

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: Spring Lake Elementary	District Name: Orange County Public Schools
Principal: Dr. Osborne	Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Joseph R. Cormier	Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

Administrators

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

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

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	Angela Murphy-Osborne	Doctorate –Education Administration- ESE/Elementary Education Certified	13	16	<p>Spring Lake Elementary: 2011-2012: Grade-A Reading Mastery: 72%. Math Mastery: 78%, Science Mastery:72%. Writing Mastery:99%. Lowest 25%: 77% (Reading) and 64% (Math). 2010-2011: Grade - A, Reading Mastery: 85%. Math Mastery: 86%. Science Mastery: 57%. Writing Mastery: 88%. AYP: 73% (Reading) and 82% (Math). Lowest 25%: 53% (Reading) and 77% (Math). 2009-2010: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 83%, Math Mastery: 85%, Science Mastery: 58%, Writing Mastery: 89% AYP: 75% (Reading) and 65% (Math). Lowest 25%: 78% (Reading) and 69% (Math). 2008-2009: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 85%, Math Mastery: 83%, Science Mastery: 59%, Writing Mastery: 92%. AYP: 80% (Reading) and 65% (Math). Lowest 25%: 71% (Reading) and 69% (Math). 2007-2008: Grade B, Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery: 82%, Science Mastery: 41%, Writing Mastery 57%. AYP: 61% (Reading) and 74% (Math). Lowest 25%: 57% (Reading) and 67% (Math). 2006-2007: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery: 77%, Science Mastery: 41%, Writing Mastery 79%. AYP: 68% (Reading) and 65% (Math). Lowest 25%: 62% (Reading) and 58% (Math).</p>
Assistant Principal	N/A				

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading Coach	Michael Knight	M.S. - Criminal Justice Administration; B.S. - U.S. History; Reading Endorsed and certified in History (6-12), Elementary Education (K-6), ESOL (K-12), and ESE (K-12). Working on Masters in Education and Leadership	9	5	Spring Lake Elementary: 2011-2012: Grade-A Reading Mastery: 72%. Math Mastery: 78%, Science Mastery:72%. Writing Mastery:99%. Lowest 25%: 77% (Reading) and 64% (Math). 2010-2011: Grade - A, Reading Mastery: 85%. Math Mastery: 86%. Science Mastery: 57%. Writing Mastery: 88%. AYP: 73% (Reading) and 82% (Math). Lowest 25%: 53% (Reading) and 77% (Math). 2009-2010: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 83%, Math Mastery: 85%, Science Mastery: 58%, Writing Mastery: 89% AYP: 75% (Reading) and 65% (Math). Lowest 25%: 78% (Reading) and 69% (Math). 2008-2009: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 85%, Math Mastery: 83%, Science Mastery: 59%, Writing Mastery: 92%. AYP: 80% (Reading) and 65% (Math). Lowest 25%: 71% (Reading) and 69% (Math). 2007-2008: Grade B, Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery: 82%, Science Mastery: 41%, Writing Mastery 57%. AYP: 61% (Reading) and 74% (Math). Lowest 25%: 57% (Reading) and 67% (Math). 2006-2007: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery: 77%, Science Mastery: 41%, Writing Mastery 79%. AYP: 68% (Reading) and 65% (Math). Lowest 25%: 62% (Reading) and 58% (Math).
CRT	Jennifer Cotterill	M.Ed- Certified in Educational Leadership B.S. - Elementary Education; 1-6	11	1	Spring Lake Elementary: 2011-2012: Grade-A Reading Mastery: 72%. Math Mastery: 78%, Science Mastery:72%. Writing Mastery:99%. Lowest 25%: 77% (Reading) and 64% (Math). 2010-2011: Grade - A, Reading Mastery: 85%. Math

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

		Certified, ESOL certified and endorsed.			<p>Mastery: 86%. Science Mastery: 57%. Writing Mastery: 88%. AYP: 73% (Reading) and 82% (Math). Lowest 25%: 53% (Reading) and 77% (Math).</p> <p>2009-2010: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 83%, Math Mastery: 85%, Science Mastery: 58%, Writing Mastery: 89% AYP: 75% (Reading) and 65% (Math). Lowest 25%: 78% (Reading) and 69% (Math).</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 85%, Math Mastery: 83%, Science Mastery: 59%, Writing Mastery: 92%. AYP: 80% (Reading) and 65% (Math). Lowest 25%: 71% (Reading) and 69% (Math).</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade B, Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery: 82%, Science Mastery: 41%, Writing Mastery 57%. AYP: 61% (Reading) and 74% (Math). Lowest 25%: 57% (Reading) and 67% (Math).</p> <p>2006-2007: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery: 77%, Science Mastery: 41%, Writing Mastery 79%. AYP: 68% (Reading) and 65% (Math). Lowest 25%: 62% (Reading) and 58% (Math).</p>
Title I Contact	Kimberly Pierce	B.S. - Elementary Education; Elementary Ed. certified and ESOL Endorsed. Currently working on Reading Endorsement. ESE certified	6	1	<p>Spring Lake Elementary: 2011-2012: Grade-A Reading Mastery: 72%. Math Mastery: 78%, Science Mastery:72%. Writing Mastery:99%. Lowest 25%: 77% (Reading) and 64% (Math).</p> <p>2010-2011: Grade - A, Reading Mastery: 85%. Math Mastery: 86%. Science Mastery: 57%. Writing Mastery: 88%. AYP: 73% (Reading) and 82% (Math). Lowest 25%: 53% (Reading) and 77% (Math).</p> <p>2009-2010: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 83%, Math Mastery: 85%, Science Mastery: 58%, Writing Mastery: 89% AYP: 75% (Reading) and 65% (Math). Lowest 25%: 78% (Reading) and 69% (Math).</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 85%, Math Mastery: 83%, Science Mastery: 59%, Writing Mastery: 92%. AYP: 80% (Reading) and 65% (Math). Lowest 25%: 71% (Reading) and 69% (Math).</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade B, Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery: 82%, Science Mastery: 41%, Writing Mastery 57%. AYP: 61% (Reading)</p>

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

					and 74% (Math). Lowest 25%: 57% (Reading) and 67% (Math). 2006-2007: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery: 77%, Science Mastery: 41%, Writing Mastery 79%. AYP: 68% (Reading) and 65% (Math). Lowest 25%: 62% (Reading) and 58% (Math)./
--	--	--	--	--	---

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Mentoring Program	Jennifer Cotterill	6/13
2. Bluejay Recognition	Angela Osborne	6/13
3. Staff Recognition Awards	Angela Osborne	6/13
4. Collaborative Neighborhood Learning Environment	Staff	6/13
5. On-going Staff Development Trainings	Jennifer Cotterill	6/13

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
None	N/A

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
42	12% (5)	43% (18)	24%(10)	21.4%(9)	31%(13)	100%(42)	14.3%(6)	0.0%(0)	61.9%(26)

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
Stacy Huntzinger	Lisa Grootius	Ms. Huntzinger is an experienced Science Lab teacher. Ms.Grootius is new to the school.	Assist with academic subject areas, benchmarks, expectations, and curriculum. Meet weekly in grade level Professional Learning Community meetings for grade level planning.
Nancy VanValkenburg	Mahassan Harb	Ms. Van is an experienced 1st grade teacher. Ms.Harb is new to the school.	Assist with academic subject areas, benchmarks, expectations, and curriculum. Meet weekly in grade level Professional Learning Community

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

			meetings for grade level planning.
Maureen Morris	Kayla Humphreys	Mrs. Morris is an experienced 1st grade teacher. Ms. Humphreys is new to the school.	Assist with academic subject areas, benchmarks, expectations, and curriculum. Meet weekly in grade level Professional Learning Community meetings for grade level planning.
Kimberly Pierce	Leah Zaguroli	Mrs. Pierce is an experienced elementary teacher. Ms. Zaguroli is new to the school.	Assist with academic subject areas, benchmarks, expectations, and curriculum. Meet weekly in grade level Professional Learning Community meetings for grade level planning.
Shelley Medley	Heather Colburn	Mrs. Medley is an experienced elementary teacher. Ms. Colburn` is new to the school.	Assist with academic subject areas, benchmarks, expectations, and curriculum. Meet weekly in grade level Professional Learning Community meetings for grade level planning.

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

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A Spring Lake Elementary Title I funds are used to hire instructional support teachers in reading, math, and science. Additionally, funds are used for supplemental intervention materials, parent involvement activities, and professional development. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided.
Title I, Part C- Migrant N/A
Title I, Part D N/A
Title II Title II Funds are used to provide professional development opportunities to improve student achievement and instructional methods at Spring Lake Elementary.
Title III Spring Lake Elementary Title III funds are used to provide support for the ELL populations. Services such as materials, resources, and support are provided through the district office to provide equal opportunities to all students.
Title X- Homeless Spring Lake Elementary Staffing Specialist and Social Worker are the contact for this program and ensure parents are aware of services available to families.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) Spring Lake Elementary provides free tutoring services for students. The tutoring focuses on Reading and Math. FCAT tutoring for students in grades 3-5 are provided before, during, and after school. Funds are also being used to support an instructional resource teacher.
Violence Prevention Programs Ocoee Police Department provides a specific program under the DARE program for fifth grade students. Through this program our students sign a pledge to be Drug and Violence free. The Staffing Specialist has established a Red Ribbon campaign which promotes a drug free lifestyle. Spring Lake Elementary also provides our K-3 students with the Michelee Puppet Bullying Prevention Theater show. Additionally, our Staffing Specialist conducts monthly character development sessions with each K-5 class. Spring Lake Elementary also partners with a counseling service that provides students with small group sessions dealing with a variety of issues.
Nutrition Programs Spring Lake Elementary offers breakfast and lunch programs that are in compliance with the USDA Breakfast and Lunch Program. Nutrition and Health lessons are also taught by our school nurse or PE teacher. University of Florida comes to the school to do a nutrition program for students in K-2(once a month).
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start N/A
Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education N/A

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

Job Training N/A
Other N/A

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
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.</p> <p>Dr. Angela Osborne, Principal Provides guidance for the RtI Leadership Team. Through her leadership, the team is able to implement the proper data decisions for all students. Dr. Osborne ensures that the team is implementing RtI for all students and interventions are implemented effectively. Dr. Osborne also provides opportunities for RtI Professional Development for the RtI Team and Spring Lake Staff.</p> <p>Ms. Jennifer Cotterill, CRT Provides various resources to the staff and parents regarding RtI. Ms. Cotterill also analyzes data with teachers and researches scientifically based curriculum and intervention programs. She collaborates with the Reading Coach to assess students early and ensure that interventions are in place. She also ensures that teachers have additional data necessary to make informed decisions about students.</p> <p>Mr. Michael Knight, Reading Coach Provides research-based intervention suggestions and instruction. Mr. Knight provides guidance on all reading curriculum and intervention programs. Mr. Knight supports data collection, assists in data analysis, and provides professional development opportunities for all staff members. Mr. Knight also works with the CRT and teachers to implement Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions.</p> <p>Mrs. Mary Ann Lattner, Staffing Specialist Serves as RtI Chairperson/Coordinator. Mrs. Lattner participates in the collection and analysis of student data. Mrs. Lattner collaborates with the CRT, Reading Coach, Principal and teachers to develop and monitor student intervention plans. She provides professional development opportunities to staff members regarding the successful implementation of RTI.</p> <p>Mrs. Kimberly Pierce, Math and Reading Title I Teacher Participates in analyzing student data and ensuring intervention plans are being followed. Mrs. Pierce assists in professional development.</p> <p>Ms. Rose Rivera, School Psychologist Participates in the collection and analysis of student data. Ms. Rivera collaborates with the CRT, Reading Coach, Principal, and teachers to develop and monitor student intervention plans. She provides professional development opportunities to staff members regarding the successful implementation of RTI.</p> <p>All Spring Lake Instructional Staff Provides information about core instruction, participates in data meetings and data collection, and ensures that all intervention plans are being followed.</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?</p> <p>The RtI Leadership Team will function as a "hands on" body to interpret data, disaggregate data, and discuss interventions for the students. The RtI Leadership Team will meet bi-weekly during PLC data meetings to ensure that all students' needs are being met and to discuss if the interventions are benefiting the students. Additionally, the team will monitor plans, conduct classroom walkthroughs, provide professional development and provide support and materials. Additional RtI-academic and RtI-behavior meetings will be held on a case by case basis as student deficiencies are identified.</p>
<p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?</p> <p>The RtI Leadership Team will meet throughout the school year to discuss all students and formulate a plan to ensure that all student needs are met. The team will make</p>

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

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

recommendations for professional development areas and intervention materials.

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.

Dr. Osborne will coordinate the tiered data management system with the RtI Leadership team and the classroom teachers. Each teacher will maintain a data notebook with specific concerns and interventions for each student. The RtI team will also have a master copy of all RtI meeting data. Data meetings will be conducted monthly. Our data meetings will focus on "all" students on each grade level. The data will be retrieved from a variety of sources such as: FCAT, Write Score, Study Island, Success Maker/I-Ready, Envision Math, FAIR, and Edusoft.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

We have a MTSS (RtI) PLC that will expose the entire staff to the concept of RtI. District personnel will conduct MTSS trainings and provide support throughout the school year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

We will have monthly data meetings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Dr. Angela Osborne, Principal Ms. Jennifer Cotterill, CRT Mr. Michael Knight, Reading Coach Mrs. Mary Ann Lattner, Staffing Specialist Mrs. Kimberly Pierce, Math and Reading Title I Teacher Ms. Rose Rivera, School Psychologist Mrs. Allison Mazzant, ESE Teacher Mrs. Valerie Campbell, Media Specialist Mr. Joseph Cormier, Dean
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). Dr. Osborne provides guidance for the school-based Literacy Leadership Team. Through her leadership, the team is able to implement the proper data decisions for all students. Dr. Osborne ensures that the team is implementing research-based literacy strategies for all students. Monthly meetings will be held and facilitated by the Reading Coach. The LLT ensures that the core reading program is implemented with fidelity and is responsible for our progress in the OCPS K-12 Reading Plan.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? Major initiatives of the LLT will be to update our Media Center by updating videos to DVDs, increasing the non-fiction section of the media center, and purchasing new textbooks. Our goal will be to increase the number of books we have in science, Accelerated Reader(AR), and reference books. Additionally, the LLT will provide professional development for our staff that focuses on effective instructional reading literacy strategies and practices. We will also have a literacy night for parents, demonstrating effective strategies to increase literacy. Instructional staff will participate in staff development and training.

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

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

****Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition***

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

At Spring Lake Elementary School, all of our Kindergarten classes begin the year with a full time paraprofessional for extra support in transitioning into kindergarten. On the first day of school, the students are given a tour of the campus. Our teachers begin the year with a focus on community building to make them feel welcome. At Spring Lake Elementary School, all incoming Kindergarten students are assessed using the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screening (FLKRS).

****Grades 6-12 Only*** Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

N/A

****High Schools Only***

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

N/A

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?

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#).

N/A

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			IA.1. Scheduling of designated school-wide interventions using resource staff, paraprofessional staff, and special area teachers	IA.1. Utilize all Special Area Instructional Staff to assist with the implementation of the interventions	IA.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal	IA.1. Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plans	IA.1. FAIR, Edusoft Reading Data, Edusoft Mini Assessment Data, Study Island reports, FCAT 2013
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In order to meet the Superintendent's five goals, the OCPS K-12 Reading Plan' and to ensure our students receive quality reading instruction, the 2013 point of target for student mastery on FCAT will increase from 25% (57) to 28% (64).	In grades 3-5, 25% (57) of students achieved a Level 3 on the 2012 Reading FCAT.	By June 2013, 28% (64) of students taking the Reading FCAT will score a Level 3.					
			IA.3. Lack of parent involvement	IA.3. Host a Literacy Night for parents, families and students.	IA.3. Dr. Osborne, Principal, Reading Coach, Leadership Team, LLT, Instructional Staff, and Instructional Coaches	IA.3. Parent participation	IA.3. Participant sign in sheets
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.

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

Reading Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Instructional Staff differentiating instruction to students above grade level	2A.1. Provide professional development to instructional staff in the area of differentiating instruction	2A.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal, Reading Coach, Leadership Team, and CRT	2A.1. Classroom walkthroughs, weekly PLC meetings, and Lesson plans	2A.1. EduSoft Assessments, FAIR data, Edusoft Mini Assessments, Study Island, and Imagine It Weekly Assessments
Reading Goal #2A: In order to meet the Superintendent's five goals, the OCPS K-12 Reading Plan, and to ensure our students receive quality reading instruction, the 2013 point of target for student mastery on FCAT will increase from 45% (104) to 48% (110).	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In grades 3-5, 45% (104) of students achieved a Level 4 or above on the 2012 Reading FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 48% (110) of students taking the Reading FCAT will score a Level 4 or above.	Lack of time beyond core instruction to implement enrichment activities	Utilize all Special Area Instructional Staff to implement research based enrichment activities			
			2A.2. Lack of parental involvement	2A.2. Host a Family Reading Night for parents, families, and students	2A.2. Dr. Osborne, Principal, Reading Coach, LLT, Instructional Staff	2A.2. Parent Participation	2A.2. Parent Sign In sheets
			2A.3. Common understandings of essential, instructional goals among teachers within vertical grade levels to continue the same rigor and relevance from one grade level to the next	2A.3. Teacher Leaders will participate in Lesson Study professional development sessions throughout the year, in an effort to analyze lessons and collaborate on best practices when teaching.	2A.3. Dr. Osborne, Principal, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist, and CRT	2A.3. Classroom walkthroughs, weekly PLC meetings, and lesson plans	2A.3. Edusoft reports, Study Island reports, and FAIR data
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Scheduling of Designated School-Wide Interventions	3A.1. Utilize all Resource and Special Area Instructional Staff to assist with the implementation of interventions	3A.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal	3A.1. Classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans	3A.1. FAIR, Edusoft Reading Data, Edusoft Mini Assessment Data, Study Island reports, and FCAT 2013
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In order to meet the Superintendent's five goals, the OCPS K-12 Reading Plan, and to ensure our students receive quality reading instruction, we will increase FCAT Reading scores from 79% (131) to 82% (135).	In June 2012, 79% (131) of all students made learning gains.	By June 2013, 82% (135) of students will make learning gains.					
			3A.2. Varying levels of student proficiency requiring differentiated instruction	3A.2. Teachers will actively utilize differentiated instruction, monitor progress of RtI students and discuss additional interventions for students.	3A.2. Dr. Osborne, Principal, RtI Team, Instructional Coaches	3A.2. Classroom walkthroughs, PLC meetings, and lesson plans	3A.2. FAIR, Edusoft Reading Data, Edusoft Mini Assessments, and Study Island reports
			3A.3. The time ELL and ESE students need to acquire new information	3A.3. Provide additional intensive instruction outside of the 90 minute reading block. Students attend early morning computer lab from 7:30 to 8:00 am and work on computer based reading intervention programs.	3A.3. Dr. Osborne, Principal, Reading Coach, and Grade level Teachers	3A.3. Classroom walkthroughs, I-Ready computer based reading program, PLC meetings, and lesson plans	3A.3. Classroom walkthrough data, Formative and Summative Assessments, I-Ready reports, FAIR, Edusoft Mini Assessments, and Edusoft Benchmark data
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

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

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

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
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Varying levels of student proficiency requiring differentiated instruction	4A.1. Teachers will actively utilize differentiated instruction. Provide professional development to instructional staff in the area of differentiated instruction Peer Classroom visits	4A.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal, RtI Team, and Instructional Coaches	4A.1. Classroom walkthroughs, PLC meetings, and lesson plans	4A.1. FAIR, Imagine It! Weekly Assessment, Edusoft Reading Data, Edusoft Mini Assessment Data, Study Island reports, lesson plans, and FCAT 2013
Reading Goal #4:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
To facilitate our students' growth, meet the Superintendent's five goals, and the OCPS K-12 Reading Plan, our students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading will increase from 77% (32) to 80% (33).	In June 2012, 77% (32) of the lowest 25% of students taking the Reading FCAT made learning gains.	By July 2013, 80% (33) of the lowest 25% of students taking the Reading FCAT will make learning gains.					
			4A.2. Scheduling of Designated School-Wide Interventions	4A.2. Utilize all Resource and Special Area Instructional Staff to assist with the implementation of the interventions	4A.2. Dr. Osborne, Principal	4A.2. Classroom walkthroughs	4A.2. FAIR, Edusoft Data, Edusoft Mini Assessment Data, Study Island reports, and FCAT 2013
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017												
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Reading Goal #5A: Our goal is to reduce the achievement gap by 50%. Our baseline data for 2010-2011 was 71% (169) students were proficient in Reading. Our goal is to have 86% (205) students at proficiency by 2016-2017.	Baseline data 2010-2011																			
			73%	76%	78%	81%	83%	86%												
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool													
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B: To facilitate our students' growth, meet the Superintendent's five goals, and the OPCS K-12 Reading Plan, we will decrease the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress by 3%.			5B.1. White: Scheduling of Designated School-Wide Interventions using resource staff, paraprofessional staff, and special area teachers. Black: Scheduling of Designated School-Wide Interventions using resource staff, paraprofessional staff, and special area teachers. Hispanic: Lack of Parental Involvement and Support due to limited vocabulary. Asian: Scheduling of Designated School-Wide Interventions using resource staff, paraprofessional staff, and special area teachers.	5B.1. Utilize all Special Area Instructional Staff to assist with the implementation of the interventions A Parental Involvement teacher will coordinate Parent Trainings and/or Parent nights to encourage parental involvement. Additional translators will be available during Report Card Conferences to encourage communication between teachers and parents.	5B.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal, RtI Team, and Instructional Coaches	5B.1. Classroom walkthroughs, Weekly PLC meetings	5B.1. FAIR Data, Edusoft Data, Imagine-It Formative and Summative Assessments													
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White: 31%(37)</td> <td>White: 28% (34)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black: 21%(3)</td> <td>Black: 18%(3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic: 26%(23)</td> <td>Hispanic: 23%(20)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian: 50%(1)</td> <td>Asian: 47% (1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>American Indian: N/A</td> <td>American Indian: N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	White: 31%(37)	White: 28% (34)	Black: 21%(3)	Black: 18%(3)	Hispanic: 26%(23)	Hispanic: 23%(20)	Asian: 50%(1)	Asian: 47% (1)	American Indian: N/A	American Indian: N/A							
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*																			
White: 31%(37)	White: 28% (34)																			
Black: 21%(3)	Black: 18%(3)																			
Hispanic: 26%(23)	Hispanic: 23%(20)																			
Asian: 50%(1)	Asian: 47% (1)																			
American Indian: N/A	American Indian: N/A																			

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

		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. The time ELL and ESE students need to acquire new information	5C.1. Provide additional intensive instruction outside of the 90 minute reading block Students attend early morning computer lab from 7:30 to 8:00 am and work on computer based reading intervention programs	5C.1. Principal, Reading Coach	5C.1. I-Ready Reading Intervention program	5C.1. Edusoft Reading Mini Assessments, FAIR, Edusoft Reading Benchmark Assessments, and I-Ready reports
Reading Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In order to meet the Superintendent's five goals, the OCPS K-12 Reading Plan, and to ensure our students receive quality reading instruction, the 2013 point of target for ELL students not making learning gains will decrease from 33% (25) to 30% (23).	In grades 3-5, 33% (25) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress on the 2012 Reading FCAT.	By June 2013, we will decrease to 30% (23) of ELL students not making satisfactory progress.					
			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
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. The time ESE students need to acquire new information	5D.1. Provide additional intensive instruction outside of the 90 minute reading block Students attend early morning computer lab from 7:30 to 8:00 am and work on computer based reading intervention programs	5D.1. Principal, Reading Coach	5D.1. I-Ready Reading Intervention program	5D.1. Edusoft Reading Mini Assessments, FAIR, Edusoft Reading Benchmark Assessments, and I-Ready reports
Reading Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In June 2013, we will decrease the number of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading by 3%.	In June 2012, there were 78% (19) students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading.	By June 2013, there will be 75% (18) students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading.					

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

		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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Limited exposure to reading outside of school	5E.1. Promote interest in reading through MyOn Reader Program	5E.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal, RtI Team, and Instructional Coaches	5E.1. Monitor reading awards	5E.1. FAIR Assessments and Ongoing Progress Monitoring, Edusoft Benchmark Tests
Reading Goal #5E: By June 2013, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In grades 3-5, 31% (61) of economically disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress on the 2012 Reading FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, we will decrease to 28% (55) of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress.	Limited experiences to build background knowledge outside school	Promote reading with a school wide reading award system		Data meetings to review student data and identify effective strategies	
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FAIR Refresher	K-5	Reading Coach	Classroom Teachers	September 2012	Observation of testing	Dr. Osborne, Principal, Reading Coach, and CRT.
Maintain Data Notebooks. Notebooks will focus on ongoing student progress monitoring performance.	K-5	Dr. Osborne, Principal, CRT, Reading Coach, and RtI Team.	Classroom Teachers	2012-2013 School Year	Weekly PLC/Data meetings	Dr. Osborne, Principal

**August 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

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
SRA Imagine It!	Research Based materials	General Budget	\$3,000.00
Parent Night Incentives	Parent Night Incentives	PTO will provide incentives	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal:\$4,000
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reading- Study Island	Research Based Reading web based program	General Funding	\$2,293.55
Reading- Success Maker or I-Ready	Research Based online program	General Budget/PTO	\$9,200.00
My-ON	Research Based online program	General Budget	\$0.00
			Subtotal:\$11,493.55
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal:\$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase independent student reading by adding high interest materials and incentives	Media/Library Books	PTO	\$5,000.00
			Subtotal: \$5,000.00
			Total:\$20,493.55

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1. Fitting it in with the core curriculum	1.1. Teachers will actively utilize differentiated instruction	1.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal, and Instructional Coaches	1.1. Classroom walkthroughs, PLC meetings, and lesson plans	1.1. Cella Test
CELLA Goal #1: In June 2013, 55% (83) of students in K-5 will be proficient in listening/speaking.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: In June 2012, 52% (78) of students in K-5 were proficient in listening/speaking.					
		1.2. Having enough time to administer the test	1.2. Put together a testing team	1.2. Dr. Osborne, Principal, and Instructional Coaches	1.2. Discussion with Data team	1.2. Cella Test
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1. Differentiated Instruction	2.1. Provide professional development to instructional staff in the area of differentiated instruction Peer Classroom visits	2.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal	2.1. Classroom walkthroughs, weekly PLC meetings, and lesson plans	2.1. Cella Test
CELLA Goal #2: For June 2013, 46% (69) of students in K-5 will be proficient in reading.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: In June 2012, 43% (65) of students in K-5 were proficient in reading.					
		2.2. Need for RtI Tier 2 and Tier 3 Instruction	2.2. Teachers will actively utilize differentiated instruction	2.2. Dr. Osborne, Principal, RtI Team, and Instructional Coaches	2.2. Classroom walkthroughs, PLC meetings, and lesson plans.	2.2. Cella Test
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		2.1. Time to conference individually with students about their writing	2.1. Continue to implement strategies from the Empowering Writer's Curriculum. All students will participate in monthly writing prompts.	2.1. Principal, teachers, Reading Coach, and CRT.	2.1. Monitor classroom walkthrough data and teacher lesson plans Writing samples will be reviewed by RtI team and Writing teacher	2.1. Cella Test
<u>CELLA Goal #3:</u> For June 2013, 44% (66) of students in K-5 will be proficient in writing.	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u> In June 2012, 41% (62) of students in K-5 were proficient in writing.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. Students making the connection between classroom math and real-world math	1A.1. Provide professional development to instructional staff on standards and skills to be mastered Use Teach-In Day to bring in mathematicians	1A.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal, Leadership Team, Instructional Coaches	1A.1. Classroom walkthroughs, weekly PLC grade level meetings, lesson plans	1A.1. Professional Development attendance, Classroom walkthrough data, and PLC agendas
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In order to prepare our students to be the most "successful students in the nation", the percentage of students achieving mastery will increase from 26% (59) to 29% (66) on the 2013 Math FCAT.	In June 2012, 26% (59) of students in grades 3-5 scored at a Level 3 on the Math FCAT.	By June 2013, 29% (66) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 on the Math FCAT.					
			1A.2. Varying levels of student proficiency requiring differentiated instruction	1A.2. Provide professional development, class visitations, and instructional coaching Teachers will utilize strategies to differentiate instruction.	1A.2. Dr. Osborne, Principal, CRT, RtI Leadership Team, and Instructional Staff	1A.2. Classroom walkthroughs, weekly PLC grade level meetings, lesson plans	1A.2. Sign-In sheets, Classroom walkthrough data, iObservation
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Students making the connection between classroom math and real-world math	2A.1. Provide professional development to instructional staff on standards and skills to be mastered Use Teach-In Day to bring in mathematicians	2A.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal, CRT, Instructional Coaches	2A.1. Classroom walkthroughs, weekly grade level PLC, lesson plans	2A.1. Sign-In sheets, classroom walkthrough data, PLC agendas
Mathematics Goal #2A: In order to prepare our students to be the most "successful students in the nation", the percentage of students achieving mastery will increase from 51% (116) to 54% (123) on the 2013 Math FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In June 2012, 51% (116) of students in grades 3-5 scored at a Level 4 or above on the Math FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 54% (123) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 4 or above on the Math FCAT.					
			2A.2. Instructional Staff differentiating instruction to students above grade level Lack of time beyond core instruction to implement enrichment activities	2A.2. Provide professional development to instructional staff on enrichment strategies Peer classroom visitations	2A.2. Dr. Osborne, Principal, RTI Chairperson, RTI Leadership Team, CRT	2A.2. Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, grade level PLC meetings	2A.2. Sign-In sheets, classroom walkthrough data, PLC agendas
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. ELL and ESE learners take more time to acquire new skills	3A.1. Provide additional intensive instruction in mathematics using Envision Supplemental Lessons Students attend early morning computer lab from 7:30 to 8:00 am and work on FASTT Math to improve computation fluency	3A.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal, CRT, Classroom Teacher	3A.1. Classroom walkthroughs, Weekly PLC grade level data meetings	3A.1. Envision Math, FASTT Math, and Study Island reports
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Spring Lake Elementary seeks to ensure that all students achieve academic growth. The percentage of students making learning gains will increase from 76% (127) to 79% (132).	In June 2012, 76% (127) of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the Math FCAT.	By June 2013, 79% (132) of students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the Math FCAT.					
			3A.2. Varying levels of student proficiency requiring differentiated instruction	3A.2. Teachers will actively utilize differentiated instruction, monitor progress of RtI students, and discuss additional interventions for students	3A.2. Dr. Osborne, Principal, RtI Team, Instructional Coaches	3A.2. Classroom walkthroughs, PLC meetings, and lesson plans	3A.2. FAIR, Edusoft Math Data, Edusoft Mini Assessments, and Study Island reports
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.

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

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

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
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Students lack a strong foundation of basic math skills	4A.1. Students will be offered SES tutoring Additional small group instruction Students will be offered tutoring before, during, and after school by Spring Lake Elementary	4A.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal, CRT	4A.1. Progress Monitoring using Envision Assessments, Edusoft Mini Benchmark Assessments	4A.1. Envision Unit Test, District Edusoft Math Benchmark Assessment, and Study Island data
Mathematics Goal #4:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Spring Lake Elementary seeks to ensure that all students make growth. The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains will increase from 64% (27) to 67% (28).	In June 2012, 64% (27) of the lowest 25% of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the Math FCAT.	By June 2013, 67% (28) of the lowest 25% of students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the Math FCAT.					
			4A.2. Varying levels of student proficiency requiring differentiated instruction	4A.2. Teachers will actively utilize differentiated instruction , monitor progress of RtI Students, and discuss additional interventions for students	4A.2. Dr. Osborne, Principal, RtI Team, Instructional Coaches	4A.2. Classroom walkthroughs, PLC meetings, and lesson plans	4A.2. FAIR, Edusoft Math data, Edusoft Mini Assessments, and Study Island data
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: Our goal is to reduce the achievement gap by 50%. Our baseline data for 2010-2011 was 77% (184) of students proficient in Math. Our goal is to have 89% (213) of students at proficiency by 2016-2017.	Baseline data 2010-2011							
			80%	81%	83%	85%	87%	89%
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: By June 2013, percentage of students not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 3%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*		5B.1. White: Scheduling of Designated School-Wide Interventions using resource staff, paraprofessional staff, and special area teachers. Black: Scheduling of designated school-wide interventions using resource staff, paraprofessional staff, and special area teachers Hispanic: Lack of Parental Involvement and support due to limited vocabulary Asian: Scheduling of designated school-wide interventions using resource staff, paraprofessional staff, and special area teachers American Indian: N/A	5B.1. Utilize all Special Area Instructional Staff to assist with the implementation of the interventions A Parental Involvement teacher will coordinate parent trainings and/or parent nights to encourage parental involvement. Additional translators will be available during Report Card Conference Nights as well, to encourage communication between teachers and parents.	5B.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal, RtI Team, and Instructional Coaches	5B.1. Classroom walkthroughs, Weekly PLC meetings	5B.1. FAIR data, Edusoft data, Study Island data	
	White: 23% (28) Black: 21%(3) Hispanic: 18%(16) Asian: 50% (1) American Indian: N/A	White: 20%(24) Black: 18%(3) Hispanic: 15%(14) Asian: 47%(1) American Indian: N/A						

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

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

		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. ELL and ESE students need more time to acquire new information	5C.1. Students attend early morning computer lab from 7:30 to 8:00 am and work on computer based math intervention programs	5C.1. Principal, CRT, Classroom Teachers	5C.1. Classroom walkthroughs, weekly grade level PLC, lesson plans	5C.1. Edusoft Math Mini Assessments, Study Island reports, Edusoft math Benchmark Assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
By June 2013, the percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 3%.	In grades 3-5, 22% (17) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress on the 2012 Math FCAT	By June 2013, we will decrease to 19% (14) of ELL students not making satisfactory progress.					
			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
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. The time ESE students need to acquire new information	5D.1. Students attend early morning computer lab from 7:30 to 8:00 am and work on computer based reading intervention programs	5D.1. Principal, CRT, Classroom Teachers	5D.1. Classroom walkthroughs, weekly grade level PLC, lesson plans	5D.1. Edusoft Math Mini Assessments, Study Island reports, Edusoft math Benchmark Assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In June 2013, we will decrease the number of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in math by 3%.	In June 2012, there were 73% (17) students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in math.	By June 2013, there will be 70% (16) students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in math.					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.

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

		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Students making the connection to real world math outside of school	5E.1. Math through use of Smart Board technology	5E.1. Principal, CRT, and Classroom Teachers	5E.1. Data meetings to review student data and identify effective strategies.	5E.1. Benchmark Tests and Mini Assessments Envision Math Assessments
Mathematics Goal #5E: By June 2013, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 3%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In grades 3-5, 21% (41) of economically disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress on the 2012 Math FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, we will decrease to 18% (35) of economically disadvantaged students taking the not making satisfactory progress.	Limited experiences to build background knowledge outside of school	Use Teach-In Day to bring in mathematicians Assist teachers in planning and implementing math groups and/or centers using student engagement			
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

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
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: NA	Baseline data 2010-2011							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#5E:	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
NA			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Mathematics Goal #1: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #1: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra Goal #2: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011							
	Algebra 1 Goal #3A: NA							
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	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>						
	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:						
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.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
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
NA	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal #1: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal #2: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2011-2012						
	Geometry Goal #3A: NA						
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
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	Geometry Goal #3B:		3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
	NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
		<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
		White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:				
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
NA	Geometry Goal #3C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*					
		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.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
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
NA	Geometry Goal #3D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*					
		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Geometry Goal #3E: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Provide teachers with ongoing support and professional development	Grades K-5	CRT	Classroom Teachers K-5	On-going	Professional Development Sign In sheets	Dr. Osborne, Principal, CRT
Envision Math curriculum training	K-5	CRT, District Math Personnel	Classroom Teachers K-5	On-Going	Professional Development Sign-In sheets	Leadership Team
FCAT Math Strategies	Grades 3-5	CRT	Classroom Teachers Grades 3-5	October 2012	Professional Development Sign In sheets	Dr. Osborne, Principal, CRT

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

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Mathematics- EnVision Math	Research Based Math Materials	District Funds	\$0.00
			Subtotal:\$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Mathematics- Study Island Math	Technology research based math program	General Budget	\$2,293.55
Mathematics- Success Maker or I-Ready	Technology research based math program	General Budget/PTO	\$9,200
Mathematics- FASTT Math instructional software program	School-wide implementation of FASTT Math software program to assist with fluency of math facts.	General Budget	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$11,493.55
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NO DATA			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NO DATA			
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$11,493.55

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			IA.1. Lack of problem solving activities for students	IA.1. Expose students to solving open-ended problems or questions by utilizing the science lab, data collection, and analysis to support claims	IA.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal, Science Lab Teacher	IA.1. Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, Weekly PLC meetings	IA.1. Classroom walkthrough data, lesson plans
Science Goal #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
By June 2013, 44% (40) of fifth grade students will score at a Level 3 on the Science FCAT.	In June 2012, 43% (39) of fifth grade students scored at a Level 3.	In June 2013, 44% (40) of fifth grade students will score at a Level 3.					
			IA.2. Students are lacking a significant amount of vocabulary and background knowledge	IA.2. Continue science classes as a Special Area with students attending once per week	IA.2. Principal, CRT, Reading Coach, Teachers, Science Special Area Teacher	IA.2. Weekly PLC data meetings, Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	IA.2. FCAT Science scores, Write score data, science assessments
			IA.3. Students lack of "hands-on" theory practice	IA.3. Utilize the Science Lab for students in Grades K-5 to design and conduct experiments using lab materials, and keep logs and journals Host a Family Science Night	IA.3. Dr. Osborne, Principal, Science Lab Teacher	IA.3. Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	IA.3. Classroom walkthrough data
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Science Goal #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							

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

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Lack of "hands-on" opportunities for students	2A.1. Partnership with local agency to sponsor a weekly gardening club	2A.1. Dr. Osborne, Principal, Teachers	2A.1. Disney Garden, Classroom walkthroughs	2A.1. Disney Garden, classroom walkthrough data
Science Goal #2A: By June 2013, 32% (29) of fifth grade students will score at a Level 4 or higher on the Science FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In June 2012, 31% (28) of fifth grade students scored at a Level 4 or 5 in the Science FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 32% (29) of fifth grade students will score at a Level 4 or 5 in the Science FCAT.					
			2A.2. Lack of time beyond core instruction to implement enrichment activities	2A.2. Provide professional development in the area of differentiating instruction	2A.2. Dr. Osborne, Principal, Science Lab Teacher, CRT	2A.2. Lesson plans, Classroom walkthroughs	2A.2. Write Score Science, Study Island Science Data
			2A.3. Students lack of knowledge of Science facts	2A.3. Purchase AR Science books	2A.3. Dr. Osborne, Principal, Media Specialist	2A.3. AR books checked out through Destiny	2A.3. AR Science books checked out to students
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)*

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology 1 Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology 1 Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Write Score Training	Fifth Grade	Write Score	Fifth grade teachers	September 2012	Review Write Score data in PLC team data meetings.	Principal, CRT
Science Journal Writing	K-5	District Trainer	K-5 teachers	October 2012	Review Science Journals, K-5 Review during Team PLC meetings	Principal, CRT, Science teacher

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
Use data to drive science instruction	Write Score	General Budget	\$2,800.00
			Subtotal:\$2,800
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
FCAT Explorer	Web-based instructional program to reinforce science concepts and vocabulary	District-wide resource	\$0.00
Study Island	Research and web based instructional program	General Budget	\$2,293.55
Success Maker	Research and web based instructional program	General Budget/PTO	\$7,800.00
P-SELL PROGRAM	Research and web based instructional program	Grant	\$0.00
			Subtotal:\$10,093.55
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NO DATA	NO DATA	NO DATA	\$0.00
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

Increase science vocabulary awareness	Purchase science vocabulary workbooks	General Budget	\$700.00
Conduct Essential Labs/Programs	Purchase science lab materials for Essential Labs	General Budget/PTO	\$2,500
			Subtotal:\$3,200.00
			Total:\$16,093.55

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Lack of a strong writing curriculum in the early elementary grades	1A.1. Utilize Write Score for additional writing practice Continue to implement strategies from the Empowering Writer's curriculum All students will participate in monthly writing prompts Collect and analyze writing prompt data Conduct a Family Writing Night Implement Thinking Maps in all classrooms	1A.1. Principal, teachers, Reading Coach, and CRT	1A.1. Review Write Score data during team PLC meeting Monitor classroom walkthrough data and teacher lesson plans Writing samples will be reviewed by RtI team and writing teacher Collect sign-in sheets from Writing Night	1A.1. Write Score Assessments, FCAT data, classroom walkthrough data, and monthly writing assessments
Writing Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In June 2012, 99% (73) of students at Spring Lake Elementary scored at a Level 3 or above on the Writing FCAT. In 2013, the percentage of students scoring a 4.0 or higher will increase from 59%(44) to 62%(46)	In June 2012, 99% (73) of students taking the Writing FCAT scored at a Level 3 or above.	By July 2013, 62% (46) of students taking the Writing FCAT will score at a Level 4.0 or above.					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Write Score WebEx	Fourth Grade	Write Score	Fourth Grade teachers	September 2012	Classroom walkthrough and Write Score data	Principal and CRT

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
Use data to drive instruction	Write Score – Writing and Science	General Budget	\$2,800.00
			Subtotal: \$2,800.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No data	No data	No data	\$0.00
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No data	No data	No data	\$0.00
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No data	No data	No data	\$0.00
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$2,800.00

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

End of Writing Goals

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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2014-2015)*

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

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics Goal #2: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Civics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
NA						

Civics 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
NA			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			

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

	Subtotal:
	Total:

End of Civics Goals

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

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

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

U.S. History EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
U.S. History Goal #1: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
U.S. History Goal #2: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

U.S. History Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
NA						

U.S. History 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
NA			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal:

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

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

	Total:
--	---------------

End of U.S. History Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Lack of parent understanding of the importance of being in school and on time	1.1. Connect-Orange Messages, newsletters, and communicating importance of attendance at monthly Parent Nights Certificates and other incentives for perfect attendance and no tardiness Conducting home visits	1.1. Staffing Specialist, Dean, Principal	1.1. Attendance data will be reviewed at monthly RtI meetings	1.1. Attendance Data
Attendance Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
The average daily attendance rate for 2011-2012 was 97.52%, with 119 students receiving excessive unexcused absences (10 or more). A total of 45 students had excessive tardiness (10 or more). Based on this data, improving the attendance rate by 1% and decreasing excessive tardiness by 5% will be our attendance goal.	The current attendance rate is 97.52 %.	The expected attendance rate will be 98.52 %.					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	There were 119 students with excessive absences.	The expected number of students with excessive absences will decrease by 1% to 118 students.					
	<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>					
	There were 121 students with excessive	The expected number of students					

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

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

	tardiness.	with excessive tardiness will decrease by 5% to 116 students.					
			1.2. Parents and students lack of transportation	1.2. Attendance Committee will meet once a week Attendance reports will be run each week	1.2. Principal, dean, instructional staff	1.2. Attendance and tardy reports will be reviewed on a weekly base	1.2. Attendance and tardy reports
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A						

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
No data	No data		\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No data	No data		\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No data	No data		\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No data	No data		\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Total: \$0.00

End of Attendance Goals

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

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			I.1. Students not following school-wide rules and classroom rules	I.1. Implement school-wide behavior plan, implement RtI academic and behavior strategies, frequent communication with parents	I.1. Principal Staffing Specialist Dean	I.1. Disaggregate Suspension data with RtI Team and meet no less than quarterly to review data	I.1. Suspension data
Suspension Goal #1: By June 2013, the suspension rate and the total number of students suspended at Spring Lake Elementary will drop by 1%.	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
	Spring Lake Elementary does not have an In-School suspension program. Therefore, no students received In-School Suspension.	It is anticipated that no students will receive In-School Suspension.					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	There were no in-school suspensions during the 2011-2012 school year.	It is anticipated that no students will receive In-School Suspension.					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	There were 7 Out-of-School Suspensions	6 total students suspended Out of School expected.					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
7 total students	6 total students						

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

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

	were suspended Out-of-School.	suspended Out of School expected.					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A						

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: As an elementary school we do not have a dropout rate. However, we will identify students at risk for dropping out of school based on attendance and retention data.	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*	Students that have been retained are at risk for dropping out of school	Students with one or more retentions will be identified and put on the RtI list	Guidance Counselor, Attendance Clerk	Monitoring attendance log and student achievement data	Student achievement data and student attendance records
	In June 2012, no students in grades 3-5 were retained.	In June 2013, maintain our current 2012 data.					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	In June 2012, 100% of students in grades 3-5 meet the graduation rate.	In June 2013, we will maintain our current 2012 data.					
			1.2	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			Primary grade students are dependent on parents	Connect Orange message will be sent to primary parents	Principal, Dean	Monitoring attendance log and student achievement data	Student achievement data and student attendance records

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A						

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Parent Involvement Goal #1: In an effort to enhance student achievement, parent involvement will increase from 83% (485) to 86% (502). <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> The level of parental involvement was 83% (485).	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> The level of parental involvement will increase from 83% (485) to 86% (502).	Challenge getting parents to attend school events due to time constraints	SAC, PLC, and Parent informational sessions will all be held on the same evening Provide incentives, such as Chick-fil-a, Marcos, Subway, and McDonald gift cards Connect-Orange, monthly newsletter, Parent Involvement Calendar, and incentives for parents will be utilized to increase involvement	Principal	The SAC committee will review parent involvement sign-in sheets and implement changes to plan as needed	Sign-in sheets
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
			Parent limited English proficiency	Provide translations when feasible at different curriculum based activities and meetings	Principal	Have personnel available that can translate at different activities and meetings	Sign-in sheets, Preferred Language Survey

Parent Involvement Professional Development

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Module I - The Importance of Parental Involvement	All	Title I Representative /Reading Coach, CRT	All PLC members from all grade levels will attend meetings.	Quarterly meetings will be held.	PLC meeting minutes collected. Sign-in sheets will be collected.	Title I Representative/Reading Coach, CRT
Module II - Building Ties Between Home and School	All	Title I Representative /Reading Coach, CRT	All PLC members from all grade levels will attend meetings.	Quarterly meetings will be held.	PLC meeting minutes collected. Sign-in sheets will be collected.	Title I Representative/Reading Coach, CRT
Module III - Coordination of Parental Involvement Programs	All	Title I Representative /Reading Coach, CRT	All PLC members from all grade levels will attend meetings.	Quarterly meetings will be held.	PLC meeting minutes collected. Sign-in sheets will be collected.	Title I Representative/Reading Coach, CRT
Module IV - Communicating and Working With Parents	All	Title I Representative /Reading Coach, CRT	All PLC members from all grade levels will attend meetings.	Quarterly meetings will be held.	PLC meeting minutes collected. Sign-in sheets will be collected.	Title I Representative/Reading Coach, CRT

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal:\$0.00
			Total: \$0.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:</p> <p>STEM Goal #1:</p> <p>In 2012, 74% (67) of fifth grade students scored at a Level 3 or higher on the Science FCAT. In 2013, 77% (69) of students will score at a Level 3 or higher on the Science FCAT.</p> <p>In order to prepare our students to be the most "successful students in the nation", the percentage of students achieving mastery will increase from 26% (59) to 29% (66) on the 2013 Math FCAT.</p>	<p>IA.1.</p> <p>Varying levels of student proficiency requiring differentiated instruction in science and math</p>	<p>IA.2.</p> <p>Provide professional development in the area of differentiating instruction</p>	<p>IA.3.</p> <p>Dr. Osborne, Principal, Science Lab Teacher, CRT</p>	<p>IA.4.</p> <p>Lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs</p>	<p>IA.5.</p> <p>Write Score Science, Study Island Science Data</p>
	<p>IA.2.</p> <p>Lack of "hands-on" opportunities for students</p>	<p>IA.2.</p> <p>Partnership with local agency to sponsor a weekly gardening club</p>	<p>IA.3.</p> <p>Dr. Osborne, Principal, Teachers, Science lab teacher</p>	<p>IA.4.</p> <p>Disney Garden, classroom walkthroughs</p>	<p>IA.5.</p> <p>Disney Garden, classroom walkthrough data</p>
	<p>I.3.</p> <p>Lack of student experience in conducting science labs and using journals</p>	<p>I.3.</p> <p>Conduct essential science labs and inquiry</p>	<p>I.3.</p> <p>Dr. Osborne, Principal, Instructional staff, science lab teacher</p>	<p>I.3.</p> <p>Classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans</p>	<p>I.3.</p> <p>Science data and science journals</p>

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
P-Cell	5th	Mr. Badger	5th grade teacher	Monthly meetings	Classroom walk through, Data meetings	Dr. Osborne and CRT
P-Cell	Science	Ms. Huntzinger	Science Teacher	Monthly meetings	Classroom walk through, Data meetings	Dr. Osborne and CRT

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

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
P-Cell	Research and web based instructional program	Grant	\$0.00
Mathematics- EnVision Math	Research based math materials	District Funds	\$0.00
			Subtotal:\$0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science-Study Island	Research and web based instructional program	School Budget	\$2,293.55
Mathematics- Study Island Math	Technology research based math program	General Budget	\$2,293.55
			Subtotal: \$2,293.55
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
In-service training	County sponsored trainers	Grant	\$0.00
			Subtotal:\$0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No data	No data	No data	No data
			Subtotal:\$0
			Total:\$2,293.55

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE 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
CTE Goal #1: N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A						

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional 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
1. Additional Goal			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*	Students enter 3rd grade not reading on grade level	Screen students in K - 2 and provide reading interventions	Principal, Classroom teachers, Reading Resource teacher, CRT	Monitor students through RtI process	Edusoft data, mini benchmark data, and Imagine It reading assessments (K-5), FAIR (K-5) and I-Ready (K-5)
Reading Independently by Age 9	In grades 3-5, 25% (57) of students achieved a Level 3 on the 2012 Reading FCAT.	By June 2013, 28% (64) of students taking the Reading FCAT at Spring Lake Elementary School will score a Level 3.					
2. Additional Goal			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Additional Goal #2:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*	Students enter 3rd grade not fluent with math facts.	Increase students' time on FASTT Math and Study Island math	Principal, Classroom teachers, Reading Resource teacher, CRT	Monitor students through RtI process	FASTT Math and Study Island reports, Envision math test (K-5)
All students will become fluent with math facts by age 9	In June 2012, 26% (59) of students in grades 3-5 scored at a Level 3 on the Math FCAT.	By June 2013, 29% (66) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 on the Math FCAT.					

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

3. Additional Goal			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Additional Goal #3:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
Increase College and Career Awareness		We will increase college and career awareness in our students.	Lack of parent encouragement for higher education	Promote college awareness in the classrooms Teach-In	Classroom teachers, Dean	Monitor students through RtI process	Classroom walk through

4. Additional Goal			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Additional Goal #4:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
Maintain High Fine Arts Enrollment Percentage	We currently have 100% of our students enrolled in Fine Arts.	We will maintain 100% participation in Fine Arts.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

5. Additional Goal			5.1.	5.1.	5.1.	5.1.	5.1.
Additional Goal #5:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
Increase by 3 to 5% the percent of VPK students who will enter elementary school ready based on FLKRS data (score 70% and above)	In June 2012, 48% (53) of VPK students entered elementary school ready based on FLKRS data.	By June 2013, 51 % (56) of VPK students entered elementary school ready based on FLKRS data.	Not having VPK on campus makes it harder to get information to those incoming parents	Deliver resources to surrounding preschools	Principal	Monitor students through RtI process	FLKRS data

6. Additional Goal			6.1.	6.1.	6.1.	6.1.	6.1.
Additional Goal #6:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
Closing the Achievement Gap by 50% by June 2016.	See Reading Section 5A	See Reading Section 5A	See Reading Section 5A and Math Section 5A	See Reading Section 5A and Math Section 5A	See Reading Section 5A and Math Section 5A	See Reading Section 5A and Math Section 5A	See Reading Section 5A and Math Section 5A

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

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

	and Math Section 5A	and Math Section 5A					
--	---------------------	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--

7. Additional Goal			7.1.	7.1.	7.1.	7.1.	7.1.
Additional Goal #7:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*	See Reading section 5D and Math Section 5D	See Reading section 5D and Math Section 5D	See Reading section 5D and Math Section 5D	See Reading section 5D and Math Section 5D	See Reading section 5D and Math Section 5D
Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education	See Reading section 5D and Math Section 5D	See Reading section 5D and Math Section 5D					

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC Meetings	All	Team Leaders	Classroom teachers	Weekly	PLC Team Notes	Principal
Data Meetings	All	Principal/CRT	Classroom Teachers	Monthly	Data Meeting Notes	Principal

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.

Reading Budget	Total:\$20,493.55
CELLA Budget	Total:\$0.00
Mathematics Budget	Total:\$11,493.55
Science Budget	Total:\$13,293.55
Writing Budget	Total:\$2,800.00
Civics Budget	Total:\$0.00
U.S. History Budget	Total:\$0.00
Attendance Budget	Total: \$0.00
Suspension Budget	

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

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

	Total: \$0.00
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total: \$0.00
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total: \$0.00
STEM Budget	
	Total: \$0.00
CTE Budget	
	Total: \$0.00
Additional Goals	
	Total: \$0.00
	Grand Total: \$48,080.65

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prevent

Are you reward school? Yes No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community members who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting *Yes* or *No* below.

Yes No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The School Advisory Council for Spring Lake Elementary will meet monthly to discuss updates and concerns regarding the school. Additionally, the SAC will review the School Improvement Plan and revise and update as needed. Members of SAC will participate in Curriculum Night and several of the school based activities.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
None	\$0.00