

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Rosemont Elementary	District Name: Orange
Principal: Ms. Patty Harrelson	Superintendent: Dr. Jenkins
SAC Chair: Beth Hickey	Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

Administrators

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

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Patty Harrelson	B.S. Elementary Education M.A. Educational Leadership Certified in Elementary Education, Educational Leadership, and ESOL	2	5.5	<p>Lake Gem Elementary 04-05 A grade; 72% HS in reading; 59% high standards in math; 78% writing, 75% LGR, 79%LGM, 71% of lowest 25 in reading. 2005-2006: A grade, 72% HSR, 57% HSM, 80%HSW, 67% LGR, 71%LGM, 75% lowest 25% in R 2006-2007 A grade. 74% HSR, 62%HSM, 96% HSW, 33% HSS, 73%LGR, 76%LGM, 74% of lowest 25%R, 83% of lowest 25% M. 2007-2008: A Grade. 78% HSR, 72%HSM, 86% HSW, 46\$ HSS, 69% LGR, 72% LGM, 62% lowest 25% R, 79% lowest 25% M. 2008-2009: Grade A 81% HSR, 77% HSM, 98% HSW, 44% HSS, 73% LGR, 71% LGM, 63% of lowest 25% R, 71% of lowest 25% M 2009-2010: A Grade. 76% HSR, 72% HSM, 88% HSW, 48% HSS, 67% LGR, 59% LGM, 52% of lowest 25% R, 67% of lowest 25% M. Rosemont Elementary: 2010-2011: A Grade 63% HSR, 65% HSM, 86% HSW, 42% HSS, 63% LGR, 66% LGM, 67% of lowest 25% LGR, 75% of lowest 25% LGM 2011-2012 B Grade, 59% HSR, 55% HSM, 86%HSW, 31%HSS, 68% LGR, 44%LGM,74% LGR lowest 25%, 58% LGM lowest 25%.</p>
Assistant Principal	William Harris	B.S. Social Science Education M.A. Educational Leadership Certified in Social Science Education, Educational Leadership, and ESOL	2	5.5	<p>Wolf Lake Elementary 2006-07 A Grade; 75% proficient & 69% learning gains in Reading; 71% proficient & 65% learning gains in Math 2007-08 A Grade; 74% proficient & 74% learning gains in Reading; 65% proficient & 63% learning gains in Math 2008-09 A Grade; 81% proficient & 71% learning gains in Reading; 74% proficient & 75% learning gains in Math 2009-10 B Grade; 79% proficient & 68% learning gains in Reading; 77% proficient & 60% learning gains in Math Rosemont Elementary: A grade. 63% HSR, 65% HSM, 86% HSW, 42% HSS, 63% LGR, 66%LGM, 67% of lowest 25% LGR, 75% of lowest 25% 2011-2012: B Grade 59% HSR, 55% HSM, 86%HSW, 31%HSS, 68% LGR, 44%LGM,74% LGR lowest 25%, 58% LGM lowest 25%.</p>

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)
Rdg/Math Interventions	Kari DeVore	B.S. Elementary Education M.A. Educational Leadership Certified Elementary Education and Educational Leadership and ESOL	2	2	Lake Gem Elementary 2006-2007 A grade. 74% HSR, 62%HSM, 96% HSW, 33% HSS, 73%LGR, 76%LGM, 74% of lowest 25%R, 83% of lowest 25% M. 2007-2008: A Grade. 78% HSR, 72%HSM, 86% HSW, 46\$ HSS, 69% LGR, 72% LGM, 62% lowest 25% R, 79% lowest 25% M. 2008-2009: Grade A 81% HSR, 77% HSM, 98% HSW, 44% HSS, 73% LGR, 71% LGM, 63% of lowest 25% R, 71% of lowest 25% M 2009-2010: A Grade. 76% HSR, 72% HSM, 88% HSW, 48% HSS, 67% LGR, 59% LGM, 52% of lowest 25% R, 67% of lowest 25% M. Rosemont Elementary: 2010-2011: A Grade 63% HSR, 65% HSM, 86% HSW, 42% HSS, 63% LGR, 66% LGM, 67% of lowest 25% LGR, 75% of lowest 25% LGM 2011-2012 B Grade, 59% HSR, 55% HSM, 86%HSW, 31%HSS, 68% LGR, 44%LGM,74% LGR lowest 25%, 58% LGM lowest 25%.
All subjects	Beth Hickey	B.S. Sociology M.A. Childhood Education Certified in Sociology, Childhood education, and ESOL	2	1	Lake Gem Elementary 2006-2007 A grade. 74% HSR, 62%HSM, 96% HSW, 33% HSS, 73%LGR, 76%LGM, 74% of lowest 25%R, 83% of lowest 25% M. 2007-2008: A Grade. 78% HSR, 72%HSM, 86% HSW, 46\$ HSS, 69% LGR, 72% LGM, 62% lowest 25% R, 79% lowest 25% M. 2008-2009: Grade A 81% HSR, 77% HSM, 98% HSW, 44% HSS, 73% LGR, 71% LGM, 63% of lowest 25% R, 71% of lowest 25% M 2009-2010: A Grade. 76% HSR, 72% HSM, 88% HSW, 48% HSS, 67% LGR, 59% LGM, 52% of lowest 25% R, 67% of lowest 25% M.

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

					Rosemont Elementary: 2010-2011: A Grade 63% HSR, 65% HSM, 86% HSW, 42% HSS, 63% LGR, 66% LGM, 67% of lowest 25% LGR, 75% of lowest 25% LGM 2011-2012 B Grade, 59% HSR, 55% HSM, 86% HSW, 31% HSS, 68% LGR, 44% LGM, 74% LGR lowest 25%, 58% LGM lowest 25%.
Writing	Miranda Schrader	B.S. Elementary Education Certified in Elementary Education	2	4	2006-2007 A grade. 74% HSR, 62% HSM, 96% HSW, 33% HSS, 73% LGR, 76% LGM, 74% of lowest 25% R, 83% of lowest 25% M. 2007-2008: A Grade. 78% HSR, 72% HSM, 86% HSW, 46% HSS, 69% LGR, 72% LGM, 62% lowest 25% R, 79% lowest 25% M. 2008-2009: Grade A 81% HSR, 77% HSM, 98% HSW, 44% HSS, 73% LGR, 71% LGM, 63% of lowest 25% R, 71% of lowest 25% M 2009-2010: A Grade. 76% HSR, 72% HSM, 88% HSW, 48% HSS, 67% LGR, 59% LGM, 52% of lowest 25% R, 67% of lowest 25% M. Rosemont Elementary: 2010-2011: A Grade 63% HSR, 65% HSM, 86% HSW, 42% HSS, 63% LGR, 66% LGM, 67% of lowest 25% LGR, 75% of lowest 25% LGM 2011-2012 B Grade, 59% HSR, 55% HSM, 86% HSW, 31% HSS, 68% LGR, 44% LGM, 74% LGR lowest 25%, 58% LGM lowest 25%

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. Staff development	Principal and resource staff	ongoing
2. Instructional coaching, feedback, and support	Principal, AP, and resource staff	ongoing
3. Recognition, positive praise, and validation	Admin	ongoing
4. Recruiting: Interns from area colleges-investing in and coaching them up to remain with us	Admin and resource staff	Fall and spring semesters

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/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
One teacher received less than effective rating.	Moved to 2b status, which allows extra observations and coaching from Principal and AP. One on one discussions have occurred since day one after classroom walkthroughs. Teacher was moved to second grade from first in the hopes of a better fit. I asked her to go back through training on our programs during pre-planning as well.

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
64	8% (5)	46% (29)	36% (23)	10% (6)	28% (18)	98% (1)	17% (11)	3% (2)	58% (37)

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
Ashley Snyder	Layne Hooper	Former VPK-New VPK	Weekly meetings, and daily face to face. Monthly Eagle Pack staff development trainings hosted by Admin

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

			and Leadership team
Kari DeVore	Lindsey Sawyer	ESE intervention coach mentoring new ESE teacher	Weekly meetings, and daily face to face. Monthly Eagle Pack staff development trainings hosted by Admin and Leadership team
Jaime del Valle	Matthew English and Becky Victor	Fourth Grade team leader-fourth grade teachers (new)	Weekly meetings, and daily face to face. Monthly Eagle Pack staff development trainings hosted by Admin and Leadership team
Brett Bennett	Brooke Harris	ESE team leader and new ESE team member	Weekly meetings, and daily face to face. Monthly Eagle Pack staff development trainings hosted by Admin and Leadership team
Audra Jurgelonis	Kari Harwell	New First Grade teacher, and experience first grade teacher	Weekly meetings, and daily face to face. Monthly Eagle Pack staff development trainings hosted by Admin and Leadership team
Merrill Stanton	Camellia Muniz	New first grade teacher and experienced first grade teacher	Weekly meetings, and daily face to face. Monthly Eagle Pack staff development trainings hosted by Admin and Leadership team

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 The Title One funds are used to supplement educational activities at Rosemont Elementary School. Our funds are used to hire additional instructional resource staff that work directly with students all day. They provide intervention in reading and math to students working below grade level, pushing in to the classroom and working with fragile students in small groups. Additional Title I funds are used to purchase supplemental curriculum to provide needed interventions, as well as technology that we use to assess and instruct our students. We use the assessment information to provide differentiated instruction for all.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title II money is used for staff development for our fourth grade teachers in writing. Our writing consultant models once a week in every fourth grade classroom 4 times, and then she comes in to coach the classroom teachers in writing, and conference with students.

Title III Title II money is used for staff development purposes. We use it to train a team of teacher leaders, and they in turn share with the staff to ensure implementation of best practices learned in staff development.

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds are used to coordinate and facilitate REAL(Rosemont Eagles Achieving and Learning) our after school tutoring program.

1. The after school program is 75 minutes, three days a week for students in grades 3-5. It is designed to assist struggling readers based on the FCAT Reading scale score and AIMSweb results for students without FCAT information. Computer-assisted instruction and books from the reading core curriculum program are used.

2. Students scoring level 1 or level 2 in FCAT Reading and are enrolled in the Extended Day program also receive additional instruction time after the regular school day.

3. Our kindergarten through grade 5 students who receive free and / or reduced lunch, are given the opportunity to sign up for extra tutoring services through the SES tutoring program that is housed at Rosemont. Those schedules vary per individual tutors

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Violence Prevention Programs

Our local sheriff's office provides us with our Super Kids officer, who teaches drug and alcohol awareness and prevention. He also works with our fourth grade students on gang violence and bully prevention

Nutrition Programs

Title I provides either free or reduced lunches to roughly 85% of our student body, ensuring that they get a nutritious lunch and breakfast each day.

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school MTSS Team:

Lisa Seyler – Staffing Specialist

Patty Harrelson – Principal

William Harris -Assistant Principal

Kari DeVore – Reading Coach/Instructional Coach

Beth Hickey – Curriculum Resource Teacher

Erica Collins – Media Specialist

Beth Hickey-Math Coach

Bryan Harper-Dean

April Allen-School Psychologist

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?

We have a solid system that goes into effect as soon as we register an ESE student. The principal, staffing specialist, and school psychologist if necessary study the cum folder and follow the IEP instructions, ensuring the best fit for success. This includes homeroom, as well as intervention teachers/groups.

For unidentified students, we do extensive staff training, and have RTI experts on each grade level that give guidance on data collection, graphing, BIPs, etc.. We meet every other Wednesday to discuss students of concern, with all team members and the homeroom teacher attending. We troubleshoot, triage, and come up with all of the needs that must be met, and solutions that we will implement for each individual student. Once documentation has been collected, and further help is needed, we reach out to our Area North ESE specialists. We keep parents informed and involved in every step of this process.

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?

It is a critical piece for Rosemont, as we have an extremely high percentage of ESE students, both identified and unidentified. We continue to register record numbers of students that are in critical need, even retained in which no RTI has been started or documented. Our SIP cannot be written without this component. It is overarching, and key to the success of all of our students.

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.

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

We use AIMS Web for progress monitoring. Each teacher PMs their ESE students, as well as any in the RTI process the last Friday of each month. The first Friday of each month, we have data meetings with the principal, and discuss each student, and examine data. The staffing specialist collects and keeps behavior data for our students with BIPS, and with those specific needs.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Our staff has been fully trained for two years. We meet with new teacher monthly, and on an as-needed basis to train if they are unfamiliar with RTI, and also to indoctrinate them in our way of work.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Our budget is driven by and large by our intervention program. We work hard to ensure that my intervention team is funded, that they are all ESE certified, highly qualified, and the best of the best. We have a strong and consistent system of checks and balances in place when it comes to the monitoring and identification of our students in need. Bi-weekly RTI meetings, monthly data meetings, and quarterly individual data meeting with the principal help us stay on top of this.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

Principal Patty Harrelson

AP William Harris

Reading and Intervention Coach Kari DeVore

CRT Beth Hickey

Media Specialist Erica Collins

Media Clerk Mary Propes

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The LLT first ensures that all teachers are trained on our core program: Imagine It. We also monitor the effectiveness and implementation of our core by daily classroom visits, accompanied by specific feedback. If the principal sees any area of concern, coaching and feedback are given. Often coaches are also sent in to model, have conversations, and coach. The LLT also works with the intervention team to ensure that areas of deficiency are retaught, and interventions are in place through small group, direct, engaging instruction with proven, research-based programs.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

We are piloting a new (or tweaked) model for interventions. Due to lack of prior funding, we are using classroom teachers to provide the interventions on these grade levels. ESE students are still being served by push-ins, but other students in need are placed in intervention programs through diagnostic and placement assessments, and assigned to the intervention teacher on grade level. Classes regroup in order to accommodate the model.

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.

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

****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.

In the spring, we host a "Moving Forward" Day. We let each of our students spend the morning in the grade level that they will transition to the following year, in order to see what it is like, and to prepare them. We invite our area daycare Pre-K students in to participate, and we also have our Pre-K VE and VPK students go to Kindergarten for the day. We host a K Open House in the Spring as well, in conjunction with Kindergarten registration.

****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?

****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?

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?

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](#).

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			IA.1. Lack of comfort with technology, and instructional software programs.	IA.1. This year we have Purchased an upgrade to SuccessMaker 5.0, a research-based instructional software program. Training was provided for all instructional staff on the program, and how to monitor and use the reports. We also use Read Naturally, a reading fluency software program. Selected members of the resource team were trained in its usage, along with our first,second and third grade teachers.	IA.1. Principal, Tech Coordinator, reading coach, and CRT.	IA.1. SuccessMaker reports are monitored daily by classroom teachers for student sessions completed, as well as student average and level. These are also monitored by the principal throughout the week, and discussed at data meetings. Adjustments are made as needed, when identified by teacher or principal.	IA.1. SuccessMaker reports, and Read Naturally data is tracked in the RN notebooks.
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
39% (152) of students were high achieving last year. Our target for this year is 85% high achieving. We are working hard toward and expecting fidelity of the core reading program. We have also established small group, intensive reading resource intervention, using research based programs and highly qualified staff.	In July 2012, 39% (152) of students were high achieving in reading.	In July 2013, 85% of students will be high performing in reading.	IA.2. Teachers with varying skill levels, and lack of expertise in the core reading program.	IA.2. Instructional pacing done in pre-planning will be followed and monitored. Instruction will be monitored by the reading leadership team on a daily basis, with feedback provided. Coaching and modeling will be provided by our SRA reading coach, seasoned and high-	IA.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CRT, and SRA consultant.	IA.2. Various sources of reading data will be used to determine the effectiveness of the core instruction.	IA.2. classroom walkthroughs, Imagine It assessments, Edusoft, FAIR, AIMS, and STAR.

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

			performing coaches on staff (CRT, Reading Coach, Dean) as well as the principal.			
		IA.3. Some members of the Intervention team are new to their positions this year. Having had to learn new programs, and the new push-in model.	IA.3. New members of the intervention team were trained with the new programs. Select members exhibiting struggles were assigned a day to shadow a seasoned and proficient intervention teacher. We have contracted with SRA for a coaching day specifically for our intervention team, and our Direct Instruction programs. Groups are monitored daily by administration, and our intervention coach. Feedback is consistently provided. Master schedules, and their own personal schedule were provided with instructions, and time for questions. Groups are closely monitored for data and student progress (or lack thereof) by coach and administration. Changes are made based on data.	IA.3. Principal, Intervention Coach, Assistant Principal.	IA.3. Group data is taken weekly through the programs. This is used, as well as classroom data to determine the progress of the student.	IA.3. Program assessment weekly, Edusoft, STAR, FAIR,AIMS, and DIBELS.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.		1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in</i>				

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

	<i>this box.</i>	<i>this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Lack of time and materials for teachers to meet above grade level student needs.	2A.1. Leadership and vision for differentiation, small group instruction at a student's level, and using data to drive that instruction provided by Leadership. Cross grade level instructional scheduling in order to meet the needs of our high achievers.	2A.1. Principal and leadership team as directed.	2A.1. Instructional walkthroughs and class visit -data meetings -team collaboration -PLCs across grade level	2A.1. Student classroom and district assessments.
Reading Goal #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In 2012, 18% (69) of our students scored above a level 3 in reading. We want to target instruction at each student's level, intervening when necessary (to get the catch-up growth), but also to challenge students working above grade level to move and reach their potential as well.	In July 2012, 18% (69) of students scored a level four or five on FCAT.	In July 2013, 25% of students will score a level four or five on the reading FCAT.					
			2A.2. Master Instructional Calendar that must focus on interventions first	2A.2. Cross grade level PLC collaboration. Matching students with higher grade levels that share common reading block times in order to challenge these students.	2A.2. Principal, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	2A.2. progress monitoring	2A.2. STAR, AR, AIMS, Edusoft, classroom core assessments, Successmaker reports
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1.Faculty is still working towards expertise in differentiation of instruction.	3A.1.Ongoing staff development on skill groups will be provided monthly. Coaching and feedback by principal and leadership team will be provided weekly.	3A.1.Principal, SRA Consultant, and leadership team.	3A.1.reading assessment data, and classroom observations.	3A.1.classroom data, and observations.
Reading Goal #3A: In July 2012, only 59%(148) of students made learning gains in reading. This year we are working on annual growth for all, and catch-up growth for those who need it.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u> :*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u> :*					
	In July, 2012, 59% (148) of students made learning gains in reading.	In July 2013, 62% of students will make learning gains in reading.					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u> :*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u> :*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #4:</p> <p>In July, 2012, only 74% (45) of our lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. We are targeting all subgroups this year for annual and catch-up growth. We are specifically intervening with this lowest 25% subgroup in order to produce learning gains.</p>	<p>4A.1. We have established the resource, push-in, small group model this year. However, some of the teachers on this team are new to the programs. An anticipated barrier is the learning curve. They have all been trained, and are implementing the programs, they are still moving towards fluency and fidelity of the programs</p> <p>4A.2. Attendance/Tardies for students have decreased, but remain very high. Those students' groups begin first thing in the morning and many are coming in after this time.</p>	<p>4A.1. Training and staff development by highly qualified SRA staff. Coaching days provided by SRA on the program implementation. Group visits and specific coaching and feedback provided at least twice a week, and often more.</p> <p>4A.2. We have continued an aggressive attendance, and on time arrival policy. We have established a committee to come up with incentives for perfect attendance and no tardies. We have continued our Early Truancy Intervention Program. Our Attendance Clerk has begun setting up meetings with parents of students with severe attendance and tardy issues. Our state's attorney's office will be assisting with this as well. Our attendance clerk is regularly sending the warning letters out. We also advertise on the marquis: "every student here every day, on time".</p>	<p>4A.1. Principal, Reading Coach, and SRA consultant.</p> <p>4A.2. Attendance Committee, Administration, CRT, Attendance Clerk, Dean, Social Worker, ETI Liaison, SRO.</p>	<p>4A.1. Data of intensive/resource students. This data is monitored closely, on a weekly basis. Program assessments, classroom data, as well as instructional software program reports will be used to monitor.</p> <p>4A.2. We are tracking attendance and tardies on a monthly basis. WE will chart them to watch for our anticipated decrease, and celebrate this in our parent newsletter. Students with perfect attendance will also be recognized at the nine weeks ceremonies.</p>	<p>4A.1. Program data, classroom assessments, SuccessMaker reading reports, Read Naturally logs.</p> <p>4A.2. The monthly data on tardies and attendance.</p>

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

		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017							
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Reading Goal #5A: In July 2011, 66% of RES students scored below the achievement gap.	Baseline data 2010-2011		In July 2012, 39 percent of students scored satisfactory in reading.	In July 2013, 53 percent of students will score satisfactory in reading.	In July 2014, 58 percent of students will score satisfactory in reading.	In July 2015, 63 percent of students will score above the achievement gap.	In July 2016, 67 percent of students will score above the achievement gap.	In July 2017, 72 percent of students will score above the achievement gap.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool								
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B: In July 2012, the following subgroups by ethnicity were not making satisfactory progress in reading: White: 25% Black: 65% Hispanic: 52%			Students arriving late to class during reading resource or whole group reading instruction	5B.1. See attendance plan mentioned in reading barriers.	5B.1. Attendance team	5B.1. Data taken monthly on absences and tardies	5B.1. Data.								
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White: 60%</td> <td>White: 67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black: 40%</td> <td>Black: 50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic: 68%</td> <td>Hispanic: 73%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2012 Current Level of Performance		2013 Expected Level of Performance	White: 60%	White: 67%	Black: 40%	Black: 50%	Hispanic: 68%	Hispanic: 73%	5B.2. Teachers with lack of experience teaching our core reading program Imagine It!	5B.2.Coaching and Modeling whole group reading instruction	5B.2.CRT, Reading Coach and Principal	5B.2.Monthly Progress Monitoring	5B.2.AIMS web
2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance														
White: 60%	White: 67%														
Black: 40%	Black: 50%														
Hispanic: 68%	Hispanic: 73%														
		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
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Students' lack of required skills needed to attain grade level proficiency	5C.1. Provide Tier 2/3 interventions during the school day Provide opportunities for after-school tutoring Provide additional personnel to work with students during reading block Provide computer based support with SuccessMaker Continue to provide opportunities for students in grades 3-5 to attend before school hours for study hall	5C.1. Admin Intervention coach Staffing Specialist	5C.1. CWT Data Lesson Plans RtI Meetings	5C.1. Weekly AIMSweb Progress Monitoring
Reading Goal #5C:	<u>2012</u> <u>Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Perform</u> <u>ance:*</u>	<u>2013</u> <u>Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance</u> <u>:*</u>					
In July 2012, 37% of our ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	In July 2012, 37% of our ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	In July 2013, no more than 52% of our ELL students will make satisfactory progress in reading.					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1 Students' lack of required skills needed to attain grade level proficiency	5D.1. 5D.1. Provide Tier 2/3 interventions during the school day Increase rigor by differentiating instruction within and beyond the reading block Provide opportunities for after-school tutoring	5D.1. Classroom Teachers Leadership Team Principal	5D.1. Monthly Progress Monitoring	5D.1. AimsWeb
Reading Goal #5D:	<u>2012</u> <u>Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Perform</u> <u>ance:*</u>	<u>2013</u> <u>Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance</u> <u>:*</u>					
In July 2012, 92% of our SWD students did not make satisfactory progress in reading	In July 2012, 92% of our SWD	In July 2013, 30% of our SWD students will					

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

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

	students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	make satisfactory progress in reading.		<p>Provide additional personnel to work with students during reading block as much as possible</p> <p>Provide computer based support with Successmaker</p> <p>Continue to provide opportunities for students in grades 3-5 to attend before school study hall</p>			
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: In July 2012, 61% of our Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance :* In July 2012, 61% of our Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance :* In July 2013, 53% of our Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Students arriving late to class during reading resource or whole group reading instruction	5E.1. Provide additional personnel to work with students during reading block as much as possible Provide computer based support with Successmaker Continue to provide opportunities for students in grades 3-5 to attend before school study hall	5E.1. Classroom Teachers Leadership Team Principal	5E.1. CWT Data Lesson Plans 5E.1. Weekly AIMSweb Progress Monitoring
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Imagine It core curriculum coaching, modeling, and feedback	K-5	SRA Coches Admin CRT	All instructional staff	First Wednesday of each month	Administration and coaches-classroom walkthroughs and formal assessments	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Reading Coach

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)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Small group, intensive reading resource program	Research-based direct instructional programs geared toward intervention. Early Interventions in Reading, Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, Rewards.	Title One	
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Upgrade to Successmaker 5.0	Successmaker school-wide upgrade (alignment to new standards)	Title One	16,000
Upgrade of our fluency software Read Naturally	Read Naturally is a fluency software program used with fragile readers in order to increase their fluency. This is available to all teachers school-wide, but used across the board in 1-3 with identified students.		2,000.00
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Imagine It core curriculum coaching, modeling, and feedback	New teacher initial core training. SRA coach visit once this year.	OCPS funding/RES Title One.	1,500.00
SRA Direct Instructional programs training and coaching	Intervention team initial training with SRA trainers. SRA Coach one-time visit.	RES General fund	1,500.00
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1. Students have not developed strong academic language skills in English.	1.1. Identify ESOL students and plan and implement accommodations for each student and monitor their learning progress very closely.	1.1. Principal, Asst. Principal, CRT, Teachers	1.1. Review data frequently with RtI team, tutor teachers and at data meetings to monitor student progress and make adjustments to instruction as necessary.	1.1. , EDUSOFT BENCHMARK TESTING, SuccessMaker,, Formative Assessments, Summative Assessments, FCAT
CELLA Goal #1: In 2012, 50% (18) of students scored at the proficiency level on the listening/speaking portion of the CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: In 2013, 55% of the students will score at the proficient level on the listening/speaking portion of the CELLA.	Low socioeconomic conditions contribute to the challenges teachers face in advancing student Achievement.				
		1.2	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1. Students have not developed strong academic language skills in English.	2.1. Identify ESOL students and plan and implement accommodations for each student and monitor their learning progress very closely	2.1. Principal, Asst. Principal, CRT, Teachers	2.1. Administer formative assessments frequently and plan for interventions. Attend data meetings to review student data.	2.1. EDUSOFT BENCHMARK TESTING, SuccessMaker, Formative Assessments, Summative Assessments, FCAT
CELLA Goal #2: In 2012, 44%(18) of students scored at the proficiency level on the reading portion of the CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: In 2013, 49% of students will score at the proficient level on the reading portion of the CELLA.					
		2.2	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

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

		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.
--	--	------	------	------	------	------

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		2.1. . Students have not developed strong academic language skills in English.	2.1. Identify ESOL students and plan and implement accommodations for each student and monitor their learning progress very closely	2.1. Principal, Asst. Principal, CRT, Teachers	2.1. Administer formative assessments frequently and plan for interventions. Attend data meetings to review student data.	2.1. EDUSOFT BENCHMARK TESTING, SuccessMaker, Read Formative Assessments, Summative Assessments, FCAT
CELLA Goal #3: In 2012, 50%(18) of students scored at the proficiency level on the writing portion of the CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : In 2013, 55% of students will score at the proficient level on the writing portion of the CELLA.	Low socioeconomic conditions contribute to the challenges teachers face in advancing student Achievement.				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. Teachers with varying skill levels, and lack of expertise in the core math program	1A.1. Instructional pacing done in pre-planning will be followed and monitored. Instruction will be monitored by the leadership team on a daily basis, with feedback provided. Coaching and modeling will be provided by our instructional coaches, seasoned and high performing coaches on staff (CRT, Math Coach, Dean) as well as the principal and assistant principal.	1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Instructional Coaches	1A.1. Various sources of math assessments to determine the effectiveness of the core instruction.	1A.1. EduSoft Test Mini-Benchmark Test.
Mathematics Goal #1A: 55% (165) of students were high achieving last year. Our target for this year is 38% high achieving. We are working hard toward and expecting fidelity of the new core math program, Envision. We have also established small math resource intervention groups, using research based programs and highly qualified staff.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u> .:* In July 2012, 55%(165) of students were high achieving in math.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u> .:* By July 2013, 58% (174) of students will be high achieving in math.					
			1A.2. Lack of comfort with Technology.	1A.2. This year we have Purchased an upgrade to Successmaker 5.0, a research-based instructional software program. Training was provided for all instructional staff on the program, and how to monitor and use the reports. We also use school-wide: FAST Math, a math fluency software program.	1A.2. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Instructional Coaches Technology Coordinator	1A.2. Successmaker and FAST Math reports are monitored daily by classroom teachers for student sessions completed, as well as student average and level. These are also monitored by the principal throughout the week, and discussed at data meetings. Adjustments are made as needed, when identified by teacher or principal.	1A.2. Successmaker reports and FAST Math data tracked.

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

			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Instructional staff not a comfort level with differentiation yet.	2A.1. Leadership and vision for differentiation, small group instruction at a student's level, and using data to drive that instruction provided by leadership..	2A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Leadership team, as directed	2A.1. Instructional Walk throughs Classroom visits Data Meetings Team collaboration	2A.1. EduSoft Test Mini-Benchmark Aimsweb assessments
Mathematics Goal #2A: In 2012, only 11% of our students scored above a level 3 in math. We want to target instruction at each student's level, intervening when necessary (to get the catch-up growth), but also to challenge students working above grade level to move and reach their potential as well.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In July 2012, 11% (28) of students scored a level four or five on the FCAT.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In July 2013, 14% (35) of students will score a level four or five on the FCAT.					
			2A.2. Comfort level with technology is increasing, but more expertise is needed.	2A.2. We have contracted with Successmaker for a coaching day specifically for our teachers. Groups are monitored daily by administration, and our intervention coach. Feedback is consistently provided.	2A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Leadership team, as directed Technology Coordinator	2A.2. Successmaker reports monitored daily.	2A.2. Successmaker reports
				2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Faculty is still working toward expertise in small group differentiation.	3A.1. Ongoing staff development on skill groups will be provided monthly. Coaching and feedback by principal and leadership team will be provided weekly.	3A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Instructional Coach Math Coach	3A.1. Data of intensive/resource students. This data is monitored closely, on a weekly basis. Program assessments, classroom data, as well as instructional software program reports will be used to monitor.	3A.1. Classroom Assessments SuccessMaker Math Reports FAST Math Reports
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In July 2012, 44% (132) of our students made annual growth as evidenced by learning gains in math. This year we are working on annual growth for all, and catch-up growth for those who need it	In July 2012, 44% (132) of students made learning gains in math.	By July 2013, 47% (141) of students will make learning gains in math.					
			Gaps in learning persist for a large portion of our student body.	3A.2. 3A.2. Small group interventions will be provided by push-in resource team in grades 4-5, and by selected classroom teachers in K-2	3A.2. Intervention coach Principal	3A.2. Continuous ongoing progress monitoring	3A.2. AIMS web data STAR Edusoft Program data
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #4:</p> <p>In July 2012, 58% of our lowest 25% made learning gains in math. We are targeting all subgroups this year for annual and catch-up growth. We are specifically intervening with this lowest 25% subgroup in order to produce learning gains.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>In July 2012, 58% of our lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>By July 2013, 61% of students will make learning gains in math.</p>	<p>4A.1. Teachers with varying skill levels and lack of expertise in the core program. They have all been trained by the curriculum's trainers and are implementing the programs. They are still moving towards fidelity of the program.</p>	<p>4A.1. Training and staff development by highly qualified Envision staff as well as the Math Coach.</p>	<p>4A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Instructional Coach Math Coach</p>	<p>4A.1. Data of intensive/resource students. This data is monitored closely, on a weekly basis. Program assessments, classroom data, as well as instructional software program reports will be used to monitor.</p>	<p>4A.1. Classroom Assessments SuccessMaker Math Reports FAST Math Reports</p>
			<p>4A.2. Attendance/Tardies for students has been very high historically. Those students groups begin first thing in the morning, and many are coming in after this time in past years.</p>	<p>4A.2. We have begun an aggressive attendance, and on time arrival policy. We have established a committee to come up with incentives for perfect attendance and no tardies. We have established the Early Truancy Intervention Program here at school with our state's attorney. Our social worker has begun setting up meetings with parents of students with severe attendance and tardy issues. Our attendance clerk is regularly sending the warning letters out. We also advertise on the marquis: "every student here every day, on time".</p>	<p>4A.2. Attendance Committee Administration CRT Attendance Clerk Dean Social Worker ETI liaison</p>	<p>4A.2. We are tracking attendance and tardies on a monthly basis. We will chart them to watch for our anticipated decrease, and celebrate this in our parent newsletter. Students with perfect attendance will also be recognized at the nine weeks ceremonies.</p>	<p>4A.2. The monthly data on tardies and attendance.</p>
			<p>4A.3.</p>	<p>4A.3.</p>	<p>4A.3.</p>	<p>4A.3.</p>	<p>4A.3.</p>

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017				
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: In July 2011, 35% of students made satisfactory progress in math.	Baseline data 2010-2011 In July 2012, 35% of students made satisfactory progress in mathematics.		In July 2012, 35% of students made satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In July 2013, 46% of students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In July 2014, 51% of students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In July 2015, 57% of students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In July 2016, 62% of students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In July 2017, 68% of students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.				
	In July 2011, 35% of students made satisfactory progress in math.											
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool					
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: In July 2012, the following subgroups by ethnicity did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics: White: 44% Black: 70% Hispanic: 48%			Teachers with varying skill levels, and lack of expertise in the core math program.	5B.1. Training and staff development by highly qualified Envision staff as well as the Math Coach.	5B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Instructional Coach Math Coach	5B.1. Data of intensive/resource students. This data is monitored closely, on a weekly basis. Program assessments, classroom data, as well as instructional software program reports will be used to monitor.	5B.1. Classroom Assessments SuccessMaker Math Reports FAST Math Reports					
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> In July 2012, the following subgroups by ethnicity did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics: White: 44% Black: 70% Hispanic: 48% </td> <td> In July 2013, the following subgroups will be making satisfactory progress in mathematics: White: 67% Black: 42% Hispanic: 63% </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	In July 2012, the following subgroups by ethnicity did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics: White: 44% Black: 70% Hispanic: 48%	In July 2013, the following subgroups will be making satisfactory progress in mathematics: White: 67% Black: 42% Hispanic: 63%						
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*											
In July 2012, the following subgroups by ethnicity did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics: White: 44% Black: 70% Hispanic: 48%	In July 2013, the following subgroups will be making satisfactory progress in mathematics: White: 67% Black: 42% Hispanic: 63%											
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.					
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.					

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Students' lack of required skills needed to attain grade level proficiency	5C.1. Provide Tier 2/3 interventions during the school day Provide opportunities for after-school tutoring Provide additional personnel to work with students during math block Provide computer based support with SuccessMaker Continue to provide opportunities for students in grades 3-5 to attend before school hours for study hall	5C.1. Classroom Teachers Leadership Team Principal	5C.1. CWT Data Lesson Plans RtI Meetings	5C.1. Weekly AIMSweb Progress Monitoring
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In July 2012, 50% of our ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In July 2012, 50% of our ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics	In July 2013, 47% of our ELL students will be making satisfactory progress in mathematics					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1 Students' lack of required skills needed to attain grade level proficiency	5D.1. Provide Tier 2/3 interventions during the school day Increase rigor by differentiating instruction within and	5D.1. Classroom Teachers Leadership Team Principal	5D.1. Monthly Progress Monitoring	5D.1. AIMS web
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In July 2012, 90% of our Students with							

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

Disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In July 2012, 90% of our Students with Disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics .	In July 2013, 30% of our SWD will make satisfactory progress in mathematics .		beyond the math block Provide opportunities for after-school tutoring Provide additional personnel to work with students during math block as much as possible Provide computer based support with Successmaker			
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Students' lack of required skills needed to attain grade level proficiency	5E.1. Provide Tier 2/3 interventions during the school day Provide opportunities for after-school tutoring Provide additional personnel to work with students during math block Provide computer based support with SuccessMaker Continue to provide opportunities for students in grades 3-5 to attend before school hours for study hall	5E.1. Classroom Teachers Leadership Team Principal	5E.1. CWT Data Lesson Plans RtI Meetings	5E.1. Weekly AIMSweb Progress Monitoring
Mathematics Goal #5E:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u> .*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u> .*					
In July 2012, 66% of our Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In July 2012, 66% of our Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics	In July 2013, 45% of our Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

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

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Geometry Goal #3C: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Geometry Goal #3D: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Envision Core Training	K-5	District Dept	New Teachers	Pre-Planning	PLC meetings, coaching, classroom observation	Principal, PLC and team leaders, Coaches
Successmaker 5.0 Training	K-5	Santos Flores-SM Consultant	All instructional staff	September 10, October 23	Staff development (differentiated) during faculty meetings, PLCs, team meetings with the principal	Selected teacher leaders, Principal, team leaders, CRT

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
Connecting Math Concepts	Math Intervention materials for resource students	Title One	N/A
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Upgrade to Successmaker 5.0	Instructional software for all students.	Title One	16,000.00
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
*see above			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

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
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1. Students reading and comprehension skills are below grade level.	1A.1. Students receive intensive small group instruction during their reading workshop time to increase reading and comprehension skills.	1A.1. Patty Harrelson, Principal William Harris, Jr., Assistant Principal Kari DeVore, Reading Coach	1A.1. Classroom observation, review of data matrices	1A.1. Unit Assessment, EduSoft Science Test Grade 5
Science Goal #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
33% of our fifth grade students will score a level 3 or higher on the science portion of the FCAT for the 2012-13 school year.	In June 2012, 30%(33) of our fifth grade students scored a level 3 or higher on the science portion of the FCAT.	In July 2013, 33% of our fifth grade students will score a level 3 or higher on the science portion of the FCAT.					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Science Goal #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Teachers having to implement the new essential labs curriculum.	2A.1. Teachers will teach from the Essential Lab daily. 5th grade students will also attend two Science classes on the specials rotation and complete higher level thinking labs. Administration will do walkthroughs during the scheduled science time.	2A.1. Patty Harrelson, Principal William Harris, Jr, Assistant Principal	2A.1. Classroom observation, review of data matrices, SuccessMaker Science reports.	2A.1. Unit Assessments, EduSoft Science test Grade 5
Science Goal #2A: 6% of our fifth grade students will score a level 4 or higher on the science portion of the FCAT for the 2012-13 school year.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In June 2012, 3%(4) of our fifth grade students scored a level 4 or higher on the science portion of the FCAT.	2013Expected Level of Performance:* In June 2013, 6% of our fifth grade students will score a level 4 or higher on the science portion of the FCAT.					
			2A.2. Girls were underrepresented in Advanced Science class	2A.2. One of our fifth grade teachers founded the STAR (Science, Technology Advancement at Rosemont) science club for girls, that meets after school.	2A.2. Tami Zeniewicz, 5 th grade teacher Craig Bonawandt, Science teacher	2A.2. Data collected from classroom science assessments, and standardized tests.	2A.2. Edusoft Fusion assessments
				2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			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

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FCAT Scram	5th	Bonawandt, Science teacher	5 th grade teachers and Leadership Team	Spring 2013	Full implementation with our fifth graders	Science Teachers, CRT.

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
FCAT Scram	Two-week blitz review of essential labs and science concepts.	District funds	Unknown-No cost to school.
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Successmaker Investigations	Middle school science instructional software	Title One	Included in 16,000 Successmaker upgrade.
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science teachers attend FCAT Scram PD	Training to conduct the 2-week program	District funds	Unknown-no cost to school.
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

	Subtotal:
	Total:

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Lack of implementation of the Writing curriculum as a result of new members to the fourth grade team.	1A.1. Hired and will utilize our writing consultant to train teachers, demo lessons, monitor writing implementation, develop consistent writing lessons/activities to be utilized in grade four. (August 2012-June 2013)	1A.1. Principal, CRT, Instructional Coach, 4 th grade Team Leader, Writing Consultant, Miranda Schrader	1A.1. Train all teachers in Power Writing techniques and how to use scoring rubrics.	1A.1. Using scoring rubric to determine progress in writing essays scored at 3.0 or above.
Writing Goal #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
88% of our fourth grade students will score a 3.0 or higher on FCAT Writes for the 2012-2013 school year.	In June 2012, 85% [118] of students scored a level 3.0 or above.	By July 2013, 88% of students will score a level 3.0 or above.					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Power Writing training	4 th grade teachers	Miranda Schrader	4 th grade teachers, admin, coaches.	Tuesday planning time weekly	PLC meetings, monitored by the Principal through classroom visits	Miranda Schrader, Principal, Coaches

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
Writing Consultant	Expert writing consultant will model, and coach fourth grade team.	Title II	2100.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

U.S. History Professional Development

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

U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Certain barriers to improve attendance are: the high mobility rate, attitudes towards school, and lack of parental involvement	1.1. The Attendance Child Study Team (ACST) committee will monitor the attendance of students with excessive absences from last year. Early Truancy Intervention will be implemented. The services of the school's Social worker will be used to follow up students with 15 or more tardies and excessive absences. A warning letter will be sent to parents after 5 absences. Continued absences will be followed up with an ACST meeting with the parent. The SSW will work with the parents and student in resolving truancy issues that continue.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Attendance Clerk, and Social Worker	1.1. The attendance clerk will provide attendance and tardy data to ACST committee for review and discussion. Data will be shared with the Social Worker as soon as absence and tardy patterns are noticed.	1.1. SMS attendance data, EDW attendance data
<u>Attendance Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
By June 2013, the attendance rate for the year will increase by 2%.	94.4% (1,015 student days absent)	96.4%					
	<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>					
	322	315					
	<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>					
349	342						
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Attendance Professional Development

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

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

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
1. Suspension			1.1.Select teachers not teaching academic programs with fidelity.	1.1.The strategy would be to bring various consultants from the academic programs to model how to use it effectively.	1.1.Principal	1.1.The administration will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor fidelity of the programs.	1.1.The evaluation tool will be the walkthroughs.
Suspension Goal #1:	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
The behavioral goal for Rosemont Elementary 2012-13 school year will be to reduce its total in-school/out-of-school suspension by 10%.	14	13					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	14	13					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	122	110					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	78	70					
			1.2.The teachers not having a visible classroom management program established in their classroom. Also, the teachers not fully explaining the program to their students.	1.2.Training teachers on a modified school wide behavioral program that will allow the students to remain in the classroom for a longer amount of time.	1.2.Assistant Principal Dean	1.2.The number of referrals documented each month and displayed to the staff showing the decreasing numbers of suspensions	1.2.The number of in-school/out-of school suspensions.
			1.3.Parents not fully understanding the	1.3.The administration will continue to sponsor	1.3.Dean	1.3.Continue to conduct parent surveys to gather	1.3. The parent surveys.

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

		procedures and policies brought about through the administration.	several parent workshops on the implementation of expectations.		information on how the information provided a better insight of the school policies and procedures.	
--	--	---	---	--	---	--

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
The PLC focus for the suspension portion will be to decrease the total number of students suspended by 10%.	The grade levels will be Pre-k-5th.	The PLC Leaders will be the administration team.	The PD participants will be the entire school-wide faculty/staff at Rosemont Elementary.	On-going monthly feedback by grade level.	The strategy for monitoring will be classroom walkthroughs, referral count collections, and monthly feedback by grade level.	Principal Assistant Principal Dean

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

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

	Subtotal:
	Total:

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> <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:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i>					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>					
		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
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

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
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. Lack of parental knowledge	1.1. Continue on-going parent training through our Rosemont Parent University.	1.1 .Assistant Principal Dean Classroom Teachers	1.1. Communication	1.1. SAC Surveys
Parent Involvement Goal #1: Based on the evidence/feedback we received from the 2011-2012 school year, parents continue to be satisfied with the direction Rosemont Elementary is headed. However, there is still little, if any, parental support for such organizations as the PTA or SAC. We are continuing to strengthen the focus on increasing the level of trust between community and school. <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* The current level of parent involvement did improve slightly. This was evidenced by parents attending our Rosemont Parent University as well as 56 (6%) families returning the SAC Surveys.	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* 212 (25%) of the students' families will return the SAC Surveys.					
			1.2.Lack of Parental Trust	1.2.Continue open limited access	1.2.Principal Assistant Principal Dean Media Center Specialist	1.2.Media Night Rosemont Parent University	1.2.SAC Survey
				1.3. Lack of night events	1.3. Continue on-going parent training	1.3.Principal Assistant Principal Dean Music Teacher	1.3.Concerts Performances

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

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
Rosemont Parent University	We are continuing our Rosemont Parent University for our parents, to continue to educate them on basic school-related matters that can help them help their children be successful.	Title One Budget	\$9,649.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

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:					
<p><u>STEM Goal #1:</u></p> <p>Students at Rosemont Elementary will experience problem based learning that reinforces the collaborative nature of the 21st century workplace.</p>	1.1. Teachers and students being unfamiliar with the concept of STEM and its implementation.	1.1. PLC meetings and Professional development on STEM, and using the district STEM lessons.	1.1. Patty Harrelson, principal; William Harris, assistant principal; Kari Devore, Instructional Coach; Beth Hickey, CRT.	1.1. Class walkthroughs and monthly meetings	1.1. Class walkthroughs
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	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
PLC	All	Team leaders	School-wide	Montly PLC meeting	Monthly meetings	Patty Harrelson, principal

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s) Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	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
CTE Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1: The percentage of VPK students who will enter elementary school ready based on FLKRS data (score 70% and above)	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u> In June 2012, 87% of our VPK students scored at 70% or above on the end of the year FLKRS assessment.	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> By June 2013, 90% of our VPK students will score at 70% or above on the end of the year FLKRS assessment.	1.1. New VPK teacher of the teachers on this team are new to the programs. An anticipated barrier is the learning curve to the VPK curriculum.	1.1. Training and staff development by highly qualified VPK staff. School visits to other sites with established VPK programs.	1.1. District VPK Liaison Principal Reading Coach VPK Teacher	1.1. Student data derived from classroom assessments and monthly assessments.	1.1. FLKRS Assessment
			1.2. Lack of parental knowledge/skills of correct reading techniques.	1.2. Sharing correct reading skills with parents	1.2. Principal Assistant Principal Media Specialists VPK Teacher	1.2. Student data derived from classroom assessments and monthly assessments.	1.2. FLKRS Assessment
			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
2. Additional Goal			2.1. Lack of parental knowledge/skills of correct reading techniques.	2.1. Sharing correct reading skills with teachers Building the foundation of skills in the students	2.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Reading Coach Media Specialists Classroom Teachers Resource Teachers	2.1. Student data derived from computer Accelerated Reader and Success Maker computer programs, classroom assessments, and monthly progress monitoring.	2.1. Imagine It! Assessments STAR Assessments AIMS Web Assessments FCAT
Additional Goal #2: The percentage of students by age 9 who read on grade level will increase by 5%.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	In June 2012, 69% of our students, by age 9, read on grade level.	By June 2013, 74% of our students, by age 9, will read on grade level.					
			2.2. We have 15 teachers new to either Kindergarten, 1 st , 2 nd , or 3 rd grade this year.	2.2. Training and staff development and curriculum/instructional support.	2.2. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Reading Coach	2.2. Student data derived from computer Accelerated Reader and Success Maker computer programs, classroom assessments, and monthly progress monitoring.	2.2. Imagine It! Assessments STAR Assessments AIMS Web Assessments FCAT
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.
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
3. Additional Goal			3.1. Lack of parental knowledge/skills of correct math techniques.	3.1. Sharing correct math skills with teachers Building the foundation of math skills in the students	3.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Reading Coach Classroom Teachers Resource Teachers	3.1. Student data derived from FAST Math and Success Maker computer programs, classroom assessments, and monthly progress monitoring.	3.1. Envision Assessments AIMS Web Assessments FCAT
Additional Goal #3: The percentage of students who are fluent in math operations will increase by 5%.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	In June 2012, 75% of our students in grades Kindergarten through 3 rd grade were fluent in math operations.	By June 2013, 80% of our students in grades Kindergarten through 3 rd grade will be fluent in math operations.					

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

		3.2. We have 15 teachers new to either Kindergarten, 1 st , 2 nd , or 3 rd grade this year.	3.2. Training and staff development and curriculum/instructional support.	3.2. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Reading Coach	3.2. Student data derived from FAST Math and Success Maker computer programs, classroom assessments, and monthly progress monitoring.	3.2. Envision Assessments AIMS Web Assessments FCAT
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
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	
<u>Additional Goal #4:</u> Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup by 10% by June 30, 2016	<u>See Reading and Math AMO section 5a</u>	<u>See Reading and Math AMO section 5a</u>				
<u>Additional Goal#5:</u> Maintain exposure to Fine Arts for 100% of students K-5	2012 Current Level: 100% of students K-5 receive exposure to Fine Arts instruction	2013 Expected Level: 100% of K-5 students will continue to receive Fine Arts classes	Special Area Teachers Administration	surveys	Fine Arts enrollment	
<u>Additional Goal# 6:</u> Increase College awareness for all students K-5	<u>2012 Current Level: 100% of PreK-5 students are exposed to college awareness</u>	2013 Expected Level: 100% of K-5 students will continue to be exposed to college awareness.	Admin, Leadership Team, Planning committee	surveys		
<u>Additional Goal #7:</u> Decrease disproportionate placement of students into Special Education	<u>*See MTSSS plan</u>	<u>*See MTSSS Plan</u>	<u>*See MTSSS Plan</u>	<u>*See MTSSS Plan</u>	<u>*See MTSSS Plan</u>	

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total:13,000 (half Successmaker)
CELLA Budget	Total:
Mathematics Budget	Total:19,000 (math portion of SM included)
Science Budget	Total:1,000 (Science portion of SM)
Writing Budget	Total:21,00.00
Civics Budget	Total:
U.S. History Budget	Total:
Attendance Budget	Total:
Suspension Budget	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:9,649.00
STEM Budget	Total:
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total:

62,649.00 Grand Total:

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.
Writing and monitoring of the SIP, expenditures of school recognition money from last year’s grade, monitoring of Title One action plan.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Student planners and parent folders	8,668.00