

Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

Name of School:

Area:

North

MILA Elementary

Principal:

Area Superintendent:

Dr. Ronald Bobay

Kelli C. Dufresne

SAC Chairperson:

Colleen Barsin

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

We work together to meet the needs of every student with excellence as the standard.

Vision Statement:

MILA's community fosters motivated, independent, lifelong achievers who work together as contributing members of society.

Brevard County Public Schools

School Improvement Plan

2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

One place to start – three year trend history (optional):

In 2011-2012, MILA’s FCAT 2.0 scores declined sharply in light of the merge of School Grade and AYP data as well as a realignment of FCAT 2.0 cut scores. The school grade was a “B”; however, it would have been a “C” without Florida Department of Education’s (FLDOE) stipulation that a school could not drop more than one letter grade due to the changes that had been implemented across the state. Now, all curriculum groups are reported.

Only 61% (66% with FLDOE adjustment) of students performed at proficiency or higher in the content area of reading. Previously, MILA’s FCAT data trend for the 2005-2011 school years indicated a steady pattern of the percent of students meeting high standards in reading (within a range of 9%). Data are as follows: 90% in 2004-2005, 82% in 2005-2006, 88% in 2006-2007, 92% in 2007-2008, 89% in 2008-2009, 87% in 2009-2010, and 81% in 2010-2011. The percentages of students showing reading gains has also fluctuated over the 2005-2012 school years with large gains from the year 2005-2006 of 57% to 81% in 2006-2007. In 2011-12, an average of 68% of students had made annual learning gains in reading. The area of 50% of the lowest 25% in reading again varies from year to year. The scores in this area from the past years are as follows: 59%, 47%, 77%, 57%, 84%, 72%, 59%, and 70%. In the year 2005-2006, MILA made a “B” due to not having 50% of the lowest 25% make gains.

MILA’s FCAT data trend for the 2005-2012 school years also indicate a constant fluctuation in the percent of students meeting high standards in math. The percentages are as follows: 82% in 2004-2005, 77% in 2005-2006, 85% in 2006-2007, 93% in 2007-2008, 96% in 2008-2009, 85% in 2009-2010, 85% in 2010-2011, and 53% (58% with FLDOE adjustment) in 2011-2012. When looking at annual learning gains in math, the biggest increase was from the year 2005-2006 of 66% to the year 2006-2007 of 83%. The previous four years have been an average of 73%. In 2011-2012, 65% of MILA’s students made learning gains. The area of 50% of the lowest 25% in math since 2006-2007 has increased and decreased as indicated by the following percentages: 87%, 60%, 67%, 84%, 58%, and 54%.

In writing for the past 7 years, the percentages of students meeting proficiency are 77%, 84%, 86%, 53%, 90%, 83%, 75%, and 68% (74% with FLDOE adjustment). The 2011-2012 school year data reflect a score of 3.0 or higher as proficient. An emphasis was placed on conventions, and the criterion of 3.0 was changed from 4.0 by FLDOE due to the overall decrease in Florida’s writing scores.

The percentage of students meeting high standards in science has only been measured for the past 6 years as indicated by the following percentages: 72%, 69%, 74%, 67%, 75%, and 40%. The 2011-2012 school year marked the first in which NGSSS FCAT 2.0 Science was administered.

Historical data on MILA’s Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) from 2004-2010 reflect: 2 years Provisional, 2 years “YES” and 3 years “NO”. During the 2004-2005 school year, Students With Disabilities (SWD) in math and the subgroup Black were a NO. In 2005-2006, Economically Disadvantaged (ED) in math, and Students with Disabilities in both reading and math were NO. MILA lost the subgroup Black for the 2005-2006 school year and did not receive this subgroup again until the 2009-2010 school year. In the 2008-2009 school year, Students with Disabilities in reading and math and the area of

Writing were “NO.” In the 2009-2010 school year, Students with Disabilities in reading and math were “NO” and 95% of students in the Black subgroup were not tested. In the 2010-2011 school year, the total percentage of students showing proficiency in the areas of reading and math did not meet criterion to make AYP. In addition, the subgroups of Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities were “NO” in both reading and math. Calculations for the Hispanic subgroup could not be determined because AYP results attached two students, who withdrew prior to testing, to MILA’s data and reported 95% of students were not tested. The way in which AYP is calculated changed during the 2011-12 school year. Subgroup progress is now assessed through Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs).

MILA was formerly a Literacy First and Reading First School. MILA’s scores in reading indicate students are responding to the implementation of school-wide (K-6) Walk to Intervention in the area of reading. Response to Intervention reveals the most impact is made in grades K-2 due to the on-going progress monitoring conducted through 95% Group tools (PASI & PSI). Teachers are focusing on students’ areas of need and applying research based interventions and best practices to target these areas outside of the required 90-minute reading block.

MILA’s grade level snapshots for the 2011-2012 year in current strands indicate the greatest weakness in the following areas:

- *3rd Grade Reading-Reading Application (60% at proficiency)
- *4th Grade Reading- Literary Analysis Fiction/Non-Fiction (62% at proficiency)
- *5th Grade Reading- Informational Text and Research Process (57% at proficiency)
- *6th Grade Reading- Informational Text and Research Process (66% at proficiency)

- *3rd Grade Math- Number Operations: Problems & Statistics (66% at proficiency)
- *4th Grade Math- Geometry & Measurement (50% at proficiency)
- *5th Grade Math-Number Operations: Problems & Statistics (50% at proficiency)
- *6th Grade Math- Geometry & Measurement (55% at proficiency)

- *5th Grade Science- Earth & Space Science (63% at proficiency) and Physical Science (63% at proficiency)

MILA has several students who take the Florida Alternative Assessment which is factored into the school’s accountability process. MILA has continued to see the number of students on free and reduced lunch increase over the past 8 years (currently at 78%). Another indicator that affects student performance is attendance. MILA’s attendance has been under the 95% district expectation for the past two years despite efforts to increase awareness and compliance. The school houses several medically fragile students and pre-kindergarten students, which impacts this percentage.

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

According to Newmann & Whelage (1995, p. 37), “If schools want to enhance their organizational capacity to boost student learning, they should work on building a professional community that is characterized by shared purpose, collaborative activity, and collective responsibility among staff.” Organizations that endorse PLCs include: the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), the National Science Teachers Organization (NSTA), the Southwest Educational development Laboratory (SEDL), and the National Education Association (NEA). The reason for their support is due to the positive impact on teachers and students alike. Hord (1997) found advantages for staff such as shared responsibility, common focus on the mission,

increased content knowledge, and improved morale. While students benefit from less absenteeism and increased academic gains. Ultimately, the achievement gap is narrowed by this approach.

MILA has made great strides in developing and implementing Professional Learning Teams (both vertical and horizontal). Vertical PLTs created collective commitments to follow a shared vision and mission for their students:

- MILA's Mission: We work together to meet the needs of every student with excellence as the standard.
- MILA's Vision: MILA's community fosters motivated, independent, lifelong achievers who work together as contributing members of society.
- MILA's Collective Commitments:
 1. We believe all students can learn when instruction is presented using research-based strategies that meet their individual needs.
 2. We believe setting goals will create accountability for everyone.
 3. We believe an optimal learning environment takes place when all feel safe, nurtured and valued.
 4. We believe children have the right to be educated in an environment that promotes REACH expectations (Respect for people and property, Exhibit safe behavior, Active listener, Courteous language, Hold yourself responsible).
 5. We believe in establishing relationships in order for collaboration to occur (student-student; student-teacher; teacher-parent; teacher-teammates).
 6. We believe all shareholders should work towards their personal best at all times.

In horizontal Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) created team norms. Administrators and teachers analyzed strand scores in reading, math, science and writing to determine the specific instructional focus needed along with corresponding professional development. We agreed that a focus on data, standards, and common assessments to improve achievement in all subject areas through utilization of Professional Learning Teams must continue in order to improve our school's overall success with student achievement.

One barrier to be able to reap the benefits sooner is the attrition rate at MILA Elementary. Professionals seeking employment through promotion, private sectors, other districts, internationally, or leaving the teaching arena has an impact on continuity of school based initiatives. Highly qualified new hires have a "learning curve" and must receive training/professional development to meet the daily expectations of teaching at a Title I school.

As we continue to work in Professional Learning Teams (PLTs), we are committed to improving our teaching and learning for all students by answering the critical corollary questions: What is it we expect them to learn? How will we know when they have learned it? How we will respond when they don't learn? How will we respond when they already know it? Horizontal Professional Learning Teams will focus on specific standards, develop SMART goals based on data, and align assignments/assessments based on that goal. Emphasis should be placed on building relationships among new team members, holding teams and their members accountable, reflecting on practices (reflection summaries) and the developing common formative assessments.

MILA began the 2012-2013 school year highlighting training in Creating a High Performance Learning Culture. Research from Dr. Max Thompson's booklet titled Moving Schools: Lessons from Exemplary Leaders, mirrors Dr. Robert Marzano's research in his book Classroom Instruction that Works. Thompson suggests the following five research-based strategies produce the highest effect size and percentile gain:

1. Extending Thinking Strategies (1.61 or 45th percentile gain)

2. Summarizing (1.0 or 34th percentile gain)
3. Vocabulary in Context (.85 or 33rd percentile gain)
4. Advanced Organizers (.73 or 28th percentile gain)
5. Non-Verbal Representation (.65 or 25th percentile gain)

Dr. Thompson’s research also reveals a discord between alignment of standards and assignments, with a sharp decline beginning in third grade. One common pattern he has seen among high performing schools is “the structure of assignments reflected the state’s assessment structure in that assignments were standards-based and aligned to state standards with backward planning by teachers.” With the current implementation of Common Core standards in K-2 and bridging Next Generation Sunshine State Standards to Common Core next year in grades 3-6, greater emphasis must be placed on assignments matching the standards. This comes from a deeper understanding of the focus standards by “unpacking” them. According to Brevard Public Schools’ performance appraisal system, under Dimension Three: Instructional Delivery and Facilitation, “differentiated instruction is by content, process, and product.” In our BEST modules, beginning with the end in mind will help plan assignments and assessments that align with the standards and meet the needs of our students. Eleanor Dougherty, author of Assignments Matter: Making the Connections that Help Students Meet Standards, states, “Schools and district that teach together, collaborating on one or more common assignments, build consensus and collaborating in ways that self-contained teaching cannot.” Opportunities for regularly scheduled vertical and horizontal PLTs will be provided to allow teachers time to create quarterly units centered on a different content area each nine weeks. Differentiated assignments will be imbedded within these units to provide scaffolding needed based on data from on-going progress monitoring.

Another key factor in student achievement is quality questioning. Thompson’s (2012) research found “65-80% of classroom assessments and school/district benchmark assessment were high order questions, thus matching or exceeding state assessment. Schools established a baseline for higher order questions and tracked percentage changes each month continuously during the year.” According to Brevard Public Schools’ Steps to Quality Questioning: A Standards-based Reference Guide for Teachers of Grades 3-5, “In order for students to maximize their learning potential, they must be given opportunities to engage in higher-order thinking and authentic discussion about the information and ideas presented to them.” Francis Hunkins (1995) notes, “We are shifting from viewing questions as devices by which one evaluates the specifics of learning to conceptualizing questions as a means of actively processing, thinking about, and using information productively.” In horizontal PLTs, teachers will incorporate higher order thinking questions into assignments and assessments by studying Steps to Quality Questioning as well as Walsh & Satte’s Quality Questioning: Research-based Practice to Engage Every Learner. A rubric will be used to assess growth and progress during classroom walk-throughs and observations.

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

Teachers have met in PLTs vertically, horizontally, and as a whole staff for five years. Efforts to promote open communication and collaborative problem solving are evident in how teachers gather data from multiple sources (e.g. PASI, PSI, district assessments, SuccessMaker) to progress monitor students and provide flexible grouping to meet students’ academic needs. Two years of Brevard Effective Teaching Strategies (BEST) training (comprised of six modules) and professional development in Multi-Tiered System of Support/Response to Intervention process has taken place to further support students at varied levels of ability through differentiated instruction.

In math, teachers continue to focus on meeting individual needs through small group and differentiated instruction. Thirty minutes has been added to grade level schedules to allow time for common-needs grouping and strengthen areas

of concern and support enrichment. Hands-on application and discussion should be imbedded in math instruction. MILA's Math Points of Contact share best practices with instructional personnel during faculty meetings. Professional development will include training on utilizing Number Talks as well as How Children Learn Number Concepts: A Guide to the Critical Learning Phases.

In the area of writing, teachers have a set time for teaching grade level standards and skills. They follow the district developed curriculum guides such as Piece by Piece, Developing the Craft, Developing Ideas, Anchor Papers, and Extreme Makeover. All classroom teachers follow the district writing assessment guidelines and scoring process. The responses are holistically scored (using two readers) and scores are input into A3 and reported to administration. All grades will write daily and integrate writing in the 90 minute reading block through response to literature. In addition, kindergarten through sixth grade students respond to grade level appropriate writing prompts on a monthly basis. Data are tracked each month to monitor progress. In years past, professional development has consisted of Nancy Prizito, Melissa Forney, Thinking Maps, and rubric scoring. However, it should be noted that due to teacher turnover, it is necessary to revisit the standards/expectations in writing. This can be accomplished through whole group faculty meetings, grade level PLTs, and vertical PLTs, where guest speakers such as MILA's Writing Point of Contact and Brevard's District Writing Resource Teacher will share research based strategies that incorporate revisions to 2013 FCAT Writes, which will include more focus on conventions. Members of MILA's Title I team "push-in" to offer additional instruction in this area for students in fourth grade.

In science, grades Pre-K to 6 participate in Science Inquiry Day at MILA in conjunction with MILA's Science Fair. AIMS, FOSS kits, National Geographic science materials, and Discovery Ed are utilized and implemented during science/math instruction. Grades K-2 participate in Waterford Science, a computer assisted program. Past professional development has consisted of: AIMS, FOSS kits, Steve Spangler, Waterford, and District "Science Blitz" training. In addition, MILA's Science Point of Contact and the Assistant Principal will share information about instructional pacing, hands-on activities, and preparation for 2013 FCAT Science 2.0 during faculty meetings and grade level PLTs.

CONTENT AREA:

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

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

Kindergarten through second grade teachers will utilize Quality Questioning strategies when implementing Common Core State Standards in all content areas. Third through sixth grade teachers will utilize Quality Questioning strategies when implementing Next Generation Sunshine State Standards in all content areas. All teachers will plan lessons, assignments, and assessments that are aligned with grade level standards. Teachers will use data to differentiate

instruction based on individual student needs.

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

<i>Barrier</i>	<i>Action Steps</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Timetable</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>In-Process Measure</i>
1. Lack of professional development	1.a. Purchase Steps to Quality Questioning materials from BPS print shop. 1.b. Take baseline data from classroom walkthroughs on level of questioning conducted during lessons. 1. c. Provide Quality Questioning training for all instructional staff. 1.d. Admin. conducts classroom walkthroughs and takes data. 1.e. In May 2013, Admin. compares grade level and school wide baseline data and end of year data with vertical and horizontal PLTs.	1. Literacy coach and teacher leaders	1. a. Purchase Steps to Quality Questioning books specific to grades K-2, 3-5, 6-8 from BPS Print Shop October 2012. 1.b. Conduct training and walkthroughs October 2012 through May 2013 1.b. Study Walsh & Sattes' <i>Rubric for Formulating and Assessing Quality Questions</i> .	1. Quality questioning materials \$200.00	1. Take data during classroom walk-throughs to monitor increased use of higher order thinking questions in the classroom (baseline data vs. end of year).

<p>2. Absence of evidence reflecting differentiated instruction by content, product and process to meet all students' needs.</p>	<p>2. a. Meet in Professional Learning Teams to develop differentiated assignments based on grade level standards and student need. 2.b. Admin. will observe differentiated instruction during classroom walkthroughs/ observations and take data on frequency and fidelity in the way it is implemented. 2.c. Admin. will provide feedback to teachers about the effectiveness of differentiated instruction based on IPPAS rubric.</p>	<p>2. Administration and instructional staff</p>	<p>2.a. Instructional Staff/Admin. will meet weekly in PLTs August 2012 through May 2013 2.b. Admin. will conduct classroom walkthroughs, observations, and IPPAS conferences October 2012 through May 2013.</p>	<p>2. n/a</p>	<p>2.a. Anecdotal records from classroom walkthroughs and minutes from PLTs 2.b. IPPAS conference notes and rubric scores from instructional personnel</p>
--	--	--	--	---------------	--

<p>3. Assignments and assessments not aligned specifically to Common Core and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards</p>	<p>3. Based on grade level standards, teachers will develop standards based units in reading, writing, math, and science.</p>	<p>3. Instructional staff and administration</p>	<p>3.a. Purchase Common Core curriculum mapping materials for PLTs. 3.b. Meet in PLTs to choose two to three focus standards to develop assignments and assessments. 3.c. Chart development of skills within standards across grade levels to fully understand their progression. 3.d. The following content areas will be the primary focus of the units: First Quarter – Science Second Quarter- Reading Third Quarter – Math Fourth Quarter- Writing. 3.e. Review student work/ assessment data from units while in PLTs.</p>	<p>3. Common Core curriculum mapping materials \$2000.00.</p>	<p>3.a. Notes/ Minutes from PLT meetings 3.b. Copies of units created by each grade level 3.c. Classroom walkthroughs and observations of teachers implementing units. 3.d. Data from student work/ assessment from units</p>
--	---	--	--	---	--

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

Quantitative: After Quality Questioning training, teachers will increase the amount of higher level questions asked of students by 25% during instruction based on classroom walk-throughs and observations utilizing Walsh & Satte's (2005) *Rubric for Formulating and Assessing Quality Questions*.

Qualitative: In October 2012, instructional staff will be surveyed using a Likert scale (strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree) about their frequency and proficiency in utilizing Quality Questioning, differentiated instruction, and standards-based assignments/assessments in the classroom. A post-survey will be distributed in May 2013. The anticipated outcome of the survey will be 100% of teachers either strongly agreeing or agreeing that they feel proficient in and frequently use these strategies.

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

Quantitative: As a result of utilizing Quality Questioning, differentiated instruction, and standards based lessons with fidelity, the percent of students scoring at achievement level three on 2013 FCAT 2.0 will increase from:

- 61% to 75% in Reading
- 61% to 70% in Math
- 68% to 80% in Writing
- 41% to 70% in Science.

Achievement level four on 2013 FAA will increase from:

- 33% to 50% in Reading
- 53% to 55% in Math
- 33% to 50%
- 25% to 40% in Science.

Qualitative: In August 2012, instructional staff completed the self-assessment *Clarifying What I Believe: Ability and Achievement* during on-site Creating a High-Performance Learning Culture training. Specifically, they focused on the extent to which they believe high standards are essential for learner success (from 1=not at all important to 5= essential). In May 2013, teachers will complete the same assessment and also include to what extent they believe high standards are practiced in our school (from 1= not present at all to 5= clearly present at MILA). It is the expectation that 100% of instructional will rate their beliefs and school practice as a 4 or 5. The reason for the additional piece in the post self-assessment is due to the amount of new instructional staff hired for the 2012-2013 school year.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

1.	Reading Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance <small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)</small>	2013 Expected Level of Performance <small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)</small>
	Anticipated Barrier(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of training for new staff members 2. Time constraints and personnel 3. None anticipated 4. None anticipated 5. Technology available on a consistent basis 		
	Strategy(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize Thinking Maps and graphic organizers to independently transfer thinking skills to content learning in reading. 2. Increase opportunities for students to receive enrichment (e.g. literature circles, Readers Theatre, etc.) during walk to intervention. 3. Provide explicit differentiated instruction in small groups. 4. Continue implementation of FOCUS calendar to incorporate Professional Learning Team meetings, both vertical and horizontal, to facilitate data talks, curriculum content, and on-going progress monitoring. 5. Incorporate interactive websites and programs (e.g. SuccessMaker, enVision, Waterford, CPALMS, FCAT Explorer). 		

<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3</p> <p>Barrier(s): 1. See barriers at top of reading goal header.</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. See strategies at top of reading goal header.</p>	<p>61% (144 out of 238 students)</p> <p>3rd—58%(43) 4th—63%(35) 5th—49%(29) 6th—74%(37)</p>	<p>75% (175 out of 233 students)</p> <p>3rd- 74% (41 of 55 students) 4th- 74% (49 out of 66 students) 5th- 74% (43 out of 58 students) 6th- 77% (42 out of 54 students)</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): None anticipated.</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Use practice materials from FLDOE for FAA. 2. Utilize assistive technology for student response (e.g. I-pads, switches). 3. Invite Brevard Public Schools' ESE program support personnel to collaborate with supported and participatory level teachers regarding materials, accommodations, and access points.</p>	<p>33% (5)</p>	<p>50% (8 out of 16 students)</p>
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): Lack of training for new staff members, time constraints</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Utilize Thinking Maps to independently transfer thinking skills to content learning in reading. 2. Continuation of students receiving enrichment through literature circles, Readers Theatre, etc., during walk to intervention. 3. Continuation of explicit differentiated instruction</p>	<p>27% (65 out of 238 students)</p> <p>3rd—20%(15) 4th—35%(19) 5th—24%(14) 6th—34%(17)</p>	<p>35% (82 students out of 233)</p> <p>3rd— 36% (20 out of 55 students) 4th— 30% (20 out of 66 students) 5th— 34% (20 out of 58 students) 6th— 40% (22 out of 54 students)</p>

<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): None anticipated.</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use practice materials from FLDOE for FAA. 2. Utilize assistive technology for student response (e.g. I-pads, switches). 3. Invite Brevard Public Schools' ESE program support personnel to collaborate with supported and participatory level teachers regarding materials, accommodations, and access points. 	<p>20%(3)</p>	<p>25% (4 out of 16 students)</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): None anticipated.</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use practice materials from FLDOE for FAA. 2. Utilize assistive technology for student response (e.g. I-pads, switches). 3. Invite Brevard Public Schools' ESE program support personnel to collaborate with supported and participatory level teachers regarding materials, accommodations, and access points. 	<p>10%(1)</p>	<p>30% (4 students out of 13)</p>
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): Lack of Personnel</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize instructional personnel as team during staggered walk to intervention times. 2. Facilitate concentrated collaboration between classroom teachers and Academic Support Teachers to frontload material prior to instruction in the classroom. 3. Assign a mentor to identified students according to lowest 25% data. <p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): N/A</p> <p>Strategy(s): N/A</p>	<p>65% (22 out of 34 students)</p> <p>Doesn't measure in lowest 25%</p>	<p>76% (26 out of 34 students)</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</p> <p>Baseline data 2010-11:</p>		

<p>Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All strategies listed in Reading Goal will be used for all students. 2. Utilize instructional personnel as a team (Title I and Inclusion) during staggered walk to intervention times. 3. Continue to serve students in the classroom following the inclusion model. 4. Utilize small group pull out services for students needing additional academic support in reading. 	<p>58% (34/59) did not make progress-FCAT</p> <p>60% (9/15) did not make progress-FAA</p>	<p>48%- (23 out of 46 students) FCAT</p> <p>50%- (8 out of 16) FAA</p>
<p>Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All strategies listed in Reading Goal will be used for all students. 	<p>45% (79/177) did not make progress</p>	<p>35%- (56 out of 159 students) FCAT</p>

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Creating a High Performance Learning Culture	August 2012	Surveys and responses from participants
Overview of Learning Focused Schools (15 strategies)	August 2012	Discussion and notes from PLT's and connection to School Improvement Plan
Implementation of Common Core Standards in K-2	August 2012 and on-going May 2013	Classroom Walk-throughs, PLT agenda and meeting notes
Quality Questioning	October 2012 and follow up during PLTs	Classroom Walk-throughs, Data, Examples of Essential and Quality Questions
PLT's with standards, data and common assessments	August 2012-May 2013	PLT agenda and meeting notes
Make-up session for new teachers in B.E.S.T.(all) and Common Core (K-2).	2012-2013 school year	Inservice Record/Classroom Walk-throughs

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 29%(2)	Consistent amount of computer time scheduled each week	Register students in online English program that can be used at school and at home.	Assistant Principal and ESOL Instructional Assistant
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 43%(3)	Timely return of game by student to be able to assign the next one	Distribute FROG reading games to students in primary and intermediate grades to help them with reading/grammar skills.	Assistant Principal and ESOL Instructional Assistant
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing: 43%(3)	No barrier anticipated	Provide heritage to English language dictionaries to assist students in writing short responses in to literature, science experiments, math problems, and social studies lessons.	Assistant Principal and ESOL Instructional Assistant

1. Mathematics Goal(s):	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Anticipated Barrier(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None anticipated 2. Time to plan for differentiated centers 3. None anticipated 4. Time to plan and collaborate with colleagues 5. Technology available on a consistent basis 6. None anticipated 7. None anticipated 	N/A	N/A

<p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Infuse school-wide use of mathematical vocabulary. 2. Create differentiated centers. 3. Use math journals to integrate writing to explain and solve problems. 4. Integrate across content areas. 5. Incorporate interactive websites and programs (e.g. SucessMaker, enVision, Waterford, CPALMS, FCAT Explorer). 6. Provide additional time for math intervention 7. Implement school-wide use of <i>Eight Standards for Mathematical Practice</i>. 	N/A	N/A
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3</p> <p>Barrier(s): See barriers at top of math goal header.</p> <p>Strategy(s): 2. See strategies at top of math goal header.</p>	<p>61%(144)</p> <p>3rd—47%(35) 4th—33%(19) 5th—51%(30) 6th—70%(35)</p>	<p>70% (164 out of 233 students)</p> <p>3rd- 60% (33 of 55 students) 4th- 60% (40 out of 66 students) 5th- 60% (35 out of 58 students) 6th- 75% (41 out of 54 students)</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics</p> <p>Barrier(s): None anticipated.</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Use practice materials from FLDOE for FAA. 5. Utilize assistive technology for student response (e.g. I-pads, switches). 6. Invite Brevard Public Schools’ ESE program support personnel to collaborate with supported and participatory level teachers regarding materials, accommodations, and access points. 	53%(8)	55% (9 out of 16 students)

<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Time for planning differentiated lessons 2. Technology not working regularly <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide small group instruction during math block. 2. Integrate SuccessMaker (leveled to individual learner) during math block. 	<p>19%(46)</p> <p>3rd—12%(9) 4th—14%(8) 5th—15%(9) 6th—40%(20)</p>	<p>21% (50 students out of 233)</p> <p>3rd— 18% (10 out of 55 students) 4th— 15% (10 out of 66 students) 5th— 17% (10 out of 58 students) 6th— 37% (20 out of 54 students)</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics</p> <p>Barrier(s): None anticipated</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use practice materials from FLDOE for FAA. 2. Utilize assistive technology for student response (e.g. I-pads, switches). 3. Invite Brevard Public Schools’ ESE program support personnel to collaborate with supported and participatory level teachers regarding materials, accommodations, and access points. 	<p>0% (0)</p>	<p>13% (2 students out of 16)</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics</p> <p>Barrier(s): None anticipated</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use practice materials from FLDOE for FAA. 2. Utilize assistive technology for student response (e.g. I-pads, switches). 3. Invite Brevard Public Schools’ ESE program support personnel to collaborate with supported and participatory level teachers regarding materials, accommodations, and access points. 	<p>20% (2)</p>	<p>38% (5 students out of 13)</p>

<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See barriers at top of math goal header. 2. Scheduling time for consistent support. <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See strategies at top of math goal header. 2. Provide additional support from Title I and Inclusion team. 	<p>50% (17 out of 34 students)</p>	<p>70% (24 out of 34 students)</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics</p> <p>Barrier(s): N/A</p> <p>Strategy(s): N/A</p>	<p>Doesn't measure in lowest 25%</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</p> <p>Baseline Data 2010-11:</p>		

Student subgroups by ethnicity :			
	White:	64/142(45%)-FCAT	35% (50 out of 141 students)- FCAT
		3/8(37%)-FAA	27% (3 out of 11 students)- FAA
	Black:	26/38 (68%)-FCAT	58% (26 out of 44 students)- FCAT
		0/2 (0%)-FAA	0% (0 out of 5 students)- FAA
Hispanic:		18/35 (51%)-FCAT	41%- (13 out of 31 students)- FCAT
		0/1 (0%)-FAA	0% (0 out of 0 students)- FAA
Asian:		2/4 (50%)-FCAT	0% (0 out of 1 student) - FCAT
		0/0 (0%)-FAA	0% (0 out of students)- FAA
Indian:	American	0/0 (0%)-FCAT	0% (0 out of 0 students)- FCAT
		0/1 (0%)-FAA	0% (0 out of 0 students)- FAA

English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	100% 4/4 did not make progress	25% (1 out of 4 students)- FCAT
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	66% (39/59) did not make progress-FCAT 47% (7/15) did not make progress-FAA	56% (26 students out of 46)- FCAT 37% (6 out of 16)- FAA
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	53% (93/177) did not make progress	43% (69 out of 159 students)- FCAT

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Creating a High Performance Learning Culture	August 2012	Surveys and responses from participants
Overview of Learning Focused Schools (15 strategies)	August 2012	Discussion and notes from PLT's and connection to School Improvement Plan
Implementation of Common Core Standards in K-2	August 2012 and on-going May 2013	Classroom Walk-throughs, PLT agenda and meeting notes
In-depth look at Eight Standards for Mathematical Practice by Grade Level	August 2012 and on-going May 2013	Professional Learning Team agenda and meeting notes
Quality Questioning	October 2012 and follow up during PLTs	Classroom Walk-throughs, Data, Examples of Essential and Quality Questions
PLT's with standards, data and common assessments	August 2012-May 2013	PLT agenda and meeting notes
Make-up session for new teachers in B.E.S.T.(all) and Common Core (K-2).	2012-2013 school year	Inservice Record/Classroom Walk-throughs

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage)	2013 Expected Level of Performance
----------------	---	---

	information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): 1. Scheduling “push-in” support consistently from instructional personnel 2. Teacher participation and planning 3. No barrier anticipated 4. No barrier anticipated 5. Scheduling time for training 6. No barrier anticipated (placed on FOCUS calendar) Strategy(s): 1. Provide additional instructional support during the fourth grade writing block to target skills. 2. Provide Writing Academic Support to selected students on Saturdays to strengthen skills and increase confidence. 3. Require students to respond to literature (e.g. Time for Kids, trade books, non-fiction) across content areas. 4. Administer a monthly writing prompt for grades K-6 while reinforcing skills based on MILA’s Continuum of Writing. 5. Provide assistance from Brevard Public Schools’ writing resource teacher at Professional Learning Team meetings (bi-annually). 6. Create SMART goals in correlation with the four District writing prompt days to progress monitor student achievement and discuss BEST practices.	N/A	N/A
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	68%(36)	80% (53 out of 66 students)

Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	33% (1)	50% (2 out of 4 students)
--	---------	------------------------------

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
--	--	---

<p>Barrier(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Time for collaboration between grade level and activity teachers 2. No barrier anticipated 3. Teacher participation and planning 4. Time for preparation of materials/planning 5. No barrier anticipated 6. Schedule needed with key personnel responsible (e.g. Tech Specialist) 7. Lack of training for new hires <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The activity teachers will integrate science content during instructional time to reinforce science vocabulary skills and concepts. 2. Provide supplemental materials to target students needing enrichment (i.e. SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, CPALMS). 3. Change Science Academic Support Program to reflect Saturday sessions with hands-on science activities. 4. Conduct hands-on science experiments every two weeks in the classroom with AIMS, FOSS kits, Discovery Education and National Geographic. 5. Utilize Science journals to reflect , summarize , define vocabulary, processes, experiments and questioning. 6. Broadcast science content videos one day a week and post common science vocabulary on the scrolling news (i.e. PowerPoint) during lunch time. 7. Continue to utilize BEST strategies in the area of science. 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:</p>	<p>41%(24)</p>	<p>71% (42 students out of 59)</p>

Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	25%(1)	40% (2 students out of 5)
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	10%(6)	25% (15 students out of 59)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science	25%(1)	40% (2 students out of 5)

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

Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
--	--	--

APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		

Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. White: Black: Hispanic:		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

Geometry EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:		

Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. <p style="text-align: right;">White: Black: Hispanic:</p>		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		

Biology EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage)
-------------------------	---	--

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Partner with University of Central Florida to host Junior/Senior Interns	Assistant Principal	On-going
2. Encourage and provide teachers quality professional development opportunities	Principal and Assistant Principal	On-going
3. Encourage teachers to obtain ESOL/ Gifted/Reading Endorsements, dual certifications, or a Master's Degree or Doctorate.	Principal and Assistant Principal	On-going
4. Use Literacy Coach/Mentoring Council Representative/Teacher Leaders to help mentor teachers.	Principal and Assistant Principal	On-going
5. Provide additional staff development and materials for teachers in areas of need.	Principal & Assistant Principal	On-going
6. Provide new teachers to MILA with a mentor as part of the Brevard County Induction Program.	Assistant Principal & Teacher Leaders	On-going

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly effective	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
5	Teachers are on time line and will complete an ESOL Course prior to August 1, 2013.

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

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

Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Specialist, Guidance Counselor, Literacy Coach, and grade level representatives.

MILA's MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will:

Provide on-going professional development as needed

- Develop a master intervention schedule
- Assign additional personnel for K-6 Walk to Intervention
- Provide materials and resources for interventions
- Develop organizational methods such as DATA Notebooks and monthly focus calendar for data collection on-going progress monitoring
- Assist/participate in Kid Talk/Data Meetings/PLT's

At MILA Elementary, we have regular Professional Learning Team/Data meetings to discuss student progress and achievement. We discuss student progress on a continuous basis. When a student is struggling and brought forward for discussions, interventions are put into place immediately and closely monitored by the classroom teacher and our inclusion team. (The student's progress is shared with all team members.) After an appropriate period of time, if the student does not make progress, the MTSS/RtI team recommends further interventions and plans move forward in the process.

The role of the school based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team is to develop and put in place a plan for Response to Intervention that correlates with the School Improvement Plan. This includes the collection and disaggregation of data and the implementation of interventions to meet the specific needs of the students at MILA.

Tier 1—All students receive high quality instruction in the core reading program

Tier 2—Targeted, supplemental instruction is provided to students who need more support in a small group setting.

Tier 3—Individualized, intensive instruction is given to the student.

Data is disaggregated by the entire instructional staff throughout the school year. The MTSS/RtI team constantly looks at data and points to trends, strengths, and areas to grow. The School Improvement Plan is the fluid document of what we do for the betterment of students each and every day at MILA Elementary.

Several forms of data are used to progress monitor students. Each teacher utilizes A3 as data management. Data and on-going progress monitoring information is collected every 3-4 for weeks as per the FOCUS calendar. The administration/leadership/intervention/MTSS/RTI team utilizes the Data Notebooks to monitor student progress in grades K-6.

MILA has been facilitating training over the past four years in slow, methodical chunks to make sure teachers and assistants understand the process completely. During preplanning 2009, MILA had an official, in-depth, whole group training, however, we continue to work with smaller groups and at different grade levels depending on the individual needs of the staff. It is an on-going learning experience that is ever changing with requirements in documentation/forms.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

The Volunteers in Public Schools Report shows that MILA had 2,645.73 or 4.8 hours per student for the 2011-2012 school year. This was a decrease from the 2010-2011 school year. MILA continues to seek input from parents through annual Title I nights, PTO, SAC, and Brevard Public Schools' annual survey. MILA will implement the 2012-2013 Title I Parental Involvement Plan, which includes an annual Title I information meeting, creation/update of the Title I Compact, and monthly content area family nights . We have parent representatives who attend District Leadership Meetings and report information through PTO/SAC. MILA's Volunteers in Public Schools Orientation will be held on September 27, 2012. We will continue to communicate through our website, weekly MILA MATTERS, email, Synervoice, curriculum events, parent nights and the school marquee.

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

Attendance strategies have been implemented with fidelity to increase student attendance beyond the 2010-2011 school year rate of 94.62%. Classroom incentive programs (Popsicles for Perfect Attendance), daily attendance calls, information in newsletters, Individual Problem Solving Team meetings, assistance from Brevard Public Schools' attendance resource officer, and individual contracts still resulted in MILA's attendance for the 2011-2012 school year as 94.06%, which is a decrease of .56%. Specifically, 136 students were absent ten or more days, and 110 students were tardy ten or more days. Data reveal Pre-K students and our medically fragile students continue to have a high absenteeism rate annually.

SUSPENSION:

MILA's 2011-2012 suspension rate increased by 14 days as compared to the 2010-2011 school year of 106 total suspensions. Data further reveal twenty-five students had one day of out-of-school suspension. Eleven students had two to five days of out-of-school suspensions. Two students had six to nine days of out-of-school suspensions. Five students had ten or more out-of-school suspensions, a result of a serious discipline infraction where expulsion meetings had to be held. A school-wide behavior plan, known as REACH, was implemented in 2011-2012 with input from the faculty. Staff reviews expectations and procedures annually. For example, the Responsibility Room is not an option as an "action code" on the referral for the 2012-2013 school year. Mentors for students who require a Tier II behavior plan will continue to be assigned. Individual Problem Solving Team (IPST) meetings that involve Brevard Public Schools' behavior analyst take place for several students who require additional interventions. As part of students' Individual Education Plans (IEPs), an exceptional education resource teacher provides weekly social skills training. MILA's guidance counselor teaches guidance lessons to enhance character education as part of the activity wheel. Monthly character celebrations reward students who follow REACH expectations, and classroom/reward incentives are provided as well.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

N/A

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

N/A