

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



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

2012-2013

## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

### PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

#### School Information

School Name: Palm Lake Elementary School	District Name: Orange
Principal: Daniel L. Axtell	Superintendent: Barbara M. Jenkins
SAC Chair: Carol-Anne Warren	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)										
					School	School Year	School Grade	% Meeting High Standards in Reading	% Meeting High Standards in Math	% Meeting High Standards in Writing	% Meeting High Standards in Science	% Making Learning Gains in Reading	% Making Learning Gains in Math	% of Lowest 25% Making Gains in Reading	% of Lowest 25% Making Gains in Math
Principal	Daniel L. Axtell	<b>Educational Leadership</b> (all levels) Physical Education (6-12) Physical Education (K-8) School Principal (all levels)	0	15	Walker MS	2011-2012	C	42	38	70	32	65	64	73	66
						2010-2011	C	52	46	83	25	60	59	70	68
						2009-2010	B	57	61	87	37	62	71	70	76
					Gotha MS	2008-2009	A	75	75	96	51	65	68	67	58
						2007-2008	A	76	78	97	54	66	79	60	70
						2006-2007	A	73	72	94	48	64	74	64	66
						2005-2006	A	73	71	90		70	76	72	
						2004-2005	A	67	70	82		66	74	71	
					Thornebrooke Elem.	2003-2004	A	85	82	93	69	78	58		
						2002-2003	NG								
					Oakshire Elem.	2001-2002	C	56	59	60	56	80	56		
						2000-2001	C	54	41						
					Annual Yearly Progress: 2011-2012 AYP no longer reported 2010-2011 69% Criteria not met in Total, White, Black, Hispanic, ELL, and ED in rdg. Criteria not met in total white, Black, Hispanic, ELL, and ED in math 2009-2010 82% Criteria not met in Total, Black, Hispanic, ELL, ED and SWD in rdg. Criteria not met in SWD in math 2008-2009 74% Criteria not met in Black, ELL, ED, and SWD in reading and math 2007-2008 92% Criteria not met in ELL and SWD in reading and not met in SWD in math 2006-2007 97% Criteria not met in SWD in reading 2005-2006 90% Criteria not met in SWD in reading and not met in ED and SWD in math 2004-2005 97% Criteria not met in SWD in math 2003-2004 100% 2002-2003 Not reported 2001-2002 AYP Not Available										

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

Assistant Principal	John Stiles-Williams	Educational Leadership (all levels) Elementary Education( 1-6) Gifted Endorsement	.5	.5	School	School Year	School Grade	% Meeting High Standards in Reading	% Meeting High Standards in Math	% Meeting High Standards in Writing	% Meeting High Standards in Science	% Making Learning Gains in Reading	% Making Learning Gains in Math	% of Lowest 25% Making Gains in Reading	% of Lowest 25% Making Gains in Math
					Palm Lake Elem.	2011-2012	A	81	85	76	73	72	86	66	82
2011-2012 AYP no longer reported															

**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)
	None				

**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. Teachers will be involved in problem solving and school decision making regarding school programs and policies.	Daniel Axtell	June 2013
2. The PTA and community members will support our teachers by providing funding for school projects and programs, supplying ADDitions volunteers and hosting staff appreciation events.	Cynthia Schweitzer, Kim Palmer	June 2013
3. Update and increase the amount of available technology tools to enhance instructional programs.	Daniel Axtell, Andre Johnson	June 2013
4.		

***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/or 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
6% (3)	Teachers are taking courses to earn ESOL Endorsement

***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
48	2% (1)	6% (3)	33% (16)	58% (28)	33% (16)	98% (47)	12% (6)	10% (5)	65% (31)

***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
Barbara Bubrick	Brittney Denomme	Both on same grade level	Complete Beginning Teacher Portfolio, Provide support for beginning teacher with all classroom protocols; Classroom observations of effective teachers

**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 - N/A
Title I, Part C- Migrant - N/A
Title I, Part D - N/A
Title II - N/A
Title III- N/A
Title X- Homeless - N/A
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) -N/A
Violence Prevention Programs - N/A
Nutrition Programs - N/A
Housing Programs - N/A
Head Start - N/A
Adult Education - N/A
Career and Technical Education- N/A
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
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Team Members: Daniel Axtell, John Stiles-Williams, Martha Ficquette, Linda Martin, Joyce Muller
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? “Kid Talk” meetings are scheduled with individual teachers and teams to analyze and address multi-tiered instruction/intervention for all students. The school team utilizes school-wide, grade level, and classroom data to drive instruction and determine appropriate intervention strategies.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The school team analyzes school-wide, grade level, and classroom data to identify instructional needs that will be addressed in the SIP and related professional development sessions.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. The school team utilizes school-wide data such as Benchmark and FAIR, grade level data such as DRA and common assessments, and classroom data to drive instruction. Data is tracked through use of the Educational Data Warehouse through OCPS, data bases and charts designed by school personnel, and the new IMS system.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The MTSS Leadership Team first provides an overview of the process then meets with individual teachers or teams to provide extensive training on the implementation of the process, required documentation, and tracking tools.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. The administration will oversee the implementation and support of MTSS to insure program fidelity.

***Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)***

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Team Members: Sandy Young, Barbara Bubrick, Linda Wolfe, Mary Bloom, Denise Burnett, Chuck Fritts, Rey Mariaca, Kim Tarantello, Lori Mund, Joyce Muller
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Literacy Leadership Team meets each month to address school wide literacy concerns. Plans are made and programs are implemented to address these concerns. Team members oversee the implementation of these programs and serve as resources for their respective team members.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? Major initiative for this school year include increasing the amount of time students spend on reading for knowledge and for enjoyment, focusing on providing students with books that are at the appropriate Lexile level, and emphasizing instruction on text complexity.

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

**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.

**\*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.

N/A

**\*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



**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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>			1A.1. Students have a wide range of strengths and weaknesses in required reading skills.	1A.1. Teachers will use novel studies and guided reading groups to address specified skills.	1A.1. Principal, AP, CRT, Classroom teachers, ESE teachers	1A.1. Review data from common assessments developed by teams.	1A.1. Benchmark and FAIR assessments
<b>Reading Goal #1A:</b>  23% (65) of the students scored at Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT reading test. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 26 % (67) or more of our students taking the FCAT reading test will score at Level 3 on the 2013 reading FCAT.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  23% (65) of the students scored at Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT reading test.	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <b>By July 2013, 26 % (67) or more of our students taking the FCAT reading test will score at Level 3.</b>					
			1A.2 Less support personnel available to help struggling students.	1A.2 Provide flexible grouping and use of leveled text in reading instruction, assigned reading selections and in Making Meaning.	1A.2. Principal, AP, CRT, Classroom teachers, ESE teachers	1A.2. Data from Benchmark and FAIR	1A.2. Data reports from Benchmark and FAIR assessments
			1A.3 Students need additional strategies to help them read more advanced text in preparation for Common Core assessments.	1A.3 Collaboration among teams for implementation of direct instruction in text features, close reading and text complexity.	1A.3. Principal, AP, CRT, Classroom teachers, ESE teachers	1A.3. Data from Benchmark and FAIR	1A.3. Data reports from Benchmark and FAIR assessments
			1A.4 Teachers will need support as Common Core Standards are implemented.	1A.4. Black Belt teachers will support teachers in the instruction of the Common Core Standards.	1A.4. Principal, AP, CRT, Classroom teachers, Black Belt Team	1A.4. Data from Benchmark and FAIR	1A.4. Data reports from Benchmark and FAIR assessments
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<b>Reading Goal #1B:</b>  N/A	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  N/A	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  N/A					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b>			2A.1. Students need additional strategies to help them read more advanced text.	2A.1. Collaboration among teams for implementation of direct instruction in close reading, and text complexity.	2A.1. Principal, AP, CRT, Classroom teachers, ESE teachers	2A.1. Data from Benchmark, FAIR, and teacher created assessments	2A.1. Data reports from Benchmark FAIR, and teacher created assessments
<b>Reading Goal #2A:</b>  58% (167) of the students scored at Levels 4 and 5 on the 2012 FCAT reading test. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 61 % (172) of all students taking the FCAT reading test will score at Level 4 or Level 5 on the 2013 reading FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <b>2012 FCAT results showed that 58% (167) of all students taking the FCAT reading scored at Levels 4 and 5.</b>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <b>By July 2013, 61% (172) or more of our students taking the FCAT Reading test will score at Levels 4 and 5.</b>					
			2A.2. Challenging for students to transfer content across curriculum.	2A.2. Teachers will develop and present thematic units designed to integrate studies across the curriculum.	2A.2. Principal, AP, CRT, Classroom teachers, ESE teachers	2A.2. Data from Benchmark, FAIR, and teacher created assessments	2A.2. Data reports from Benchmark FAIR, and teacher created assessments
			2A.3. Students are not exposed to an adequate amount of higher level thinking question stems.	2A.3. Provide enrichment instruction designed to promote higher level critical thinking.	2A.3. Principal, AP, CRT, Classroom teachers, ESE teachers	2A.3. Data from Benchmark, FAIR, and teacher created assessments	2A.3. Data reports from Benchmark FAIR, and teacher created assessments
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<b>Reading Goal #2B:</b>  N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> N/A	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> N/A					
			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
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			3A.1. Limited instructional time for remediation in the classroom.	3A.1. Reading teacher will provide additional instructional time in the classroom. Two additional part-time tutors were hired to provide additional instructional support for these students. Tutoring is also being provided before school and after school for targeted students.	3A.1. Principal, AP, CRT, reading teacher	3A.1. Monitoring FAIR and Benchmark assessment results	3A.1. FAIR and Benchmark assessment reports
<b>Reading Goal #3A:</b> 72% (204) of the students taking the 2012 FCAT Reading Exam made reading gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 75% (212) of all students make learning gains on the 2013 reading FCAT.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> 72% (204) of the students taking the 2012 FCAT Reading test made learning gains.	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> By July, 2013 75% (212) of the students taking the 2013 FCAT Reading Test will make learning gains.					
			3A.2. Not all students have assistance at home with their academics.	3A.2. Utilize the take home reading component providing daily opportunities for reading that support the work done in class during the day.	3A.2. Principal, AP, CRT, reading teacher	3A.2. Monitoring FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessment results	3A.2. FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessment reports
			3A.3. Students lack knowledge of the thinking processes involved in reading unfamiliar text.	3A.3. Teachers will model "Think Alouds" as they work on unfamiliar text in the classroom.	3A.3. Principal, AP, CRT, reading teacher	3A.3. Monitoring FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessment results	3A.3. FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessment reports
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<b>Reading Goal #3B:</b> N/A	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> N/A	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> N/A					
			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
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>			4.1. Limited instructional time for remediation in the classroom.	4.1. Reading teacher will provide additional instructional time. Two additional part-time tutors were hired to provide additional instructional support for these students. Tutoring is also being provided before school and after school for targeted students.	4.1. Principal, AP, CRT, reading teacher	4.1. Monitoring FAIR and Benchmark assessment results	4.1. FAIR and Benchmark assessment reports
<b>Reading Goal #4:</b> 66% (187) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT reading exam. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 69 % (195) of our students in the lowest 25% on reading will make learning gains on the 2013 reading FCAT.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> 66% (187) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT reading exam.	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> By July 2013, 69% (195) of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT reading exam.					
			4.2. Teacher confidence and understanding of their role in the RtI process.	4.2. Provide guidelines for teachers and facilitate monthly RtI team meetings with grade level teams to provide guidance and check progress of struggling students and the continued implementation of the RtI process for tiers 1, 2 and 3.	4.2. RtI team, classroom teachers, staffing specialist	4.2. Monthly RtI team data meetings, review of growth shown on benchmark tests, FAIR	4.2. Benchmark assessment reports, FAIR assessment reports, FCAT 2012
			4.3. Students lack knowledge of the thinking processes involved in reading unfamiliar text.	4.3. Teachers will model "Think Alouds" as they work on unfamiliar text in the classroom.	4.3. Principal, AP, CRT, reading teacher	4.3. Monitoring FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessment results	4.3. FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessment reports

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>		79%	81%	83%	85%	87%	89%
	Reading Goal #5A: In July 2011, 77% of All students, 85% of the White students, 33% of the Black students, 86% of the Asian students, 73% of the Hispanic students, 80% of the ELL students, 35% of the SWD students and 57% of the ED students scored at the proficiency level on FCAT Reading. Our goal is by July 2017, to have reduced the achievement gap by 50%.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5B.1.		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
	Reading Goal #5B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		N/A	N/A					
	5B.2.		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
5B.3.		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
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5C.1. Students are at a variety of stages of language acquisition.	5C.1. Teachers implement a variety of ESOL/SIOP strategies to make instruction comprehensible. Two additional part-time tutors were hired to provide additional instructional support for these students. Tutoring is also being provided before school and after school for targeted students.	5C.1. Principal, AP, CT, Classroom Teachers	5C.1. Monitor student progress in FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessments	5C.1. CELLA 2013
<b>Reading Goal #5C:</b> In July 2011, 80% of the ELL students, scored at the proficiency level on FCAT Reading.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> In July 2012, 81% (60) of the ELL students scored at the proficiency level on FCAT Reading. The performance target of 82% was not met.	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> By July 2013, our Annual Measurable Objective for ELL students scoring at proficiency on FCAT Reading is 84% (59).					
			5C.2. Students have limited experiences to gain background knowledge	5C.2. Teachers supplement their instruction using visual clues to aid in comprehension.	5C.2. Principal, AP, CT, Classroom Teachers	5C.2. Monitor student progress in FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessments	5C.2. CELLA 2013
			5C.3. Students do not have resources for help with academic language development	5C.3. "Foldables" are used to practice vocabulary for key academic concepts.	5C.3. Principal, AP, CT, Classroom Teachers	5 C.3. Monitor student progress in FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessments	5C.3. CELLA 2013
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5D.1	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
<b>Reading Goal #5D:</b> N/A	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> N/A	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> N/A					
			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
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
Reading Goal #5E: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

**Reading Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b>						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Standards	K-5	“Black Belt” Teachers	Grade Level PLC	Twice a month	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
Effective Instructional Strategies for close reading and text complexity	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Monthly	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
Instruction in the use of the newly adopted materials for science and social studies and their implications for improving reading in the content area.	K-5	SS and Science Ambassadors	Science – School-wide Social Studies – Grades 2 - 5	Monthly	Teacher Reflections	Principal, AP
Marzano Strategies	K-5	Principal, AP	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
Classworks Training	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Monthly	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
IMS Training	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
Technology Tools Training (IPADs, Student Response Systems, SmartBoards, Promethian Boards)	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP, Technology Coordinator



**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
Monthly RtI Meetings to discuss student progress monitoring	Substitutes	SIP	909.73
			<b>Subtotal: \$909.73</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Classworks	Classworks	License active until Oct. 2013	0
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Social Studies Instructional Materials	Grade 2 -5	Grade 2 school budget Grades 3-5 purchased by district	4195.80 school funds District funds – amt. unknown
			<b>Subtotal: \$4,195.80</b>
			<b>Total: \$5,105.53</b>

*End of Reading Goals*

**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
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>  <b>CELLA Goal #1:</b>  48% (30) of the students taking CELLA in 2012 scored proficient in listening / speaking. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 51% (35) of the students taking CELLA score proficient in listening /speaking.	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</b>  48% (30) of the students taking CELLA in 2012 scored proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. Some students do not have English speaking models at home.	1.1. Students are given the opportunity to participate in verbal exchanges both in and out of the classroom. Picture clues are available to aid in these exchanges.	1.1 Principal, AP, CT, Classroom Teachers	1.1. Monitor student progress in FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessments	1.1. CELLA 2013
		1.2. Adults at home are not able to help with English Language Acquisition.	1.2. Teachers supplement their instruction using visual clues to aid in comprehension.	1.2. Principal, AP, CT, Classroom Teachers	1.2. Monitor student progress in FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessments	1.2. CELLA 2013
		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
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>  <b>CELLA Goal #2:</b>  39% (23) of the students taking CELLA in 2012 scored proficient in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 42% (29) of the students taking CELLA score proficient in reading.	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</b>  39% (23) of the students taking CELLA in 2012 scored proficient in reading.	2.1. Acquiring academic language takes an average of 5-7 years.	2.1. Teachers use the ELL vocabulary list associated with Making Meaning to aid in comprehension.	2.1. Principal, AP, CT, Classroom Teachers	2.1. Monitor student progress in FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessments	2.1. CELLA 2013
		2.2. Some students are not literate in their native language.	2.2. "Foldables" are used to practice vocabulary for key academic concepts and make instruction comprehensible.	2.2. Principal, AP, CT, Classroom Teachers	2.2. Monitor student progress in FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessments	2.2. CELLA 2013
		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
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>		3.1. Some students have little or no support at home in English grammar and punctuation rules.	3.1. The teachers focus on vocabulary building in writing.	3.1. Principal, AP, CT, Classroom Teachers	3.1. Monitor student progress in FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessments	3.1. CELLA 2013
<b>CELLA Goal #3:</b>  23% (15) of the students taking CELLA in 2012 scored proficient in writing. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 26% (18) of the students taking CELLA score proficient in writing.	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</b>  23% (15) of the students taking CELLA in 2012 scored proficient in writing.					
		3.2. Students struggle with complex sentence structure.	3.2. Teachers work in small groups to provide extra assistance as students develop their writing skills.	3.2. Principal, AP, CT, Classroom Teachers	3.2. Monitor student progress in FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessments	3.2. CELLA 2013
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

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
Electronic Glossary	Science Fusion Materials	District purchased	Amt. Unknown
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of CELLA Goals*

**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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>			1A.1. Students often have misconceptions of when to use certain problem solving strategies.	1A.1. Teachers will model the effective problem solving strategies and provide practice for students in the use of these strategies.	1A.1. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	1A.1. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	1A.1. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#1A:							
26% (74) of the students scored at Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT math test. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 29% (82) or more of our students taking the FCAT math test will score a Level 3 on the 2013 math FCAT.	2012 FCAT results showed that 26% (74) of all students taking the FCAT math scored at Level 3.	By July 2013 29% (82) or more of all students taking the FCAT math test will score at Level 3.					
			1A.2. Lack of adequate practice of basic math facts and skills outside the classroom.	1A.2. Students will practice math skills using FCAT Explorer, Envision technology component and Classworks.	1A.2. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	1A.2. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	1A.2. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
			1A.3. Many students are uncertain how to attack word problems.	1A.3. Students will participate in hands on problem solving group activities.	1A.3. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	1A.3. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	1A.3. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
			1A.4. Teachers will need support as Common Core Standards are implemented.	1A.4. Black Belt teachers will support teachers in the instruction of the Common Core Standards.	1A.4. Principal, AP, CRT, Classroom teachers, Black Belt Team	1A.4. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	1A.4. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#1B:							
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>			2A.1. Limited support personnel to provide interventions for high achieving students.	2A.1. Kid Talks include data regarding students on grade level and above to ensure plans for enrichment are in place.	2A.1. Principal, AP, enrichment teacher, classroom teachers	2A.1. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	2A.1. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u>  60% (170) of the students scored at Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT math test. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 63% (178) or more of our students taking the FCAT math test will score a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 math FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  2012 FCAT results showed that 60% (170) of all students taking the FCAT math scored at Levels 4 and 5.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  By July 2013, 63% (178) or more of our students taking the FCAT math test will score at Levels 4 and 5.					
			2A.2. Students must have computer access.	2A.2. Use technology component of Envision to enhance student learning.	2A.2. Principal, AP, enrichment teacher, classroom teachers, Tech. Coord.	2A.2. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	2A.2. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
			2A.3. Teachers must carefully select instructional materials.	2A.3. Students will complete challenging problem solving activities to promote the use of critical thinking skills.	2A.3. Principal, AP, enrichment teacher, classroom teachers	2A.3. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	2A.3. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>  N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  N/A	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  N/A					
			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
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3A.1. Students are not ready to function at the symbolic or abstract thinking levels.	3A.1. Students participate in hands-on investigations and activities focusing on basic math concepts. Two additional part-time tutors were hired to provide additional instructional support for these students. Tutoring is also being provided before school and after school for targeted students.	3A.1. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	3A.1. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	3A.1. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <b>#3A:</b>  86% (243) of the students taking the 2012 math FCAT made gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 89% (251) of all students will make learning gains on the 2013 math FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 86% (243) of the students taking the 2012 FCAT math test made learning gains.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> By July, 2013 89% (251) of the students taking the 2013 FCAT math Test will make learning gains.	3A.2. Students often don't know how to begin the problem solving process.	3A.2. Teachers use the "Think Aloud" strategy to model the thinking process required in order to solve problems.	3A.2. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	3A.2. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	3A.2. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
			3A.3. Students must be instructed on the proper use of manipulative materials.	3A.3. Teachers use manipulatives and games to practice number sense and problem solving skills.	3A.3. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	3A.3. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	3A.3. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <b>#3B:</b>  N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> N/A	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> N/A	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
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>  <b>Mathematics Goal #4:</b>  In July 2012, 82% (232) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year will be for 85% (240) of our math students in the lowest 25% to score a level 3 or higher on the 2012 math FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <b>82% (232) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT math exam.</b>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <b>By July 2013, 85% (240) of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT math exam.</b>	4.1. Students are not ready to function at the symbolic or abstract thinking levels.	4.1. Students participate in hands-on investigations and activities focusing on basic math concepts. Two additional part-time tutors were hired to provide additional instructional support for these students. Tutoring is also being provided before school and after school for targeted students.	4.1. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	4.1. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	4.1. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
			4.2. Students are not ready to function at the symbolic or abstract thinking levels.	4.2. Students participate in hands-on investigations and activities focusing on basic math concepts.	4.2. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	4.2. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	4.2. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
			4.3. Students need access to computers.	4.3. Use Classworks and FCAT Explorer to provide extra practice on basic math skills.	4.3. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT, Tech. Coord.	4.3. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	4.3. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments



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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>		81%	83%	84%	86%	88%	90%	
	Mathematics Goal #5A: In July 2011, 79% of All students, 85% of the White students, 42% of the Black students, 86% of the Asian students, 80% of the Hispanic students, 80% of the ELL students, 40% of the SWD students and 63% of the ED students scored at the proficiency level on FCAT Math. Our goal is by July 2017, to have reduced the achievement gap by 50%.								
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	Mathematics Goal #5B: In July 2011, 42% of the Black students, scored at the proficiency level on FCAT Math.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	5B.1. Lack of academic support at home	5B.1. Teachers utilize best practices to provide effective instructional strategies to increase academic success for all students. This includes the use of technology in and out of the classroom Two additional part-time tutors were hired to provide additional instructional support for these students. Tutoring is also being provided before school and after school for targeted students.	5B.1. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	5B.1. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	5B.1. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments		
		<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>							
		In July 2012, 45% (16) of the Black students scored at the proficiency level on FCAT Math. The performance target of 47% was not met.	By July 2013, our Annual Measurable Objective for Black students scoring at proficiency on FCAT Math is 52% (18).						
				5B.2. Students lack knowledge on how to begin the problem solving process.	5B.2. Teachers use the "Think Aloud" strategy to model the problem solving process	5B.2. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	5B.2. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	5B.2. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments	
		5B.3. Students lack basic foundational knowledge	5B.3. Teachers use manipulatives and other concrete models to build necessary foundational skills, then move on to symbolic and abstract models.	5B.3. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	5B.3. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	5B.3. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments			

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5C.1. Students are not familiar with math vocabulary terms.	5C.1. "Foldables" are used to practice vocabulary for key academic concepts. Two additional part-time tutors were hired to provide additional instructional support for these students. Tutoring is also being provided before school and after school for targeted students.	5C.1. Principal, AP, CT, Classroom Teachers	5C.1. Monitor student progress in Benchmark and teacher created assessments	5C.1. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#5C:  In July 2011, 80% of the ELL students, scored at the proficiency level on FCAT Math.	In July 2012, 81% (60) of the ELL students scored at the proficiency level on FCAT Math. The performance target of 82% was not met.	By July 2013, our Annual Measurable Objectives for ELL students scoring at proficiency on FCAT Math is 84% (59).					
			5C.2. Students are not able to read and comprehend word problems.	5C.2. Teachers provide visual clues to assist students in comprehending and solving word problems.	5C.2. Principal, AP, CT, Classroom Teachers	5C.2. Monitor student progress in Benchmark and teacher created assessments	5C.2. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
			5C.3. Students computational skills are stronger than their application skills	5C.3. Teachers target specific skills needing improvement, then provide appropriate intervention strategies to improve student performance in those skills. (Many of these students are on Tier 2 in MTSS/RtI.)	5C.3 Principal, AP, CT, Classroom Teachers, MTSS / RtI Team	5C.3 Monitor student progress in Benchmark and teacher created assessments	5C.3 Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments

**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		
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5D.1	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	N/A	N/A					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

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

**Mathematics Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b>						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Standards	K-5	“Black Belt” Teachers	Grade Level PLC	Twice a month	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
Problem Solving Strategies	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Monthly	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
Marzano Strategies	K-5	Principal, AP	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
Classworks Training	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Monthly	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
IMS Training	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
Technology Tools Training (IPADs, Student Response Systems, SmartBoards, Promethian Boards)	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP, Technology Coordinator

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
Monthly RtI Meetings to discuss student progress monitoring	Substitutes	SIP	909.74
			<b>Subtotal: \$909.74</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$909.74</b>

*End of Mathematics Goals*

**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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b>			1A.1. Students lack science lab experiences.	1A.1. Students participate in Essential Labs provided by the district office and other lab experiences found in their new text.	1A.1. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	1A.1. Benchmark assessments (5 <sup>th</sup> grade), Teacher created assessments	1A.1. Data reports from Benchmark assessments (5 <sup>th</sup> grade) and teacher created assessments
<b>Science Goal #1A:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
36% (41) of the students scored at Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT science test. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 39% (31) of all students taking the FCAT science test will score at Level 3 on the 2013 science FCAT.	36% (41) of the students taking the FCAT Science test scored at Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Science test.	<b>By July 2013, 39% (31) of all students taking the FCAT Science test will score at Level 3 on the 2013 Science FCAT.</b>					
			1A.2. Adequate funds are required for presentations	1A.2. Students attend science presentations such as High Tech, High Touch	1A.2. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	1A.2. Benchmark assessments for 5 <sup>th</sup> grade, Teacher created assessments	1A.2. Data reports from Benchmark assessments (5 <sup>th</sup> grade) and teacher created assessments
			1A.3. Requires careful scheduling.	1A.3. Expand the use of science rotations which allow teachers to be experts on specific science concepts.	1A.3. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	1A.3. Benchmark assessments for 5 <sup>th</sup> grade, Teacher created assessments	1A.3. Data reports from Benchmark assessments (5 <sup>th</sup> grade) and teacher created assessments
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<b>Science Goal #1B:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b>			2A.1. Students lack science lab experiences.	2A.1. Students participate in Essential Labs provided by the district office and other lab experiences found in their new text.	2A.1. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	2A.1. Benchmark assessments for 5 <sup>th</sup> grade, Teacher created assessments	2A.1. Data reports from Benchmark assessments (5 <sup>th</sup> grade) and teacher created assessments
<b>Science Goal #2A:</b> 30% (34) of the students scored at Levels 4 and 5 on the 2012 FCAT science test. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 33% (26) of all students taking the FCAT science test will score at Level 4 or Level 5 on the 2013 science FCAT.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> 30% (34) of the students taking FCAT Science scored at Levels 4 and 5 on the 2012 FCAT Science test.	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> By July 2013, 33% (26) of all students taking the FCAT Science test will score at Level 4 or Level 5 on the 2013 Science FCAT.					
			2A.2. Students need more science instruction time.	2A.2. Students will participate in Science Club designed to provide enrichment activities focusing on essential science skills.	2A.2. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	2A.2. Benchmark assessments for 5 <sup>th</sup> grade, Teacher created assessments	2A.2. Data reports from Benchmark assessments (5 <sup>th</sup> grade) and teacher created assessments
				2A.3. Students need to enhance their science experiences.	2A.3. Fifth graders participate in Science Fair.	2A.3. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	2A.3. Benchmark assessments for 5 <sup>th</sup> grade, Teacher created assessments
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<b>Science Goal #2B:</b> N/A	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> N/A	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> N/A					
			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*

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Marzano Strategies	K-5	Principal, AP	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
Classworks Training	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Monthly	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
IMS Training	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
Science Fusion Textbook Training	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
Technology Tools Training (IPADs, Student Response Systems, SmartBoards, Promethian Boards)	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP, Technology Coordinator

**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
Science Fusion Instructional Materials	Newly Adopted Text and Teacher Resources	District Purchase	Amt. Unknown
Science Labs	Variety of materials needed throughout year to support lab experiences	School Budget	\$1000
			<b>Subtotal: \$1,000.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$1,000.00</b>

*End of Science Goals*

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



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
<b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>			1A.1. Students do not have a variety of experience with writing.	1A.1. Students participate in daily writing workshops at all grade levels.	1A.1. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	1A.1. Teacher created assessments	1A.1. Data reports from teacher created assessments
<b>Writing Goal #1A:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
87% (74) of the student scored at Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT writing test. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 89% (84) of all students taking the FCAT writing test will score at Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT writing.	87% (74) of the student scored at Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT writing test.	By July 2013, 89% (75) of all students taking the FCAT writing test will score at Level 3.5 on the 2013 FCAT writing.					
			1A.2. Students do not practice responding to prompts in daily life.	1A.2. Students complete school wide writing prompts at least 4 times a year.	1A.2. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	1A.2. Teacher created assessments	1A.2. Data reports from teacher created assessments
			1A.3. Students lack knowledge in the writing process.	1A.3. Teachers model all aspects of the writing process.	1A.3. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	1A.3. Teacher created assessments	1A.3. Data reports from teacher created assessments
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<b>Writing Goal #1B:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

**Writing Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FCAT Writing Rubric	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Monthly	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
Technology Tools Training (IPADS, Student Response Systems, SmartBoards, Promethian Boards)	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP, Technology Coordinator

**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
Write Source Workbooks	Provide practice in standard conventions	School Budget	\$592.80
			<b>Subtotal: \$592.80</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$592.80</b>

*End of Writing Goals*

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

**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
<b>I. Attendance</b>			1.1. Sometimes families plan trips during school year.	1.1 Communicate with parents during SAC, PTA, and parent teacher conferences, the importance of attendance and its impact on academic success.	1.1. Principal, AP, Registrar, Classroom Teachers, Social Worker	1.1. Monitor attendance using SMS	1.1. Monitor attendance using SMS
<b>Attendance Goal #1:</b>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
During the 2011-2012 school year, the average attendance rate was 96%. Our goal for the school year 2012-2013 is to reduce the number of excessive tardies and absences by at least 10%.	96%	97%					
	<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>					
	142	128					
	<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>					
	73	67					
			1.2. Contact information not available.	1.2. Contact parents if student has an unexcused absence for three consecutive days.	1.2. Principal, AP, Registrar, Classroom Teachers, Social Worker	1.2. Monitor attendance using SMS	1.2. Monitor attendance using SMS
			1.3. Students are sometimes absent to care for younger siblings.	1.3. School social worker will conduct home visits when necessary.	1.3. Principal, AP, Registrar, Classroom Teachers, Social Worker	1.3. Monitor attendance using SMS	1.3. Social Work Report

**Attendance Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance Policy	K-5	Registrar	School-wide	Fall, 2012	Attendance Reports	Principal, AP, Registrar

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

*End of Attendance Goals*

**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
<b>1. Suspension</b>			1.1. Parents are not aware of school’s expectations.	1.1. Communicate with students and parents the school’s expectations for appropriate student behavior.	1.1. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, Guidance Counselor	1.1. Discipline Records	1.1. Discipline Report on EDW
<b>Suspension Goal #1:</b>	<b>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</b>	<b>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</b>					
During the 2011-2012 school 3.4 % of the students were involved in disciplinary actions resulting in suspension. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year will be to decrease our number of suspensions by 50%.	4	2					
<b>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</b>	<b>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</b>						
3	2						
<b>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</b>	<b>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</b>						
20	10						
<b>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</b>	<b>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</b>						
18	9						
			1.2. Parents and students need to become familiar with PRIDE acronym.	1.2. Implement PRIDE program to promote positive behavior.	1.2. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, Guidance Counselor	1.2. Discipline Records	1.2. Discipline Report on EDW
			1.3. Contact information not available.	1.3. Contact parents/guardians if student is demonstrating inappropriate behaviors.	1.3. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, Guidance Counselor	1.3. Discipline Records	1.3. Discipline Report on EDW

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PRIDE	K-5	Asst. Prin.	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP, Guidance Counselor

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

*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
<b>1. Dropout Prevention</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</b>  N/A  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	N/A	N/A					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**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

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

*End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*



**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
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>							
<b>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</b> During the 2011-2012 school year, 95% of parents participated in at least one school activity or event. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is that 96% of the parents will participate in at least one school activity or event.	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> During the 2011-2012 school year, 95% (285) of parents participated in at least one school activity or event.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> By July 2013, 96% (288) of the parents will participate in at least one school activity or event.	1.1. More parents are working and have less free time to attend school activities.	1.1. Schedule events as various times including evenings and weekends.	1.1. Principal, AP, PTA Board, SAC	1.1. Sign In Sheets	1.1. Sign In Sheets
			1.2. Sometimes difficult for parents to find childcare to be able to attend.	1.2. Schedule monthly CARD presentations for parent's education and support.	1.2. Principal, AP, ESE team	1.2. Sign In Sheets	1.2. Sign In Sheets
				1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**Parent Involvement Professional Development**

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CARD presentations	PreK-5	CARD	School-wide	Monthly	Survey	Principal, AP

**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
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PTA coordinates a variety of activities and events throughout the year	PTA and Community Resources	PTA, PIE	Varies per event
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

**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
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
<b>STEM Goal #1:</b> During the 2011-2012 school year, 85% (41) of our teachers presented STEM activities to their students. Our goal for 2012-2013 is 100% (48) of our teachers participating in at least one STEM activity during the school year.	1.1. Requires more preparation time and consumable materials.	1.1. Teachers will incorporate AIMS activities within their classroom.	1.1. Principal, AP, CRT, Classroom Teachers	1.1. Teacher Survey	1.1. Summary report of teacher surveys
	1.2. Limited availability of computers.	1.2. Teachers will engage in at least one new technology project (ie. blog, webpage, power point, etc.)	1.2. Principal, AP, CRT, Classroom Teachers	1.2. Teacher Survey	1.2. Summary report of teacher surveys
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**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
Science Fusion Textbook Training	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP

**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
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
AIMS Activities	Materials needed for lab experiences	School Budget	1000
			<b>Subtotal: \$1,000.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$1,000.00</b>

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

**Additional Goal(s)**

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

<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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		
<b>1. Additional Goal:</b> All Elementary age students will read independently on grade level by age 9.  Additional Goal #1:  During the 2011-12 school year, 85% (82) of the students read on grade level by age 9. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 88% (86) of the students read on grade level by age 9.			1.1. Limited support personnel are available to assist struggling students.	1.1. Teachers identify struggling students and target their direct instruction to address individual strengths and weaknesses. Two additional part-time tutors were hired to provide additional instructional support for these students. Tutoring is also being provided before school and after school for targeted students.	1.1. Principal, AP, Classroom teachers, Reading teacher, CRT	1.1. Monitoring FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessment results	1.1. Data Reports from FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessment reports		
								2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*
			During the 2011-12 school year, 85% (82) of the students read on grade level by age 9.	By July 2013, 88% (86) of the students will read on grade level by age 9.	1.2. Students have a wide range of reading levels.	1.2. Students will participate in guided reading activities to increase their knowledge and use of reading skills.	1.2. Principal, AP, Classroom teachers, Reading teacher, CRT	1.2. Monitoring FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessment results	1.2. Data Reports from FAIR, Benchmark and teacher created assessment reports

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

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	
<p><b>2. Additional Goal :</b> All elementary school students will become fluent in all four basic mathematical operations for whole numbers by fourth grade and adding and subtracting fractions and decimals by the end of fifth grade.</p>		2.1. Limited support personnel are available to assist struggling students.	2.1. Teachers identify students and target their direct instruction to address individual strengths and weaknesses. Two additional part-time tutors were hired to provide additional instructional support for these students. Tutoring is also being provided before school and after school for targeted students.	2.1. Principal, AP, Classroom teachers, Reading teacher, CRT	2.1. Monitoring Benchmark and teacher created assessment results	2.1. Data Reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessment reports	
<p><b>Additional Goal #2:</b></p> <p>85% (241) of the students were fluent in math skills as indicated by the 2012 Math FCAT. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is that 88 % (249) of our students will be fluent in math as indicated by a score of Level 3 or above on the 2013 math FCAT.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level :*</u></p> <p>During the 2011-12 school year, 85% (241) of the students were fluent in math skills.</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level :*</u></p> <p>By July 2013, 88% (249) of the students will be fluent in math skills as indicated by a score of Level 3 or above on 2013 math FCAT.</p>					
			2.2. Students lack understanding of basic math concepts.	2.2. Students participate in hands-on investigations and activities focusing on basic math concepts.	2.2. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT	2.2. Benchmark and teacher created assessments	2.2. Data reports from Benchmark and teacher created assessments
				2.3. Students do no practice math facts.	2.3. Use Classworks and FCAT Explorer to provide extra practice on basic math skills.	2.3. Principal, AP, Classroom Teachers, CRT, Tech. Coord.	2.3. Benchmark and teacher created assessments

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

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
<b>3. Additional Goal : Maintain High Fine Arts Enrollment Percentage</b>			3.1. Not all parents are able to provide Fine Arts opportunities for their students from private sources.	3.1. Fine Arts teachers offer enrichment classes in guitar, piano, chorus, art and ensemble at least two afternoons per week.	3.1. Principal, AP, Classroom teachers, Fine Arts teachers, CRT	3.1. Enrollment reports, performances, displays and presentations	3.1. Enrollment reports, performances, displays and presentations
<b>Additional Goal #3:</b>  100% (616) of the students were enrolled in two weekly fine arts classes and 21% (129) of our students were enrolled in a fine arts enrichment class. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is that 100% (588) of our students will be enrolled in two weekly fine arts classes and 24% (141) will be enrolled in a fine arts enrichment class.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>  During the 2011-12 school year, 100% (616) of the students were enrolled in two weekly fine arts classes and 21% (129) of our students were enrolled in a fine arts enrichment class.	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>  By July 2013, 100% (249) of the students will be enrolled in two weekly fine arts classes and 24% (141) will be enrolled in a fine arts enrichment class.					
			3.2. Transportation issues prevent some students from participating in after school enrichment classes.	3.2. Fine arts programs in music, art, and strings are offered during the school day so that all students may participate.	3.2. Principal, AP, Classroom teachers, Fine Arts teachers, CRT	3.2. Enrollment reports, performances, displays and presentations	3.2. Enrollment reports, performances, displays and presentations
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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
<p><b>4. Additional Goal :</b> Increase College and Career Awareness (i.e., Destination College, AVID, schoolwide activities)</p> <p><b>Additional Goal #4:</b></p> <p>79% (486) of the students participated in our weekly college day and 71% (437) of our students participated in career awareness activities. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is that 100 % (588) of our students will participate in college day and 100% (588) will participate in career awareness activities.</p>			4.1. Not all students have college apparel.	4.1. Continue to work with families and staff members to promote college readiness.	4.1. Principal, AP, Classroom teachers, CRT	4.1. Teacher and administrative observations, Classroom competitions	4.1. Teacher and administrative observations, Classroom competitions
	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	During the 2011-12 school year, 79% (486) of the students participated in our weekly college day and 71% (437) of our students participated in career awareness activities.	By July 2013, 100% (588) of the students will participate in our weekly college day and 100% (588) will participate in career awareness activities.					
			4.2. Not all students are exposed to a variety of potential careers.	4.2. Expand Career Day to include all classes and students.	4.2. Principal, AP, Classroom teachers, CRT	4.2. Student career surveys, Teacher and administrative observations	4.2. Student career surveys, Teacher and administrative observations
			4.3. Not all students are exposed to a variety of potential careers.	4.3. Schedule parents and community members as classroom speakers promoting career awareness.	4.3 Principal, AP, Classroom teachers, CRT.	4.3. Roster of classroom speakers	4.3. Roster of classroom speakers



**Additional Goals Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Marzano Strategies	K-5	Principal, AP	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP
Classworks Training	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Monthly	Classroom Observation	Principal, AP

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

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

**Final Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$5,105.53</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$909.74</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$1000.00</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$592.80</b>
<b>Civics Budget</b>	<b>Total: N/A</b>
<b>U.S. History Budget</b>	<b>Total: N/A</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$1000.00</b>
<b>CTE Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total:</b>
	<b>Grand Total: \$8608.07</b>

**Differentiated Accountability**

**School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance**

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

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

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 will oversee the implementation of the current School Improvement Plan, review school data, approve the use of School Recognition Money, survey the school community to determine school needs, and write goals for the 2013-2014 School Improvement Plan.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Provide substitutes for staff development	\$1819.48