Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

Name of School:

Mims Elementary

Area:

IV

Principal:

Shari Tressler

Area Superintendent:

Dr. Ronald Bobay

SAC Chairperson:

Dr. Wendy Smith

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

The Mims Elementary family takes pride in providing opportunities for each member to reach their individual potential through knowledge, skills, and values in a respectful and safe learning environment.

Vision Statement:

To serve every student with excellence as the standard.

Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

Mims Elementary earned an A School rating for the 2011 – 2012 school year, even though students scoring a Level 3 or higher dropped in Reading, Math, Science, and Writing with the new FCAT 2.0 scoring system. Mims has been an A school for the last four years.

Data results show that students scoring a Level 3 or higher in Reading have continued to drop from 83% scoring a Level 3 or higher in 2010 to 76% of students in 2011, and now 58% in 2012. Math scores have also dropped from 80% scoring a Level 3 or higher in 2012 to 77% in 2011, and currently 56% in 2012. Science scores have also declined with 73% of students scoring a Level 3 or higher in 2010 to 71% in 2011, and now 55% in 2012. Writing scores continued to drop with 96% of students scoring a Level 4 or higher in 2012 to 83% scoring a Level 4 or higher in 2011 to 81% of students scoring a Level 3.5 or higher in 2012. It is hypothesized that the drop in Writing scores is due to the fact there was only one grader for the essays with an emphasis on grammar and conventions; a change from the previous years.

Although these scores indicate a drop in students scoring a Level 3 or higher, students' scores in the Lowest 25% have been on a steady increase. Reading scores of students in the Lowest 25% making annual learning gains have increased from 53% in 2010 to 63% in 2011 and currently 80% of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains for 2012. Math scores report that 64% of the Lowest 25% made learning gains in 2010, 65% in 2011, however only 56% made learning gains in 2012 for the Math portion of the FCAT. Learning gains for the school reported an increase in Reading scores with 65% in 2010, 67% in 2011, and 73% in 2012. Learning gains for Math were reported as 70% in 2010 dropping to 64% in 2011 and dropping yet again to 56% in 2012.

In addition to the data revealing a drop in FCAT Math scores, teachers have shared in grade level meetings that small group, differentiated instruction is not taking place in math like it is in Reading. Additionally, the administration has not seen small group math instruction taking place in all classrooms. Since Reading scores have improved, especially in the Lowest 25%, it is hypothesized that Math scores could also improve with using small group, differentiated daily instruction in Math. In third grade, one teacher who used small group math instruction had 71% of students score a Level 3 or higher compared to 21%, 44%, 47%, and 35% from other 3rd grade classes. In 4th grade, a teacher using small group math instruction had 73% of students score a Level 3 or higher as compared to 50% and 45% of other teachers who may not have used small group, differentiated instruction every day. In 5th grade, 69% of students scored a Level 3 or higher in one class compared to 38%, 63%, and 37% in other classes. Sixth grade students were taught by the same teacher in a departmentalization

setting with 67% of students scoring a Level 3 or higher. All students were instructed in a setting consisting of whole group and small group. In 6th grade, 67% (42/63) students scored a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 Math FCAT. One teacher taught all 63 students and used small group, differentiated instruction compared to the other combined grade levels of 47% (94/198) of students scoring Level 3 or higher in Math.

Previous records of professional development opportunities indicate a lack of small group instruction in mathematics for teachers. Teachers have received a multitude of training in Reading instruction, using a small Reading group setting, however teachers have lacked the opportunity to attend training in small group, differentiated training in math for a 90 minute block.

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

Davidson (1985) stated that small group math instruction consists of a brief lecture by the teacher to introduce the mathematical concept followed by small groups of students (3 to 6 students) being allowed the opportunity to participate in a discovery method for students which is facilitated by the teacher.

Edvance Research Incorporated (2012) found that the process of providing small group Math instruction, just as small group Reading instruction has been modeled, allows for increasing intensity to students who are struggling in mathematics. This response is entitled Response to Intervention (RtI). The goal is to provide assistance and support to at-risk students in a timely fashion, within the general education setting, thus helping students bridge the achievement gap and promote mathematics learning.

According to The Access Center (2012), funded by the U.S. Department of Education, differentiated instruction is the process through which teachers are able to enhance student learning by matching student characteristics to instruction and assessment, based on individual student needs. Students will be accessing the same classroom curriculum, but also receive tailored assignments based on access points, entry points, learning tasks, and outcomes. Differentiated instruction, also called differentiation, is a process through which teachers enhance learning by matching student characteristics to instruction and assessment. Tomlinson (1999) reported that differentiation refers to a change in the material being learned by the student. For example, if the objective is for students to subtract using renaming, one group of students may practice subtracting two-digit numbers, while others may need to subtract larger numbers within the context of a word problem. Differentiation is defined by the process in which way the student accesses the material and shows what was learned in the process. In order to differentiate, teachers must respond to a student's readiness, interest, and learning profile. Readiness may be determined by diagnostic assessments, interest

may be determined by a student survey, and the learning profile can be attained by the student's learning styles and environmental preferences.

Tomlinson(1999) suggested differentiated math instruction may include: tiered assignments, compacting, interest centers, learning contracts, or choice boards. Tiered assignments are planned to instruct students on essential skills that are provided at different levels of complexity, abstractness, and open-endedness. The curriculum is the same, but the processes are varied according to the student's readiness level. Compacting is defined as adjusting instruction to account for prior mastery of the learning objective. Interest centers allow students to experience the learning based on interest such as allowing students to choose a motivating topic or assignment based on the target skill. Learning contracts consist of an agreement between the teacher and student with the teacher specifying the necessary skills expected to be learned and the required components. Students identify the method for completing the task. This strategy works well with older students. Finally, the choice board is organizers containing various activities for students to choose one or several activities, with a requirement of the focused skills.

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

Currently, the 90 minute Reading block consists of whole group instruction, followed with small group, differentiated instruction. According to FCAT data, Reading results improved. Having students work in small groups, with a teacher using differentiated instruction for each group based on needs, have increased Reading scores in the Lowest 25%. Since the FCAT 2.0 was initiated in 2012, data results show a drop in the total number of students scoring a Level 3 or higher, as was with most schools across the state. Small group, differentiated instruction has been viewed as a benefit for student achievement. The focus for Mims Elementary classrooms in the 2012 – 2013 school year will be to incorporate the 90 minute Reading block model into the Math Block replacing whole group math instruction as the only type of instruction. Teachers will be asked to use small group, differentiated instruction in daily Math instruction to improve math scores in the same way Reading scores have improved. The prevention of Math scores improving may be that teachers were not using small groups to instruct and remediate Math skills. By differentiating lessons for common groups, based on disaggregating test scores, teachers will be able to target specific skills needed by specific students.

CONTENT AREA:

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

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

Transfer the Reading Block model into the Math Block model to incorporate small group, differentiated instruction.

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

Barrier	***Action Steps***	***Person Responsible***	***Timetable***	***Budget***	***In-Process Measure***
1.Professional Development	1a. Professional Development Day training for Math differentiated instruction based on Common Core	Administration, Math Contact, CCSS team members	October, February	N/A	Visible posting of essential question in classrooms. Teacher lesson plans to include small group, differentiated instruction
	1b. Teacher Training on CCSS for Math	CCSS Math Team members to model lessons	October through May	N/A	Administrators' classroom walkthrus
2. Non-use of Common Assessments	2a. Title One teacher to coordinate and produce 10 question Math Common Assessment Tests given once per month	Title One Teacher	Beginning in late September to happen once per month.	$1500 from Title One	Results of Common Assessments, leading to the differentiated instruction. PLC Feedback sheets by grade level.
	2b. Grade Level PLCs discuss and report findings of Common Assessments to administration	Grade level teams and administration	October through May after each Common Math Assessment	N/A	Discussion of results in grade level meetings with administration. PLC Feedback sheets. Small group data wall.

3. Lack of writing across the curriculum	3a. Training in writing across the curriculum in grade level meetings.	Administration, Literacy Coach, Title One teacher, Math Contact teacher	Monthly September - May	N/A	Math journals, Science journals, teacher lesson plans
4.Math support provided by all teachers	4a. Title One teacher to support small group instruction during teachers' math blocks.	Title One teacher Administration	September – May	N/A	Administrative Walk-thrus Teacher lesson plans Title One teacher schedule
	4b. ASP teacher to meet with students scoring a Level 1 in math with an additional focus on students in grade 3	ASP teacher	October - April	ASP Funding $13695.00	FCAT scores ASP teacher's lesson plans Common Assessment results
	4c. Activity teachers to include math activities within their lesson plans.	Teachers of Media, Art, PE, and Music	August - may	N/A	Teacher lesson plans. FCAT scores. Administrative walk-thrus.

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

Quantitative: Classroom walkthrough reports, teacher lesson plans, results of Common Assessments, PLC Feedback Forms.

Qualitative: Teacher/Administrator minutes of discussions during grade level meetings, post survey of the effectiveness of training for small group, differentiated instruction

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

Quantitative: Common Assessment results, FCAT Math results for individual classrooms as well as whole school results.

Qualitative: Student post survey of small group instruction for math

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28% =129 students) 58% (153/262)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31% =1134 students) 71% (186/262)
Anticipated Barrier(s): **1.**Professional Development		
Strategy(s): **1a.** Monday afternoons the Literacy Coach will provide 15 – 20 minute lessons on different Higher Order Thinking Strategies. 1b. The Literacy Coach will model these lessons in the teachers' classrooms and provide additional support to the classroom teachers trying new strategies. The goal is to have multiple strategies for the students, resulting in the students' use of the appropriate strategies for the correct story skill. Strategies for Developing Higher Order Thinking Skills by Wendy Conklin and Jeanine Manlro, When Kids Can't Ready, What Teachers Can Do by Kylene Beers, and Teach Like A Champion by Doug Lemov will be used for training and support.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** Knowing how to maintaining scores of at least Level 3 of students previously scoring a Level 3**.** **Strategy(s):** **1. Bi-monthly Reading and bi-monthly Math Common Assessments will be given by each grade level.** **2. Teachers will disaggregate data from these assessments and develop a differentiated plan for students.** **3. Teachers will complete a PLC Feedback sheet to give to administration to document the upcoming differentiated instruction.** **4. Media Specialist meets with grade level teachers to disaggregate data to implement remedial skills to be taught during the Media activity wheel.** **5. Media Specialist will suggest and organize books for classroom literature circles.** **6. Media Specialist will provide training for both students and teachers on the Accelerated Reading Program.**	**Level 3 or Higher** **Gr 3 – 49% 39/78** **Gr 4 – 54% 29/54** **Gr 5 – 60% 40/67** **Gr 6 - 56% 32/56** Total school Level 3 27% (70/260)	Total school Level 3 68% (180/262)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading **Barrier(s): Teacher knowledge of differentiated instruction and how to provide instruction for students.**	**Level 3 or Higher** **Gr 3 – 21% 15/78** **Gr 4 – 30% 16/54**	

Strategy(s): 1a. During Literature Circles, students will be exposed to Higher Order Thinking Questions, involving Math questions/activities such as creating a Thinking Maps or other graphic organizers. **1b. Student conversations in Literature Circles will be student led and documented by students.** **1c. Students will use writing skills to create projects for Literature Circles.** **1d. Students will summarize what they have learned and discuss newly learned concepts with peers.**	**Gr 5 – 25% 17/67** **Gr 6 - 32% 20/56** Total School Level 3 29% (75/260)	Total School Level 3 30% (79/262)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s): Professional Development for the classroom teachers on DIBELS NEXT.** **Strategy(s):** 1a. Training for teachers in October during Professional Development Day. 1b. Grade level meetings and individual meetings with teachers and administrators will be scheduled to discuss student progress. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	84% (54/64)	90% (45/50)
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline data 2010-11:**		
Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :	Enter numerical data for current level of performance	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance
White:	63	78
Black:	33	44
Hispanic:	N/A	N/A
Asian:	N/A	N/A
American Indian:	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A

Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s): Students not reading on a regular basis with books on their reading level.** **Strategy(s):** **1.** Build classroom libraries with different reading levels. **2.** Rewards program for Accelerated Reading tests **3.** Teachers will differentiate instruction based on student ability level either within classroom or within grade level.	29% (13/44)	47% (27/58)
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s): Students not having access to books at home during the school year or during the summer.** **Strategy(s):** **1.** Provide classroom libraries and allow students to check out books from the school library. **2.** Provide an opportunity for parents to receive a free public library card at Family Heath Night in September. **3.** Provide the opportunity for parents and students to check out books from the school library one time per week during the summer. **4.** Students have the opportunity to complete a Summer Reading Workshop and receive rewards at the beginning of the 2013 school year for completion. **5.** Student created and student led book club will meet before school for grades 4 – 6 to encourage reading based on student preferences	48% (78/162)	62% (112/180)

Reading Professional Development

PD Content / Topic / Focus	Target Dates / Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up / monitoring
Higher Order Thinking Skills	Monday afternoons from October - March	Training on Monday afternoons, modeling in classrooms, and observing teachers trying new strategies. Teachers will share products with each other at grade level PLCs and continue to discuss successful strategies. Grade level teachers will share strategies for incorporating Higher Order Thinking Skills into instruction at faculty meetings (at least once per month). Monitoring will be conducted by administrative walk-thrus and completion of PLC Feedback forms.
DIBELS NEXT to build fluency	October PDD	On-going progress monitoring for students using DIBELS NEXT.

Literature Circles	Grade Level PLC – members already using Literature Circles will share ideas and materials with teammates. At faculty meetings, teams and/or grade levels will share strategies to enhance classroom instruction followed by open discussions.	Lesson plans to include literature circle activities, PLC feedback forms.

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person / Process / Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening / Speaking:**	N/A		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:**	N/A		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**:	N/A		

Mathematics Goal(s): **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)** **56% (148/262)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)** **68% (181/266)**
Anticipated Barrier(s): **1.** Adapting the reading block style of instruction into the math block (particularly utilizing small group instruction) **2.** Differentiating instruction in the math block		
Strategy(s): **1.** Title one teacher and classroom teachers collaborate to implement small group instruction in math block. **2.** Utilize results of common assessments in grade level meetings and PLC's to direct future instruction and to differentiate instruction based on results (i.e. students who need remediation of certain strands). **3.** District resource teacher will provide materials and support.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Students scoring at achievement level 3 typically lack higher order thinking skills to answer questions with a higher level of complexity to raise their score to an achievement level 4 or 5. **Strategy(s):** **1.** Through small group instruction, teachers will incorporate NCTM process standards which foster higher order thinking skills (problem solving, reasoning and proof, communication, etc). **2.** Students will be required to write about math daily and talk about their thinking process with peers.	**Level 3 or Higher** **Gr 3 – 31% 24/77** **Gr 4 – 31% 17/54** **Gr 5 – 22% 15/67** **Gr 6 - 43% 27/63** **Total School Level 3 46% (119/260)**	**Total School Level 3 75% (200/266)**
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics **1.**	**N/A**	
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** Meeting the needs of students at achievement level 4 and 5 in order to ensure they maintain this achievement level **Strategy(s):** **1.** Differentiated instruction in math block so that students receive higher complexity problems to solve which will "stretch" their thinking. **2.** Students will be required to write to explain their reasoning in solving math problems.	**Level 3 or Higher** **Gr 3 – 14% 11/77** **Gr 4 – 24% 13/54** **Gr 5 – 28% 14/51** **Gr 6 – 23% 15/63** **Total School Level 3 23%**	**Total School Level 3 25% (67/266)**

	(59/260)	
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	**N/A**	
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	**N/A**	
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** Students lack knowledge to answer challenging questions. **Strategy(s):** **1.** Small group instruction will provide for opportunities to provide students with remediation of skills that they have not fully developed/mastered. 2. PLCs will meet to discuss strategies to enhance skills of Lowest 25% students and create groups/lessons.	**58% (37/64)**	**68% (34/50)**
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline Data 2010-11:**		
Student subgroups by ethnicity : White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	 61 33 46 N/A N/A	 74 50 70 N/A N/A
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	34	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	44	58

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content / Topic / Focus	Target Dates / Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up / monitoring
Common Core Math Training K -2 and 3 -6.	October PDD February PDD	Administrative walk-thrus, teacher lesson plans
Scheduling and Strategies to use in the Math Block	1. October PDD session created by classroom and resource teachers and presented to staff. 2. Monthly faculty meetings October – May	1. Teacher lesson plans/schedules, student tracking sheets, grade level meeting discussions. 2. Administrative walk-thrus, teacher Professional Development Plans, Grade level PLC feedback forms.

	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) **81% (54/67)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) **100% (76/76)**
Barrier(s): **1. Students not able to write a 3 paragraph essay by the beginning of 4th grade, which includes the correct grammar and spelling.** **2. Lack of teacher training with regard to writing skills / figurative language** **Strategy(s):** **1a. Kindergarten – 6th grade will have a list of non-negotiable words that MUST be spelled correctly on <u>all</u> assignments. If words are not spelled correctly, teachers MUST circle words and have students correct the assignment. The same strategy of correcting mistakes will take place with grammar and conventions.** **1b. By the end of 3rd grade, students should be able to formulate a three paragraph essay with a beginning, middle, and end using correct grammar and conventions.** **1c. Additional time for**		

taking the writing test will increase from 45 minutes to 60 minutes. **2a. Teacher training on writing skills by the Writing Contact during Professional Learning Communities.**		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	81% (54/67)	100% (76/76)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	N/A	N/A

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Barrier(s): 1.3rd and 4th grade benchmarks taught in previous years. 2. Writing across the curriculum. **Strategy(s):** **1a. During 5th grade Science Lab, students will be retaught the 3rd and 4th grade benchmarks.** **1b. Formative and Summative Assessments will be analyzed to determine if students have mastered the 3rd and 4th grade benchmarks.** **1c. After school science labs will be made available to all students.** **1d. Teachers will volunteer to assist with science fair projects for students at the Cuyler Center in Mims for the 5 weeks preceding the Mims Science Fair.** **2a. During Science Lab, students will be required to write in science journal to include notes, charts, observations, and summarizations based on the "hands-on" experiments.** **2b. All grade levels will schedule time in the science lab for "hands-on" learning at least once per month.** **2c. In grades K – 6, nonfiction text during the Reading block will include the re-teaching of science vocabulary. Comprehension reading strategies will be taught using science text.** **2d. All students in grades 3 – 6 will complete a science fair project to include completing a written log. Students in grades K -2 will participate in a class science fair project.**		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science**:**	55% (37/67)	59% (36/61)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	N/A	N/A
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	16% (9/55)	33% (20/61)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading	N/A	N/A

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

APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
Due to Mims not making AYP status, all teachers are required to be Highly Effective Teachers.	Principal	August 2012
2.		
3.		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are not highly effective. *When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly effective	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
.03% (1/38)	The one teacher is currently enrolled in the ESOL classes for certification.

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

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and it role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

The MTSS team includes the guidance counselor, school psychologist, staffing specialist, principal, assistant principal, 2 ESE teachers, Literacy Coach, and 2 Title One teachers. The staff is trained in faculty meetings, one-on-one, grade level PLCs, and team meetings.

The MTSS (Leadership Team) meets on a monthly basis to discuss implementation of the SIP. Discussions are guided by data from common assessments, district assessments, and state assessments.

The K – 6 Data Wall displays students receiving IEP, PMP, and Tier III services along with which teacher(s) are responsible for providing the services.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT: Please see the PIP for Mims Elementary School.

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

As of September 24, 2012, the current unexcused absences is 272, excused is 143, for a total of 416. Mims has a total of 171 tardies with 126 students having 3 or more tardies each.

The expected attendance rate should improve over the current trend of having approximately 1600 absences with teachers and the attendance committee making phone calls to parents for students with excessive absences. The expected tardy rate should improve over the current trend of having approximately 680 tardies for the school year by the data clerk making phone calls to parents and alerting the attendance committee of students with excessive tardies.

SUSPENSION:

91 students were suspended in the 2011 – 2012 school year with 2 major discipline issues: bullying incident involving the Sheriff department and a cyber-bullying incident.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

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