

Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

Name of School:

Area:

South

Gemini Elementary

Principal:

Area Superintendent:

Dr. Mark Mullins

Joseph Loffek

SAC Chairperson:

Marianne Hamilton

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

Our mission is to help each student develop to their fullest potential, always considering first and foremost, what is BEST for the child.

Vision Statement:

Our vision is to see that Gemini's students are prepared to be successful citizens in the 21st century.

--

Brevard County Public Schools

School Improvement Plan

2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

After careful analysis of trend data, our FCAT results reveal the following over the past three years (2010-2012):

Third Grade:

Third grade test scores in the area of reading have decreased from 2009 to 2012. In 2009 to 2010 the school evidenced an 8 point decrease in the Mean Scale Score (357 to 349). From 2010 to 2011 there was no notable change in the Mean Scale Score (349 to 349). During the period 2011 to 2012 a significant drop (134 pts) in DSS was obvious but this was attributed to the implementation of the new state cut scores and the development scale score (DSS) ranges being changed from 100 (Level 1) to 500 (Level 5) and a decrease from 140 (Level 1) to 260 (Level 5). Trend data also revealed that for the period 2009-2012 Gemini continues to out-perform the state and district in mean scale scores in the area of 3rd grade reading.

During the three year period, the percentage of students meeting reading proficiency, Level 3 or above, have also been inconsistent. The percentage of students meeting proficiency in 2010 was 84% (83 out of 99 students), 2011 was 87% (73 out of 84 students) and 2012 was 82% (63 out of 77 students). Consistently though, the majority of our third graders score Level 4 in reading: 2010 – 39% (39 out of 99 students), 2011 – 49% (41 out of 84 students), 2012 – 34% (26 out of 77 students). The percentage of students scoring Level 1 decreased by 2% from 8% in 2010 (8 out of 99 students) to 6% in 2012 (5 out of 77 students).

A review of Third grade test scores in the area of math reveal a decrease each year since 2009. From 2009 to 2010 the school evidenced an 8 point decrease in the Mean Scale Score (381 to 373) and a 26 point decrease from 2010 to 2011 (373 to 347). The period 2011 to 2012 evidenced a significant 137 point MSS decrease. However, in 2012 new state cut scores were implemented and the development scale score ranges changed from 100 (Level 1) to 500 (Level 5) and decreased from 140 (Level 1) to 260 (Level 5). Trend data also revealed that for the period 2009-2012 Gemini continues to out-perform the state and district in mean scale scores in the area of 3rd grade math.

During the three year period, students meeting math proficiency, Level 3 or above have also

decreased. The percentage of students meeting proficiency in 2010 was 92% (91 out of 99 students), in 2011 was 86% (72 out of 84 students), 2012 was 77% (59 out of 77 students). While in 2010, the majority of third graders scored Level 4 (45% - 45 out of 99 students), the majority of students scored Level 3 in 2011 (36% - 30 out of 84 students) and 2012 (34% - 26 out of 77 students). The percentage of students scoring Level 1 have increased by 7% from 3% in 2010 (3 out of 99 students) to 10% in 2012 (8 out of 77 students).

Fourth Grade:

Fourth grade students have evidenced a steady decrease in reading Mean Scale Scores from 2009 (371) to 2012 (229). Again, in 2012 new state cut scores were implemented and the development scale score ranges changed from 100 (Level 1) to 500 (Level 5) and decreased to 154 (Level 1) to 269 (Level 5). Trend data also revealed that for the period 2009-2012 Gemini continues to out-perform the state and district in mean scale scores in the area of 4th grade reading.

During the three year period, students meeting reading proficiency, Level 3 or above have also decreased from 2010 to 2011, but increased in 2012. The percentage of students meeting proficiency in 2010 was 91% (91 out of 100 students), in 2011 was 87% (85 out of 98 students), and 2012 was 90% (71 out of 79 students). The majority of fourth graders scored Level 4 in all three years: 2010 (41% - 41 out of 100 students), 2011 (39% - 48 out of 98 students) and 2012 (37% - 29 out of 79 students). The percentage of students scoring Level 1 have decreased by 2% from 5% in 2010 (5 out of 100 students) to 3% in 2012 (8 out of 77 students).

A comparison to the performance of 2011 third grade students with their 2012 fourth grade reading scores demonstrate great achievement with the same cadre of students. 2012 test data evidenced an increase in the number of students scoring proficiency, Level 3 or above, from 87% (73 out of 84 students) in 2011 to 90% (71 out of 79 students) in 2012. This resulted in a decrease of 4% in students scoring Level 1 from 7% (6 out of 84 students) in 2011 to 3% (2 out of 79 students) in 2012.

Fourth grade test scores in the area of math have also decreased each year since 2009. From 2009 to 2010 the school evidenced a 15 point decrease in the Mean Scale Score (373 to 358) and a 3 point increase from 2010 to 2011 (358 to 361). The period 2011 to 2012 evidenced a drastic 133 point DSS decrease. However, in 2012 new state cut scores were implemented and the development scale score ranges changed from 100 (Level 1) to 500 (Level 5) and decreased from 155 (Level 1) to 271 (Level 5). Trend data also revealed that for the period 2009-2012 Gemini continues to out-perform the state and district in mean scale scores in the area of 4th grade math.

During the three year period, students meeting math proficiency, Level 3 or above have also decreased. The percentage of students meeting proficiency in 2010 was 90% (90 out of 100 students), in 2011 was 90% (88 out of 98 students), 2012 was 81% (64 out of 79 students). While in 2010 (43% - 43 out of 100 students) and 2011 (37% - 36 out of 98 students), the majority of fourth graders scored Level 5 in 2012 (32% - 25 out of 79 students.) However, the percentage of students scoring Level 1 increased by 7% from 3% in 2010 (3 out of 100 students) to 10% in 2012 (8 out of 79 students).

Fourth grade writing scores were continually increasing: 2009 - 4.2, 2010 – 4.3, and 2011 - 4.6, however in 2012, the State of Florida lowered the proficiency score from Level 4.0 to Level 3.0. This was due to an increase in rigor, especially in the areas of grammar, spelling, and conventions. With this, Gemini’s fourth graders still excelled with an overall writing average of 3.7 in 2012. Over the past three years, the percentage of students meeting writing proficiency has decreased: 99% (99 out of 100 students) in 2010, 97% (95 out of 98 students) in 2011, and 96% (76 out of 79 students) in 2012.

Fifth Grade:

Fifth grade students have evidenced a steady decrease in reading Mean Scale Scores from 2009 (362) to 2012 (235). Again, in 2012 new state cut scores were implemented and the development scale score ranges changed from 100 (Level 1) to 500 (Level 5) and decreased to 161 (Level 1) to 277 (Level 5). Trend data also revealed that for the period 2009-2012 Gemini continues to out-perform the state and district in mean scale scores in the area of 5th grade reading.

During the three year period, students meeting reading proficiency, Level 3 or above have also decreased from 2010 to 2012. The percentage of students meeting proficiency in 2010 was 97% (94 out of 97 students), in 2011 was 93% (85 out of 91 students), and 2012 was 80% (73 out of 91 students). The majority of fifth graders scored Level 4 in all three years: 2010 (39% - 38 out of 97 students), 2011 (42% - 38 out of 91 students) and 2012 (32% - 29 out of 91 students). The percentage of students scoring Level 1 have increased by 4% from 2% in 2010 (2 out of 97 students) to 7% in 2012 (6 out of 91 students).

A comparison to the performance of 2011 fourth grade students with their 2012 fifth grade reading scores demonstrate decreased achievement with the same cadre of students. 2012 test data evidenced a decrease in the number of students scoring proficiency, Level 3 or above, from 90% (88 out of 98 students) in 2011 to 81% (74 out of 91 students) in 2012. This resulted in no change in students scoring Level 1 – 7% of students, but it also reflected an increase in students scoring a Level 2 from 6% (6 out of 98 students) in 2011 to 13% (12 out of 91 students) in 2012.

Fifth grade test scores in the area of math increased from 2009 to 2010, but decreased to 370 scale score in 2011. From 2009 to 2010 the school evidenced a 12 point increase in the Mean Scale Score (366 to 378) and an 8 point decrease from 2010 to 2011 (378 to 370). The period 2011 to 2012 evidenced a 135 point MSS decrease. This again attributed to the new state cut scores and the development scale score ranges changing from 100 (Level 1) to 500 (Level 5) and decreased from 163 (Level 1) to 279 (Level 5). Trend data also revealed that for the period 2009-2012 Gemini continues to out-perform the state and district in mean scale scores in the area of 5th grade math.

During the three year period, students meeting math proficiency, Level 3 or above have also decreased since 2010. The percentage of students meeting proficiency in 2010 was 93% (90 out of 97 students), in 2011 was 91% (83 out of 91 students), 2012 was 84% (76 out of 91 students). The majority of fifth grade students score a Level 4 in math: 2010 (48% - 47 out of students) and 2011 (48% - 44 out of 91 students), and 2012 (33% - 30 out of 91 students). However, the percentage of students scoring Level 1 increased by 5% from 2% in 2010 (2 out of 97 students) to 7% in 2012 (6 out of 91 students).

Fifth grade science scores have seen an increase in Mean Scale Scores from 2010 (370) to 2012 (374). The percentage of fifth grade students meeting science proficiency, Level 3 or above, has decreased: 2010 - 90% (87 out of 97 students), 2011 – 87% (79 out of 91 students), and 2012 – 86% (78 out of 91 students). Consistently, the majority of fifth grade students score Level 3 in science: 2010 – 46% (45 out of 97 students), 2011 – 38% (35 out of 91 students), and 2012 – 35% (32 out of 91 students).

Sixth Grade:

Sixth grade students demonstrated high performance in reading Mean Scale Scores from 2009 to 2011 although a slight decrease is evident (370-365) Again, in 2012 new state cut scores were implemented and a significant drop (247) arose. Also, the development scale score ranges changed from 100 (Level 1) to 500 (Level 5) and decreased to 167 (Level 1) to 283 (Level 5). Trend data also revealed that for the period 2009-2012 Gemini continues to out-perform the state and district in mean scale scores in the area of 6th grade reading.

During the three year period, students meeting reading proficiency, Level 3 or above have also decreased from 2010 to 2012. The percentage of students meeting proficiency in 2010 was 95% (70 out of 73 students), in 2011 was 93% (100 out of 107 students), and 2012 was 90% (82 out of 91 students). The majority of sixth graders scored Level 4 in all three years: 2010 (37% - 27 out of 73 students), 2011 (44% - 47 out of 107 students) and 2012 (34% - 31 out of 91 students). The percentage of students scoring Level 1 has remained the same at 3%: 2010 (2 out of 73 students), 2011 (3 out of 107 students), and 2012 (3 out of 91 students).

A comparison to the performance of 2011 fifth grade students with their 2012 sixth grade reading scores demonstrate the same achievement with the same cadre of students with 90% of all 91 students scoring reading proficiency, Level 3 or above. The percentage of students scoring Level 1 (3% - 3 students), Level 2 (7% - 6 students), and Level 3 (24% – 22 students) remained the same from 2011 to 2012. However, the percentage of Level 4 decreased from 42% (38 students) to 34% (31 students) because the percentage of Level 5 increased from 27% (25 students) to 32% (29 students).

Sixth grade students have evidenced an increase in math Mean Scale Scores from 2009 (367) to 2011 (387). In 2012, the MSS decreased by 140 points from 387 to 247. Again, in 2012 new state cut scores were implemented and the developmental scale score ranges changed from 100 (Level 1) to 500 (Level 5) and decreased to 170 (Level 1) to 284 (Level 5). Trend data also revealed that for the period 2009-2012 Gemini continues to out-perform the state and district in mean scale scores in the area of 6th grade math.

During the three year period, students meeting math proficiency, Level 3 or above have decreased from 2010 to 2012. The percentage of students meeting proficiency in 2010 was 96% (70 out of 73 students), in 2011 was 94% (101 out of 107 students), and 2012 was 89% (81 out of 91 students). The majority of fourth graders scored Level 5 in all three years: 2010 (40% - 29 out of 73 students), 2011 (45% - 48 out of 107 students) and 2012 (40% - 36 out of 91 students). The percentage of students scoring Level 1 increased from 2010 – 1% (1 out of 73 students) and has remained the same at 5% for 2011 (5 out of 107 students) and 2012 (5 out of 91 students).

Conclusions:

With increased testing accountability, higher ordered questions, and a narrower range of developmental scale scores (state cut scores), the need for rigorous, research-based instructional strategies are evident more than ever. The components of Gemini’s 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan seeks to build upon the work implemented last year by focusing more on Marzano’s high yield instructional strategies, coupled with quality questioning to extend critical thinking and problem solving. An increased focus on implementing these strategies is also necessary as the most recent test data in 2012 evidenced continued decreases in proficiency (Level 3 or above) in all tested curriculum areas and grade levels 3-6, with the exception of Fourth grade reading. Efforts to implement instructional strategies and methods that encourage critical thinking and problem solving at the highest levels and a concentrated effort to increase reading, writing, math, and science proficiency (Level 3 or above), move students from Level 3 to Level 4 and from Level 4 to Level 5, and decrease the percentage of students scoring Level 1 is Gemini’s 2012-13 main area of focus.

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

	Page 7	

Gemini teachers understand that we are a high performing school. This is evidenced in that the majority of our students are meeting proficiency based on our current and trend quantitative data like FCAT, FAIR, and District Required Assessment data, and qualitative data like teacher observations, student and parent surveys, and feedback. As we celebrate this success, we continue to strive for excellence! Gemini would like to see our proficiency rates and achievement levels increase and ensure that 100% of our students are making annual learning gains.

Our teachers collaborate in various ways. Vertical Articulation Curriculum Teams measure our effectiveness based on results. They ensure that all curriculum programs and best practices are assessed within their vertical curriculum team to measure their impact on student learning. All staff members and our School Advisory Council receive relevant and timely information on their effectiveness in achieving intended results. This important and timely analysis of student data across all grade levels in the areas of reading, math, writing, and science guide our shared learning and teaching strategies in specific curriculum standards, sub-groups and reporting categories. These vertical teams also evaluate our previous year's SIP action steps and formulate which SIP strategies will be deleted, changed, or added to our current year's SIP.

Teachers also convene within their grade levels. These teachers select their meeting day and meet on a bi-weekly basis. Without a school wide grade level meeting day and time, this practice makes it difficult for administration to attend every grade level meeting. Grade levels discuss what they deem pertinent to their specific grade level needs. Knowing that this is not best practice, administration has received input from Activity and ESE teachers and added them to grade level meeting teams. We have also designed a school wide calendar so grade levels teams meet two Thursdays a month. In addition, grade level teams are given a school-wide objective for each meeting and administration is present during these meeting dates. Follow up will be conducted through monthly "Kid Talk" meetings with Administration, our Guidance Counselor, School Psychologist, and Literacy Coach. Lastly, teachers collaborate during faculty meetings and professional development.

As part of our Instructional Personnel Performance Appraisal System (IPPAS), our teachers write an annual Professional Growth Plan (PGP). They also conduct collegial observations where they examine best practices and share instructional strategies. Our teachers welcome this collegial observation as they seek to identify distinguished elements of four dimensions: Learning Environment, Instructional Delivery and Facilitation, Assessment, and Relationships with Students.

This year Gemini surveyed teacher’s professional development needs. As a result of teacher input, we created a school year Professional Development (PD) calendar to meet their needs. The Common Core Leadership Team developed the PD calendar to include CCSS instructional strategies obtained in June 2012 from the FLDOE Countdown to Common Core Summer Institute. Gemini’s professional development days are one Thursday a month and include, but are not limited to topics like:DBQ’s, text complexity, and writing across the curriculum.

Currently, Gemini does not a have a systematic school-wide problem solving and critical thinking focus. Moreover, Quality Questioning has not been evaluated at Gemini. Our school based Marzano trainer has provided professional development on four of Marzano’s nine research-based high yield strategies: identifying similarities and differences, non-linguistic representations, generating and testing hypothesis, and summarizing and note taking. During administrative walk throughs, we plan to ensure that every grade level implements these methods with fidelity.

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

Dr. Max Thompson reports that “65-80% of classroom assessments and school/district benchmark assessments are high order questions, thus matching or exceeding state assessments (p. 61).

At Gemini, we believe that student achievement will increase once students have learned how to ask effective questions, think critically, and become skillful problem solvers. We learn by asking questions. We learn better by asking better questions. We learn more by having opportunities to ask more questions (Morgan & Saxton, 1991). Teaching students to develop their own questioning skills and encouraging them to ask effective questions as a regular part of classroom talk help them become increasingly active in their own learning. Armed with self-assessment skills and using information from feedback that feeds forward, learners are more in tune with what and how much they know and understand about a topic. And because they are deeply engaged, students recognize how clearly they understand and what more they need to learn in order to apply their new understandings to unique and novel situations. As students develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of effective questioners, they also do the following (Clarke, 2005; Hale & City, 2006; Spiegel, 2005):

- Develop independence and autonomy.
- Construct deeper and richer meaning for important content and concepts.
- Take more responsibility for their own learning.
- Learn and practice discipline-specific ways of thinking.

- Discover how to persist during a challenge by seeking accuracy and clarity.
- Explain and express themselves more easily.
- Think deeply about what they are trying to achieve and master.
- Seek explanations and alternatives more frequently.
- Use self-assessment to monitor and evaluate their own understanding.

Finally, even though students learn by asking questions, without developing the ability to do that in effective and confident ways, they will continue to use what David Perkins (1995) calls “everyday thinking.” If we leave students to their own devices, they seldom become skilled thinkers. They have powerful minds but lack the means to harness their thinking in ways that enable them to reason deeply with greater Effectiveness and rise above everyday thinking. Everyday thinking is like walking. It is something we can all do without conscious thought and with little need to increase our skill. But skilled thinking—the kind of thinking that students use when they generate Effective questions—is like running the 100-yard dash. Skilled thinking requires technique, intentional effort, practice, self-regulation, and the use of self-assessment, goal setting, and increasingly sophisticated thinking strategies.

Skilled thinking and Effective questioning are two sides of the same coin. In fact, there is a strong relationship between effective questioning, skilled thinking, and student achievement (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000; Hunkins, 1995). Skilled thinkers achieve more because they think about their own thinking and constantly seek to improve it. It takes this kind of skilled, metacognitive thinking for students to generate Effective questions.

Teachers should avoid short-circuiting assessments that are meant to evaluate higher-order thinking by using in class the same questions or ideas that they know will be on the test. Sometimes this is easier said than done, as students may complain—and rightly so—“we never did that before.” Students should be assessed on things they were taught to do, not surprised on a test or performance assessment with tasks for which they have had no practice.

The solution is that teachers who want their students to be able to demonstrate higher-order thinking should teach it. Dealing with novel ideas, solving problems, and thinking critically should not be something students feel they “never did before.” By the time students arrive at a summative assessment that requires higher-order thinking in the content domain of instruction, they should have had many opportunities to learn and practice, using other novel material.

Realizing that level of difficulty (easy versus hard) and level of thinking (recall versus higher-order thinking) are two different qualities allows you to use higher-order-thinking questions and tasks with all learners. The misconception that recall is “easy” and higher-order thinking is “hard” leads to bad results. The two most insidious ones are shortchanging young students and shortchanging low achievers of any age by offering them only recall and drill assignments because they are not “ready” to do higher-order thinking. In either case, while these students are waiting for you to think they are ready, they will also learn that school is boring. They may misbehave, they may drop out, and they certainly will not learn to think well.

A good problem solver identifies exactly what the problem is, what might be obstacles to solving it, and what solutions might be expected to work. A good problem solver then tries at least one of the solutions. For more complex problems, a good problem solver can prioritize and evaluate the relative effectiveness of different solution strategies (Marzano et al., 1993). If a problem presents something so well known to a student that he or she can complete the task without having to reason, the student does not have to use problem-solving skills, and the scenario is not really a “problem” for that student.

References:

Advancing Formative Assessment in Every Classroom: A Guide for Instructional Leaders. Connie M. Moss and Susan M. Brookhart. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2009. [0]. *Gale Virtual Reference Library.* Web. 17 Sep. 2012.

How to Assess Higher-Order Thinking Skills in Your Classroom. Susan M. Brookhart. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2010. [0]. *Gale Virtual Reference Library.* Web. 17 Sep. 2012.

What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Action. Robert J. Marzano. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2003. 155-156. *Gale Virtual Reference Library.* Web. 17 Sep. 2012.

Moving Schools: Lessons From Exemplary Leaders. Max Thompson. Boone, NC: Learning-Focused Solutions, 2011.

CONTENT AREA:

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

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

To increase student achievement in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics, and science by 5%, the faculty of Gemini Elementary will continue to implement Marzano’s high yield instructional strategies and integrate quality questioning to support problem solving and critical thinking.

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

<i>Barrier</i>	<i>Action Steps</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Timetable</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>In-Process Measure</i>
----------------	---------------------	---------------------------	------------------	---------------	---------------------------

1. Teacher Professional Development	1a. Determine teachers training needs 1b. Create and implement a school wide PDD calendar schedule for the 2012-2013 school year. 1c. Administer and support teacher training	1a. Priscilla DeNino and Jennifer Julian 1b. Common Core Leadership Team 1c. Administration, CCSS Leadership Team, Lead Teachers, Literacy Coach, Blair Nave, and Kim Deffebach	1a. By August 5, 2012 1b. By August 15, 2012 1c. August 2012 to May 2013	1a. \$0 1b. \$10 (copies) 1c. \$200	1a. Printed Survey Monkey results 1b. PDD Calendar Schedule 1c. PDD Agendas, power point presentations, teacher survey results/ feedback.
2. Teacher Implementation	2a. Present Lesson Plan template that includes B.E.S.T., Bloom's Taxonomy, Marzano's high yield strategies and Quality Questioning 2b. Research and purchase Quality Questioning resources for teachers	2a. Jennifer Julian 2b. Reading Leadership Team	2a. By August 15, 2012 2b. By October 15, 2013	2a. \$0 2b. \$600	2a. Administrative observations 2b. Agenda Purchase Order Resource(s)

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

In May 2013, Gemini will evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of our professional practice using the following outcome measures and reflection.

Qualitative

Gemini teachers will access the Survey Monkey website to rate their knowledge and implementation of quality questioning techniques. They will also evaluate the usefulness of the resources provided and year long Professional Development that afforded critical thinking

and problem solving skills training. These survey results will be shared during our faculty and SAC meetings. Through collegial and administrative observations, teachers will model teaching techniques and strategies that encompass quality questioning and promote critical thinking and problem solving. Teachers and administrators will provide verbal feedback in a timely manner and will share best practices during grade level and faculty meetings.

Quantitative

Administration, the MTSS Team, and Grade K-6 teachers will maintain and update a data board and their Lowest 25% Student Tracking binder throughout the year. Evidence will include an Excel spreadsheet with documented district required assessment scores, FAIR, Running Records, DIBELS, PASI/PSI, and ORF data. Administration will evaluate teachers' quality questioning and critical thinking implementation using IPPAS Classroom Evaluation Indicator forms. Administration will also chart and graph the frequency of quality questioning, critical thinking, and problem solving strategies using an iPad App.

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

In May 2013, Gemini will evaluate student achievement using the following outcome measures and reflection.

Qualitative

Teachers will be able to articulate student progression and be able to track and monitor student achievement as evidenced through verbal dialogue and observations at monthly "Kid Talk" and weekly MTSS meetings. Teachers will analyze student surveys and student journals. Student achievement results will be shared during student and parent conferences. Student engagement and achievement will also be observed by administration during classroom walk throughs.

Quantitative

Administration, the MTSS Team, and Grade K-6 teachers will maintain and update a data board and their Lowest 25% Student Tracking binder throughout the year. Student achievement evidence will include documented district required assessment scores, FAIR, Running Records, DIBELS, PASI/PSI, and ORF data. A3 data, item analysis reports, on going progress monitoring reports, PMP's, and student progress reports will illustrate student achievement as well. Finally, Administration, teacher data teams, and SAC will analyze and evaluate FCAT 2.0 data. These teams will disaggregate the data and document student achievement learning gains and annual measurable outcome success.

APPENDIX A (ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal 1. Implement Quality Questioning to increase Level 5 student percentage reading proficiency by 5%.	2012 Current Level of Performance 30% = 100 students	2013 Expected Level of Performance 35% = 118 students) +18
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. Extended Critical Thinking Strategies		
Strategy(s): 1. Create Vertical Articulation Reading Leadership Team 2. Present and provide Critical Thinking Skills Professional Development for teachers 3. Research and purchase Quality Questioning and Critical Thinking resources. 4. Evaluate text complexity and questioning (simple or complex) 5. Recruit Media Specialist to provide 21 st Century technology learning opportunities for teachers and students 6. Invite Blair Nave to train faculty on DBQ's 7. Incorporate DBQ's into the reading curriculum 8. Send teachers to FRA Reading Conference and have them present to all teachers		

<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3</p> <p>Barrier(s): Vocabulary Strategies</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Present and implement interactive word walls / learning maps 2. Extend robust vocabulary opportunities 3. Increase text complexity through read alouds</p>	<p>86% = 289 students</p>	<p>91% = 307 students +18</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>		
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): Enrichment Opportunities</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Identify GSP students in grades 1-3 and Level 4 & 5 students in grades 4-6 2. Group these students during SMART Time for enrichment opportunities 3. Recruit Gifted teachers to present critical thinking/higher order lessons and instructional strategies to all teachers</p>	<p>64% = 216 students</p>	<p>69% = 233 students +17</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>		
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): Vocabulary Strategies</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Present and implement interactive word walls / learning maps 2. Extend robust vocabulary opportunities 3. Increase text complexity through read alouds</p>	<p>81% = 314 students</p>	<p>86% = 334 students +20</p>
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): Tracking and Monitoring of Student Progress</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Evaluate current student tracking and monitoring procedures 2. Design student tracking and monitoring binders for each grade level 3. Inform teachers how to access data on A3 4. Record data in student tracking and monitoring binders 5. Meet monthly to analyze student progression and adjust instruction</p> <p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>72% = 35 students</p>	<p>80% = 38 students +3</p>

<p>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</p> <p>Baseline data 2010-11: 87%</p>	<p>86% (334 students)</p>	<p>89% (354 students) +20</p>
<p>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :</p> <p>White:</p> <p>Black:</p> <p>Hispanic:</p> <p>Asian:</p> <p>American Indian:</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for current level of performance</p> <p>14% = 49 students</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance</p> <p>9% = 30 students -5</p>
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>		
<p>Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): Raising expectations for ESE students</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement Marzano’s High Yield Strategies 2. Utilize Quality Questioning 3. Develop a Master Schedule 4. Provide Tier 2 and 3 interventions through SMART Time 5. Supplement research-based resources for ESE Teachers 6. Involve ESE teachers in the MTSS meetings 	<p>52% = 23 students</p>	<p>47% = 11 students -12</p>
<p>Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <p>1.</p>		

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Differentiated Instruction ● Interactive Word Walls / Learning Maps 	Sept. 6, 2012	Administrative Walk Throughs Teacher Lesson Plans Student Work Pictures of Interactive Word Walls / Learning Maps
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Informational Text – Why the Shift? ● Text Complexity ● Text Based Questions 	Sept. 27, 2012	Administrative Walk Throughs Teacher Lesson Plans Student Work Teacher Surveys / Feedback

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read Alouds • Paired Readings 	November 1, 2012	Administrative Walk Throughs Teacher Lesson Plans AR STAR Reports FAIR, DRLA Data Results Teacher Surveys / Feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Order Thinking • Problem Solving • DBQ's 	November 29, 2012	Administrative Walk Throughs Teacher Lesson Plans Student Work A3 Data Results Teacher Surveys / Feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing Across the Curriculum • Writing to Think • Providing Evidence 	January 17, 2013	Administrative Walk Throughs Teacher Lesson Plans Student Work / Notebooks A3 Writing Data Teacher Surveys / Feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESE Strategies (Autism & Aspergers) • Rubrics of Student Work 	February 28, 2013	Report Cards for ESE Students A3 Item Analysis Data Rubrics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thinking Maps 	March 7, 2013	Administrative Walk Throughs Teacher Lesson Plans Student Work / Notebooks A3 DRLA Data Teacher Surveys / Feedback

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 67% (2/3)	Exposure to English Language	1. Utilize Learning Today website 2. Immerse student with English speaking peers and adults 3. Invite Pam Lorenzo to work with ELL students	Jennifer Julian Learning Today Data Report

<p>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</p> <p>67% (2/3)</p> <p>Thompson goes on to report that 65-80% of classroom assessments and school/district benchmark assessments were high order questions, thus matching or exceeding state assessments.</p>	<p>Exposure to English language, text, and letters</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize Learning Today and Star Fall websites 2. Book Buddies 3. Invite Pam Lorenzo to work with ELL students 	<p>Jennifer Julian Learning Today Data Report</p>
<p>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing:</p> <p>67% (2/3)</p>	<p>Exposure to English written language</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide daily writing opportunities 2. Create a student writing journal 	<p>Jennifer Julian Learning Today Data Report</p>

<p>Mathematics Goal(s):</p> <p>1. Implement standardized problem-solving vocabulary and math journaling to increase Level 5 student percentage mathematic proficiency by 5%.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance 25% = 97 students</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance 30% = 116 students +19</p>
<p>Anticipated Barrier(s): Implementation of standardized problem-solving vocabulary and consistency</p>		

<p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create Vertical Articulation Mathematics Leadership Team 2. Research standardized math problem-solving vocabulary 3. Provide training and implementation of standardized problem-solving vocabulary in order to support consistency and continuity across all grade levels. 4. Evaluate student progress based on district math assessments 5. Send teachers to FCTM Conference (Robert Marzano quest speaker) and present to all teachers 		
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s): Number Sense</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create student math journals 2. Implement "Number Talk" 3. Explain students' math thinking 	84% = 326 student	89% = 345 student +19
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 		
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Enrichment Opportunities</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify GSP students in grades 1-3 and Level 4 & 5 students in grades 4-6 2. Group these students during SMART Time for enrichment opportunities 3. Recruit Gifted teachers to present critical thinking/higher order lessons and instructional strategies to all teachers 	49% = 190 students	54% = 210 students +20
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 		
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 	87% = 338 students	92% = 357 students +19

FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): Tracking and Monitoring of Student Progress Strategy(s): 1. Evaluate current student tracking and monitoring procedures 2. Design student tracking and monitoring binders for each grade level 3. Inform teachers how to access data on A3 4. Record data in student tracking and monitoring binders 5. Meet monthly to analyze student progression and adjust instruction	74% = 33 students	80% = 36 students +3
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11: 83%	84% (326 students)	89% 345 students) +19
Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in mathematics: White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5% = 19 Students 	3% = 12 students -7
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Common Core State Standards Mathematical Practices	November 12, 2012	Administrative Walk Throughs Agendas Teacher Lesson Plans Student Work Teacher Surveys / Feedback

Number Talk	January 15, 2013	Administrative Walk Throughs Agendas Teacher Lesson Plans Student Work Teacher Surveys / Feedback
-------------	---------------------	---

<p>Writing Goal(s) 1. Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence to increase FCAT Writes proficiency by 4%</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance 96% = 77 students</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance 100% = 80 students +3</p>
<p>Barrier(s): Teacher Training</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Create Vertical Articulation Writing Leadership Team 2. Design Argument Writing PDD for all teachers 3. Teach Argumentative Writing with relevant and sufficient evidence 4. Track and monitor all students' district writing scores</p>		
<p>FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing</p>	96% = 77 students	100% = 80 students +3
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing</p>		
<p>Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) 1. Utilize Marzano's Note-taking strategy and develop Science Journals for all students to facilitate written problem solving and critical thinking communication during science to increase FCAT 2.0 Science proficiency by 5%</p>	<p>2012 Current Level 86% = 78 students</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of 91% = 83 students +5</p>
<p>Barrier(s): School-wide implementation</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Create Vertical Articulation Science Leadership Team 2. Provide Marzano Note-taking training 3. Present student science journal samples</p>		

FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:	86% = 78 students	91% = 83 students +5
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	51% = 46 students	56% = 51 students +5
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading		

1. Science Goal(s) (High School)	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s):		
Strategy(s): 1.		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. <div style="text-align: right;"> White: Black: Hispanic: </div>		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

Geometry EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. <p style="text-align: right;">White: Black: Hispanic:</p>		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		

Biology EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the
-------------------------	--	---

	students that percentage reflects)	number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Biology:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology:		

Civics EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Civics:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics:		

U.S. History EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in U. S. History:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History:		

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
---	----------------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: Goal 1: Goal 2:			
---	--	--	--

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: Goal 1: Goal 2:			

Additional Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: Goal 1: Goal 2:			

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1.		
2.		
3.		

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 paraprofessionals 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

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

<p>MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI</p> <p>Gemini’s MTSS/RtI Team consists of: Joe Loffek (Principal), Jennifer Julian (AP), David Dunn (Guidance Counselor, Drema Moody (Staffing Specialist), Heather Fleming (School Psychologist), Oscar Ellis (Behavior Analyst), Sue Melcher (Speech/Language Pathologist), Kim Bliss (Intermediate ESE Teacher), Marianne Hamilton (Primary ESE Teacher), and Nancy Craft (Literacy Contact – Teacher). Gemini continues to gain knowledge and develop a clear vision of MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Supports) and the cyclical Problem-Solving Model: Step 1-Problem Identification, Step 2 – Problem Analysis, Step 3 – Intervention Design, Step 4 – Response to Intervention. These intertwined support systems are critical to making the instructional adjustments needed for continual improvement and must be addressed this school year.</p> <p>The MTSS Team developed four goals that will enhance the development of Gemini’s SIP and impact the 2012-13 data. These goals include: Implement a master schedule that includes SMART (Students Making Advancements through Responsive Teams) Time (30 minutes a day for Tier 2 interventions and/or enrichment), make intervention and referral/placement process for potential exceptional student education services more transparent for parents and staff, ensure that IEP three year re-evaluations are within calendar guidelines and all inputs are completed in a timely manner, and service our staff with any changes to our County Plan and new guidelines/procedures as they arise. Gemini’s MTSS Team uses a multitude of data sources including: A3(District Benchmark Assessments in all academic areas), FLKRS, FAIR, FCAT, Running Records, Students Portfolios, Classroom Behavior Management Plans, Teacher Made Assessments, Tier 2 and Tier 3 (Barton, PASI, PSI, ERDA, DAR, QRI) FOCUS, KBIT, KTEA, Progress Reports, and observational checklists. Staff will receive on-going MTSS training throughout the school year through faculty meetings and grade level “Kid Talk” meetings. The purpose of MTSS/RtI and SMART were presented on September 6, 2012. Grade Level Student Tracking and Monitoring binders, IPST Checklists, IPST Forms 1-8, and procedures were presented on September 24, 2012.</p>
--

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

The BPS 2011-12 Parent Survey from Survey Monkey indicates the following: 96% (153/159) state E-mail is the best way to communicate and stay informed, 77% (156/159) rate our office staff as “Excellent” for being friendly and helpful, Staff members were rated as “Excellent” for responding to needs, concerns, and questions - Principal (48%), AP (39%), Teachers (68%). 91% (144/158) of parents have attended an information meeting or academic event and 88% (130/147) felt the information was useful. 25% (35/139) parents that did not attend the information meeting or academic event because the meeting/events were not at convenient times. The best day/time to attend school events was noted as Friday morning 63% (63/154), Tuesday afternoon 54% (37/154) and Thursday evening 73% (85/154). 42% (57/135) would like Study Skills presented at our school. 51% (76/149) feel well informed and satisfied with their level of participation in school decision making. 60% (90/151) of parents rate the homework quality as “Good” and 74% (108/154) feel the amount of homework is “Just Fine.” 56% (85/153) rate the classroom instruction as “Excellent,” while they rate the instructional materials (56%- 86/154), technology (54% - 83/154), school website (58% - 88/153), school environment (47% - 72/152), and enrichment activities (44% - 67/154) as “Good.” A school safe environment is viewed as “Excellent” 52% (80/154). Student learning ratings were reported as “Excellent” for Reading/Language Arts (46% - 71/153) and Science (47% - 73/154) and “Good” for Math (43% 66/154), Social Studies (43% - 66/153), and electives/specials/activities (41% - 60/148). We had an overall rating of “Good” on students learning 21st century skills at school. Lastly, 65% (100/153) rated their overall satisfaction with the quality of our school as “Excellent.”

Parent volunteer hours were reported from VIPS as 9,721.31 hours.

We can improve the 2012-13 BPS Parent Survey results by scheduling information meetings or academic events on Friday mornings, Tuesday afternoons, or Thursday evenings. We can also include these events and publicize volunteer opportunities in our GemiNews, which is emailed to parents, as that is their preferred method of communication. This year, Gemini will develop a PTO website with pertinent, up-to-date information and events. Teachers will share this website during Open House and the website will be included in teacher newsletters and in our weekly GemiNews. With increased communication, we will also increase parental involvement. Gemini’s PTO is also initiating new fundraisers to supplement technology endeavors. These include a parents’ night out, tennis tournament “Tennis for Technology” and a 5K community run where all stakeholders are involved. Administration and teachers are also collaborating with PTO to write grants in an effort to increase Gemini’s school wide technology. Lastly, two parent contacts attend Brevard County’s Parent Leadership Meetings and present this information to our Administration, SAC and PTO.

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

Reviewing attendance data from 2009 to 2012 indicates a 0.68% increase. The results are 2009-2010 = 95.97%, 2010-2011 = 97.03%, 2011-2012 = 96.62%, and 2012-2013 = 96.65%. Gemini has an Attendance Review Team consisting of Joe Loffek (Principal), Dave Dunn (School Counselor), and Jeannine Bell (Teacher). This team analyzes attendance records from AS400 and Brevard’s Leadership Team Packet. Parents are contacted immediately when five tardies or absences are incurred. The school counselor also conferences with students to mentor students on the importance of student participation.

Many of Gemini families travel. To ensure that students are present on testing days, a school-wide master calendar has been designed. This will alert parents of important FCAT 2.0 testing dates and aid in student involvement. Attendance policies and procedures are also shared in our GemiNews, Open House, and Edline Webpage.

SUSPENSION:

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

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