	3A.3. Progress Monitoring, TBITs, SBITs, Summarizing activities	3A.3. Summarizing activities, mid chapter checkpoints, chapter tests, Core K-12, Benchmark assessments	
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	3B.1. Individual behaviors and cognitive levels of students guide the differentiated instruction while grouping students according to academic need.	3B.1. Teachers will differentiate math instruction based on individual student levels as reflected on the Access Point Progress Monitoring tool (standards).	3B.1. Self Contained Classroom ASD Teacher	3B.1. Informal and formal observations based on individual student portfolios, Progress Monitoring tool for specific grade level Access Points for individuals	3B.1. Access Point Progress Monitoring Tool for Math which ties directly to the standards (BOY, MOY, and EOY)		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u> <i>The percentage of students making learning gains in math will increase by 5%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					

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

	<i>50% (2) students made learning gains in math.</i>	<i>55% of students will make learning gains in math as demonstrated on the 2012-2013 FAA.</i>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

**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		
<b>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	4A.1. Ability to structure math instruction to provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to students.	4A.1. Teachers will administer a beginning of year benchmark assessment from Go Math! Florida as well as Core K-12 to identify targeted areas of instruction for intensive remediation and provide differentiated instruction to meet the needs of each student through the use of flexible small group instruction. Teachers will review and follow the curriculum pacing guides, teach error analysis strategies, and provide extending and refining activities.	4A.1. Classroom teachers, Administrative team, District support, RtI team, PLC Leaders, and Math Liaisons.	4A.1. Progress Monitoring data meetings, PLC (grade level) meetings, RtI meetings, and lesson plans.	4A.1. Core K-12, pre and post tests, mid chapter checkpoints, teacher designed assessments, Benchmark assessments.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u> <i>Learning gains in math will increase for students in the lowest 25% by 7%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	37% (159) of students in the lowest quartile of grades 3-5 made learning gains in math.	44% of students in the lowest quartile of grades 3-5 will make learning gains in math.					
		4A.2. Limited practice and summarizing strategies to ensure student understanding throughout lessons.	4A.2. Teachers will provide additional practice and consistent summarizing activities to check for student understanding throughout lessons.	4A.2. Classroom teachers	4A.2. Progress Monitoring, TBITs, SBITs, Summarizing activities	4A.2. Summarizing activities, mid chapter checkpoints, chapter tests, Core K-12, Benchmark assessments	
		4A.3. Limited use of manipulatives and technology to provide student understanding of skill.	4A.3. Teachers will increase opportunities for students to use manipulatives and technology during math instruction.	4A.3. Classroom teachers	4A.3. Progress Monitoring, TBITs, SBITs, Summarizing activities	4A.3. Summarizing activities, mid chapter checkpoints, chapter tests, Core K-12, Benchmark assessments	
<b>4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	4B.1. Individual behaviors and cognitive levels of students guide the differentiated instruction while grouping students according to academic need.	4B.1. Teachers will differentiate math instruction based on individual student levels as reflected on the Access Point Progress Monitoring tool (standards).	4B.1. Self Contained Classroom ASD Teacher	4B.1. Informal and formal observations based on individual student portfolios, Progress Monitoring tool for specific grade level Access Points for individuals	4B.1. Access Point Progress Monitoring Tool for Math which ties directly to the standards (BOY, MOY, and EOY)		
<u>Mathematics Goal #4B:</u> n/a	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					



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

	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>					
--	------------	------------	--	--	--	--	--

**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	
<p><b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b></p>	<p><b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b> 78% of our students in grades 3-5 were proficient in math.</p>	<p>We will increase proficiency in math in grades 3-5 by 2% which will equal 80%.</p>	<p>We will increase proficiency in math in grades 3-5 by 2% which will equal 82%.</p>	<p>We will increase proficiency in math in grades 3-5 by 2% which will equal 84%.</p>	<p>We will increase proficiency in math in grades 3-5 by 2% which will equal 86%.</p>	<p>We will increase proficiency in math in grades 3-5 by 1% which will equal 87%.</p>	<p>We will increase proficiency in math in grades 3-5 by 1% which will equal 88%.</p>
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u>  <i>Our students in grades 3-5 will increase proficiency in math by 10% over the next six years (2016-2017) to reduce the achievement gap.</i></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 subgroups:</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. Limited vocabulary</p>	<p>5B.1. Teachers will implement previewing activities with vocabulary prior to lessons and scaffold instruction with the use of visual aids, manipulatives, graphic organizers and modeling.  Access to language development resources such as dictionaries, books, thesaurus, etc.</p>	<p>5B.1. Classroom Teachers and ESOL Resource Teachers</p>	<p>5B.1. Teacher completes informal and formal observations of students, weekly assessments, summarizing activities, and Teacher observations by administration</p>	<p>5B.1. CELLA, FCAT, Core K-12, Chapter Pre and Post Tests and Mid Chapter Checkpoints administered by classroom teacher.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u>  <i>Hispanic students in grades 3-5 will increase proficiency in math: Grade 3 by 3%, Grade 4 by 3%, and Grade 5 by 3% as measured on the 2012-2013 FCAT.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>32% of Hispanic students in grade 3 were nonproficient in math. 33% of Hispanic students in grade 4 were nonproficient in math. 34% of Hispanic students in grade 5 were nonproficient in math.</i></p>	<p><i>Grade 3 will decrease nonproficiency in math to 29%, grade 4 will decrease to 30%, and grade 5 will decrease to 31% as measured by the 2012-2013 FCAT.</i></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		
<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> <i>n/a</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>					
		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.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		

**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>					
<i>n/a</i>							
	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		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		
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5.E.1. Limited guided practice, home activities for additional practice, student engagement and summarizing opportunities directly demonstrating student learning.	5.E.1. Through weekly Professional Learning Community meetings, the teachers will enhance their knowledge of strategies to increase student engagement, assign meaningful and differentiated homework, distributed guided practice in class and at home, and summarizing in class.	5.E.1. PLC Leaders, Literacy Coach, and Administration	5.E.1. PLC Grade Level Discussions	5.E.1. Core K-12, FCAT, Pre and Post Chapter Tests, and Mid Chapter Checkpoints		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u>  <i>Students who are economically disadvantaged in grades 3-5 will increase proficiency in math: Grade 3 by 3%, Grade 4 by 3%, and Grade 5 by 4% as measured on the 2012-2013 FCAT.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	33% of Economically Disadvantaged students in grade 3 were nonproficient in math, 33% in grade 4 were nonproficient in math, and 36% in grade 5 were nonproficient in math.	Grade 3 will decrease nonproficiency in math to 30%, grade 4 will decrease to 30%, and grade 5 will decrease to 32% as measured by the 2012-2013 FCAT.					
		5E.2.	5E.2. Limited parent involvement Teachers will work in grade level teams to establish creative ways to get the parents more involved in their child's home activities and make the home/school connection. Parent/Teacher conferences held more frequently with Tier II and III students.	5E.2. Classroom teachers	5E.2. Data Reviews, TBIT, SBIT, Grade Level Discussions	5E.2. Core K-12, FCAT, Pre and Post Chapter Tests, and Mid Chapter Checkpoints.	
		5E.3.	5E.3. Limited resources (online resources) Teachers will provide opportunities for students to work on the online resources (ThinkCentral) during math centers or provide activities to complete at home for additional practice with skills addressed in class.	5E.3. Classroom teachers	5E.3. SBIT, TBIT, Grade Level Discussions, Student/Teacher conferences, assessment results, observations, and work completion	5E.3. Core K-12, FCAT, Pre and Post Chapter Tests, and Mid Chapter Checkpoints.	

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

**Mathematics Professional Development**

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

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

<b>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
Common Core Standards	Grades K-5	Math Liaisons, District Math Coaches	Classroom Teachers	On-going	Lesson Plans, Observations, Progress Monitoring Meeting with Data Review	Administration
Unpacking the Common Core Standards	Grades 4 & 5	Math Liaisons, District Math Coaches	Classroom Teachers	On-going	Lesson Plans, Progress Monitoring Meetings with Data Review	Administration

**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
Florida Assessment Guides Gr. 2-5	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Assessment Guides	District Instructional Media Center (DIMC)	\$2004.24
<b>Subtotal: \$2004.24</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

Unwrapping the Common Core Standards (Grades 4 & 5)	Grades 4 & 5 Teachers will participate in 1 ½ days of training to establish an understanding of the Common Core Standards and Best Practices implementing them in the classroom.	Florida Lottery Money (SAC funds) and Internal Accounts	\$1250.00 approximately
<b>Subtotal: \$1250.00</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Total: \$3254.24</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. Resources from the Science series and the district's curriculum map and pacing guides will need to be implemented properly and timely to address the standards at each grade level.	1A.1. Teachers will work in grade level PLCs to develop lesson plans that will address the standards using their resources from the Science series and curriculum map and pacing guides.	1A.1. Classroom teachers, PLC Leaders, Science Liaisons, and Administration	1A.1. Progress Monitoring, Lesson Plans, and Time Line for implementation	1A.1. Core K-12, Unit Assessments		

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

<p><u>Science Goal #1A:</u> <i>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 on the FCAT Science in grade 5 will increase by 14% in 2013.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>46% (63) of students in grade 5 score Level 3 on the FCAT.</i></p>	<p><i>60% of students in grade 5 will score Level 3 on the FCAT Science.</i></p>					
		<p>1A.2. Vocabulary instruction, resources (materials and supplies) and time throughout the unit to conduct hands on experiments to develop an understanding for curriculum.</p>	<p>1A.2. Teachers will work together in grade level PLCs to share materials and resources as well as develop lesson plans that meet the needs of their students.</p>	<p>1A.2. Classroom teachers, PLC Leaders, Science Liaisons, and Administration</p>	<p>1A.2. Progress Monitoring, Lesson Plans, and Time Line for implementation</p>	<p>1A.2. Core K-12, Unit Assessments</p>	
<p><b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b></p>	<p>1B.1. Individual student behaviors and cognitive levels.</p>	<p>1B.1. Teachers will differentiate instruction based on the level of assistance individual students need.</p>	<p>1B.1. Self Contained ASD Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>1B.1. Informal and formal observations, Unique Learning Systems (ULS) Checkpoints</p>	<p>1B.1. Progress Monitoring Rubric for Content Related Theme Tubs, Ongoing ULS Checkpoints throughout the school year</p>		
<p><u>Science Goal #1B:</u> <i>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 will remain at 100% (1) for the 2012-2013 FAA.</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**

	<i>100% (1) student scored at Level 4, 5, or 6 in science.</i>	<i>n/a</i>					
--	--	------------	--	--	--	--	--

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b>	2A.1. Resources from the Science series and the district's curriculum map and pacing guides will need to be implemented properly and timely to address the standards at each grade level.	2A.1. Teachers will work in grade level PLCs to develop lesson plans that will address the standards using their resources from the Science series and curriculum map and pacing guides.	2A.1. Classroom teachers, PLC Leaders, Science Liaisons, and Administration	2A.1. Progress Monitoring, Lesson Plans, and Time Line for implementation	2A.1. Core K-12, Unit Assessments		
<b>Science Goal #2A:</b> <i>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Science in grade 5 will increase by 13% in 2013.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>16% (22) of students in grade 5 score Level 4 or 5 on FCAT.</i>	<i>29% of students in grade 5 will score Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT in Science.</i>					



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

		2A.2. Vocabulary instruction, resources (materials and supplies) and time throughout the unit to conduct hands on experiments to develop an understanding for curriculum.	2A.2. Teachers will work together in grade level PLCs to share materials and resources as well as develop lesson plans that meet the needs of their students.	2A.2. Classroom teachers, PLC Leaders, Science Liaisons, and Administration	2A.2. Progress Monitoring, Lesson Plans, and Time Line for implementation	2A.2. Core K-12, Unit Assessments	
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>	2B.1. Individual student behaviors and cognitive levels.	2B.1. Teachers will differentiate instruction based on the level of assistance individual students need.	2B.1. Self Contained ASD Classroom Teachers	2B.1. Informal and formal observations, Unique Learning Systems (ULS) Checkpoints	2B.1. Progress Monitoring Rubric for Content Related Theme Tubs, Ongoing ULS Checkpoints throughout the school year		
<b>Science Goal #2B:</b> <i>One student will score at or above Level 7 in science as demonstrated on the 2012-2013 FAA.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
	<i>n/a</i>	<i>One student will score Level 7 or above in science as demonstrated on the FAA.</i>					

*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
PLC and Progress Monitoring Meetings to discuss data based on Core K-12 results and Unit Assessments	K-5	PLC Leader	PLC Grade Level Teams, Science Liaisons	On-going	Lesson Plans, Core K-12 Data discussed at Progress Monitoring meetings	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
Instructional Materials for Science Curriculum	Consumable science materials to be used in the classroom.	District Instructional Media Center (DIMC)	\$1760.90
<b>Subtotal: \$1760.90</b>			
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**

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$1760.90</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. Increased time, resources, and use of rubrics during student conferencing will be needed to increase the writing levels of individual students.	1A.1. Grade level teams will meet to share expectations, ideas, and differentiated instructional strategies and analyze student writings. Teams will use rubrics with anchor papers to provide examples of exemplary work to guide instruction. Teachers and students will participate in regular writing conferences to increase the student's writing levels.	1A.1. Classroom Teachers, Grade Level teams, Literacy Coach, Administration	1A.1. Lesson plans, observations, progress monitoring meetings, and PLC discussions and meetings	1A.1. 2013 FCAT Writes, ongoing student writing samples, student conference logs		

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

<p><u>Writing Goal #1A:</u> <i>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3.0 or higher in writing will increase by 2% as demonstrated on the 2013 FCAT Writes.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>96% (125) of students in grade 4 score 3.0 on FCAT Writes.</p>	<p>98% of students in grade 4 will score a 3.0 or higher on FCAT Writes.</p>					
<p><b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b></p>	<p>1B.1. Individual student behaviors and cognitive levels.</p>	<p>1B.1. Teachers will work with individuals on individual writing skills based upon Individual Education Plan (IEP) goals and the FAA Access Points.</p>	<p>1B.1. Self Contained ASC Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>1B.1. Student/Teacher writing log, writing samples, and progress monitoring charts</p>	<p>1B.1. Progress Monitoring charts and checkpoints towards IEP goals of individual students.</p>		
<p><u>Writing Goal #1B:</u> <i>The percentage of students scoring at 4 or higher in writing will increase by 3%.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>33% (1) student scored at Level 4 or higher in writing.</p>	<p>36% of students will score at Level 4 or higher in writing.</p>					

**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
Core Writing	Grades K-5	Literacy Coach	School-Wide	On-going	Progress Monitoring meetings, PLC Meetings, and student writing samples	Administration and Literacy Coach

**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
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$0.00</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. Wide spread illnesses and parent motivation.</p>	<p>1.1. Administration will meet with the Data Entry to identify students with excessive tardies and/or absences and consult with the School Social Worker to develop a plan of action to monitor attendance.  Classroom teachers will notify the Administration and School Social Worker of students who have attendance and/or tardy concerns.</p>	<p>1.1. Administration, School Social Worker, Data Entry individual, and Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>1.1. The reports from TERMS should reflect an increase in attendance and decrease in tardies of individual students.</p>	<p>1.1. TERMS and eSembler</p>		
<p>Attendance Goal #1:  <i>The number of students who are absent ten or more days will decrease by 7%.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p>					
	<p>96% (905)</p>	<p>97%</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**

	<i>25% (240) of our students were absent for 10 or more days during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	<i>18% of our students will be absent for 10 or more days during the 2012-2013 school year.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	<i>10% (92) of our students were tardy 10 or more days during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	<i>9% of our students will be tardy 10 or more days during the 2012-2013 school year.</i>					
		1.2. Wide spread illnesses and parent motivation.	1.2. Students will perfect attendance will be recognized at quarterly assemblies.	1.2. Classroom teachers and administration	1.2. Decline in student absences and tardies.	1.2. TERMS and eSembler	

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

**Attendance 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
Attendance Monitoring Plan	Grades K-5	School Social Worker	Administration	On-Going ending June 2013	TERMS reports and Teacher input, Meetings with School Social Worker	Administration and School Social Worker

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$0.00</b>			

*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)).

<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>I.1. Repeat offenders</p>	<p>I.1. We will continue to have monthly Principal's Luncheons to reward students with good behavior or positive changes in behaviors.  There will be quarterly assemblies to recognize students for outstanding behavior.  Behavior plans will be written and/or monitored for students with severe behaviors.  Guidance Counselors will continue with Character Counts and rewarding the student with positive Character Traits each month.  Progress Monitoring, TBITs, and SBITs will be held to discuss individual student's needs for interventions.</p>	<p>I.1. Administration, Classroom teachers, Behavior Specialist, PS/Rtl Leadership Team, Guidance Counselors</p>	<p>I.1. Maintain Award Celebration data, review referrals, data collected through SBITs and TBITs</p>	<p>I.1. TERMS and Pasco STAR</p>		
-----------------------------	----------------------------------	--	--	---	--------------------------------------	--	--

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

<p><u>Suspension Goal #1:</u></p> <p>The total number of in-school suspensions will decrease by one student for the 2012-2013 school year.</p> <p>The total number of students suspended out of school during the 2012-2013 school year will decrease to 14.</p> <p>The decrease in student suspensions in and out of school will result in more academic time on task and less on behavior management and discipline.</p>	<p><u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>					
	5	4					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u></p>					
	4	3					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u></p>					
	22	20					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u></p>					
	16	14					

**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
Bullying	Grades K-5	Guidance Counselors and PS/RtI Leadership Team	Classroom Teachers and Staff	On-Going ending June 2013	Agendas and Attendance logs	Administration, Guidance Counselors, and PS/RtI Leadership Team
School-wide Positive Behavior System (PBS)	Grades K-5	Guidance Counselors, Behavior Specialist, and PS/RtI Leadership Team	Classroom Teachers, Guidance Counselors, Behavior Specialist, and Staff	On-Going ending June 2013	Agendas and Attendance logs	Administration, Guidance Counselors, and PS/RtI Leadership Team

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

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$0.00</b>			

*End of Suspension Goals*



**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.	1.1. PTA, class, team, and school wide functions will be held for families to be involved with their children.	1.1. PTA, Specials Areas Teachers, Classroom Teachers, Administration, and School Advisory Council (SAC).	1.1. Number of parents attending events, sign in logs (if available), and Parent Satisfaction Survey.	1.1. Sign in sheets and Parent Satisfaction Survey		
<u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u>  <i>The percentage of parental involvement during the 2012-2013 school year will allow our school to be recognized as a Five Star School and Golden School.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					

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

	<i>At least 80% of our parents and families are involved with our school for PTA sponsored events, curriculum nights, Open Houses, and the School Advisory Council (SAC) at least once during the school year.</i>	<i>At least 80% of our parents and families will be involved in our school functions and activities at least once during the 2013-2014 school year.</i>					
		1.2. Work Schedules and other additional commitments	1.2. PTA, class, team, and school wide functions will be held for families to be involved with their children.	1.2. PTA, Specials Areas Teachers, Classroom Teachers, Administration, and School Advisory Council (SAC).	1.2. Number of parents attending events, sign in logs (if available), and Parent Satisfaction Survey	1.2. Sign in sheets and Parent Satisfaction Survey	

**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

**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			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$0.00</b>			

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

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><b>STEM Goal #1:</b>  <i>Create a STEM Team consisting of Science, Technology, and Math school representatives and a member of the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) or PLC Leadership Team.</i></p>	<p>1.1.                      Limited time to have meetings</p>	<p>1.1.                      Provide STEM information with Grade Level Teams/PLC Leaders regularly.                       Increase the number of Great American Teach In (GATI) speakers with a Science, Technology, and Math (STEM) focus.</p>	<p>1.1.                      Science, Technology, and Math school representatives and Administration</p>	<p>1.1.                      Monitor GATI guest speakers through walkthrough of presentations, review lesson plans which should reflect Science, Math, and Technology connections as suggested in meetings and shared with grade level/PLC groups.</p>	<p>1.1.                      Sign in logs/Raptor report of GATI speakers, STEM meeting agendas and sign in logs, and lesson plans</p>

**STEM Professional Development**

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

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

professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content / Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science, Technology, and Math (STEM) Meetings	K-5	Technology Specialist and Administration	Science Representatives (Primary and Intermediate), Math Representatives (Primary and Intermediate), Technology Specialist, PLC Leaders, Administration	On going throughout school year (1x/quarter)	Lesson Plans, Sign in logs, Agendas	Administration

**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
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$0.00</b>			

*End of STEM 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: \$2010.00</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$3254.24</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$1760.90</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
	<b>Grand Total: \$7025.14</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.
n/a
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The SAC Committee meets the first Monday of every month to discuss and/or introduce the new or existing curriculum, parent involvement activities, district initiatives, learning opportunities for our students, and campus happenings. The SAC reviews the Parent Surveys each school year and provides insight and ideas to enhance parent involvement. The SAC Committee is also given the opportunity to have presentations and/or demonstrations of the programs that occur on our campus while learning about the various needs our students.

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

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
The SAC funds are used to provide the instructional staff with ½ day Progress Monitoring meetings five times per year to discuss student data and areas of improvement and/or enrichment.	Florida Lottery funds have not been released by DOE.