

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: Alta Vista Elementary	District Name: Polk
Principal: Denece Dudeck	Superintendent: Dr. Sherrie Nickell
SAC Chair:	Date of School Board Approval:

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	Deneece Dudeck	Masters Educational Leadership BS Elementary Education Certifications Include: 1-6 Elementary Education ESOL Certified Elementary Education Leadership	2 Principal 4 Assistant Pr.	2 Principal 4 Assistant Pr.	<p>Alta Vista Elementary: Principal 2011-12 Grade B Reading Mastery: 40% Math mastery: 47% Science Mastery: 33 % Writing 89% Increased overall Learning Gains in reading by 19% to 73% from 54%. Increased overall Learning Gains in math by 30% to 72% from 42%. Increased Learning Gains for bottom 25% in reading by 33% to 86% from 53%. Increased Learning Gains for bottom 25% in math by 11% to 67% from 56%. AMO -100% of students tested who were present for both FTE Surveys will achieve Learning Gains as reported by the DSS from FCAT 2.0. 2010-11 Grade D Reading Mastery: 50% Math mastery: 59% Science Mastery: 26 % Writing 90% AYP: 72% met did not make AYP for Total, Black, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged and English Language Learners in Reading and in Math. Assistant Principal 2009-10 Grade C Reading Mastery: 52% Math mastery: 64% Science Mastery: 17% Writing 80% AYP: 90 % met did not make AYP for Black, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged in Reading. 2008-09 Grade C Reading Mastery: 50% Math mastery: 55% Science Mastery: 11%. AYP: 95% met, did not make AYP in white both reading and math. 2007-08 Grade D</p>

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

					<p>Reading Mastery: 39% Math mastery: 50% Science Mastery: 11%. AYP: 72% met did not make AYP in Total, Black, Hispanic, Econ Disadv, ELL both reading and math. 2006-07 Grade: B Reading Mastery: 50% Math mastery: 63% Science Mastery: 21% AYP: 85% met,</p>
Assistant Principal	Crystal Richardson	<p>Doctorate Organizational Leadership Masters Educational Leadership Certifications Include: K-5 Elementary Education 6-12 Sociology Athletic Coaching Educational Leadership</p>	1	7	<p>Alta Vista Elementary: 2011-12 Grade B Reading Mastery: 40% Math mastery: 47% Science Mastery: 33 % Writing 89% Increased overall Learning Gains in reading by 19% to 73% from 54%. Increased overall Learning Gains in math by 30% to 72% from 42%. Increased Learning Gains for bottom 25% in reading by 33% to 86% from 53%. Increased Learning Gains for bottom 25% in math by 11% to 67% from 56%. AMO -100% of students tested who were present for both FTE Surveys will achieve Learning Gains as reported by the DSS from FCAT 2.0. 2010-11 Grade D Reading Mastery: 50% Math mastery: 59% Science Mastery: 26 % Writing 90% AYP: 72% met did not make AYP for Total, Black, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged and English Language Learners in Reading and in Math. Bethune Academy : 2009-10 School Grade B Reading Mastery: 77% Math mastery: 84% Science Mastery: 59% Writing Mastery: 78% AYP: -95 % met, did not make AYP for Black and Economically Disadvantaged students in Reading.</p>

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

					<p>Bethune Academy : 2008-09 School Grade A Reading Mastery: 81% Math mastery: 75% Science Mastery: 62% Writing Mastery: 91% AYP: - 97% met, did not make AYP in Math, Economically Disadvantaged.</p> <p>Bethune Academy : 2007-08 School Grade A Reading Mastery: 76% Math mastery: 68% Science Mastery: ??% Writing Mastery: 95% AYP: 97% met, did not make AYP in Black Males (subgroup), Math.</p> <p>Bethune Academy : 2006-07 School Grade A Reading Mastery: 81% Math mastery: 77% Science Mastery: % Writing Mastery: 94% AYP:100% met,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
LFS/Math Resource	Sandra Gamez	BS Accounting Certification: K-6	6	3	<p>2011-12 Grade B Reading Mastery: 40% Math mastery: 47% Science Mastery: 33 % Writing 89% Increased overall Learning Gains in reading by 19% to 73% from 54%. Increased overall Learning Gains in math by 30% to 72% from 42%. Increased Learning Gains for bottom 25% in reading by 33% to 86% from 53%. Increased Learning Gains for bottom 25% in math by 11% to 67% from 56%. AMO -100% of students tested who were present for both FTE Surveys will achieve Learning Gains as reported by the DSS from FCAT 2.0.</p> <p>2010-11 Grade D Reading Mastery: 50% Math mastery: 59% AYP: 72% met 54% of students made a year’s worth of progress in Reading 53% of struggling students made a year’s worth of progress in Reading 42% of students made a year’s worth of progress in Math 56% of struggling students made a year’s worth of progress in Math did not make AYP for Total, Black, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged and English Language Learners in Reading and in Math.</p> <p>2009-10 Grade C 64% of students at or above grade level in math</p> <p>63% of students making a year's worth of progress in math</p>

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

					<p>61% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math All subgroups made AYP in math.</p> <p>2008-09 Grade C 55% of students at or above grade level in math 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 56% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math All subgroups, with the exception of white, made AYP in math.</p>
Science AIF	James Bracey	<p>B.A. in Business Management M.S. in Teaching and Learning Ed.S. in Educational Leadership</p>	1	1	<p>2011-12 Grade B Reading Mastery: 40% Math mastery: 47% Science Mastery: 33 % Writing 89% Increased overall Learning Gains in reading by 19% to 73% from 54%. Increased overall Learning Gains in math by 30% to 72% from 42%. Increased Learning Gains for bottom 25% in reading by 33% to 86% from 53%. Increased Learning Gains for bottom 25% in math by 11% to 67% from 56%. AMO -100% of students tested who were present for both FTE Surveys will achieve Learning Gains as reported by the DSS from FCAT 2.0.</p>
Teacher Trainer	Rodrick Gray	<p>Bachelors Degree: Elementary Education (K-6) Minor or certified to teach Spanish and Language Arts Master's Degree: Education Administration ESOL endorsed.</p>	5	0	<p>AMO -100% of students tested who were present for both FTE Surveys will achieve Learning Gains as reported by the DSS from FCAT 2.0.</p>

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

Language Arts Resource	Karen Davis	Bachelor's Degree: Elementary Education Certification: Elementary Ed (K-6) ESOL Endorsement.	1	4	<p>2011-12 Grade B Reading Mastery: 40% Math mastery: 47% Science Mastery: 33 % Writing 89% Increased overall Learning Gains in reading by 19% to 73% from 54%. Increased overall Learning Gains in math by 30% to 72% from 42%. Increased Learning Gains for bottom 25% in reading by 33% to 86% from 53%. Increased Learning Gains for bottom 25% in math by 11% to 67% from 56%. AMO -100% of students tested who were present for both FTE Surveys will achieve Learning Gains as reported by the DSS from FCAT 2.0.</p>
------------------------	-------------	--	---	---	---

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

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Professional Learning Communities	Principal and Assistant Principal	On Going
2. Common planning time for grade levels.	Principal	On Going
3. Book studies to build knowledge and morale.	Admin, LFS /Math/Science/Language Arts Coaches, Teacher Trainer	On Going
4. Vertical teaming to facilitate collaboration among grade levels	Admin, LFS /Math/Science/Language Arts Coaches, Teacher Trainer	On Going

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
All staff are in field and highly effective	Not Applicable

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

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	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
42	21% (9)	57% (24)	17% (7)	5% (2)	17% (7)	100	5% (2)	2% (1)	50% (21)

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
Diane Hill Sandra Gamez James Bracey Rodrick Gray	New Teachers Rincon Upton Nunez	Content Knowledge Professional Development	Assistance with: Curriculum Development Classroom Management Parent/Teacher conferences Elegrade/Progress Monitoring
Leadership Team (Principal, Assistant Principal, LFS Coach, Teacher Trainer, Science AIF, Media Specialist, Program Facilitator)	Struggling Teachers	Content Knowledge Professional Development	Assistance with: Curriculum Development Classroom Management Parent/Teacher conferences Elegrade/Progress Monitoring

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

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A Title I, Part A, funds school-wide services to Alta Vista Elementary. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. Title I, Part A, support provides after-school and summer instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents.
Title I, Part C- Migrant Migrant students enrolled in Alta Vista Elementary will be assisted by the school and by the District Migrant Education Program (MEP). Students will be prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status. MEP Teacher Advocates, assigned to schools with high percentages of migrant students, monitor the progress of these high need students and provide or coordinate supplemental academic support. Migrant Home-School Liaisons identify and recruit migrant students and their families for the MEP. They provide support to both students and parents in locating services necessary to ensure the academic success of these students whose education has been interrupted by numerous moves.
Title I, Part D N/A
Title II Professional development resources are available to Title I schools through Title II funds. In addition, School Technology Services provide technical support, technology training, and licenses for software programs and web-based access via Title II-D funds. Professional development resources are available to Title 1 schools through Title II funds. At Alta Vista these funds will be used to provide substitutes, or Special Activities Pay, to facilitate curriculum development
Title III N/A
Title X- Homeless N/A
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) N/A
Violence Prevention Programs N/A
Nutrition Programs N/A
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start N/A

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

Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education
Job Training N/A
Other. N/A

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

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

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

ALL MEMBERS WILL MAINTAIN THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE INFORMATION SHARED IN THE LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETINGS.

Principal: (Required Member) The Principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision –making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure for implementation of PS/RtI; ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS/RtI; conducts assessment of MTSS/RtI skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; ensures and participates in adequate professional learning to support MTSS/RtI implementation; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff for the implementation of MTSS/RtI schoolwide; ensures resources are assigned to those areas in most need; and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS/RtI plans and activities.

Assistant Principal: Assists Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of MTSS/RtI, further assists the principal in the assessment of MTSS/RtI skills, implementation of intervention support and documentation, professional learning, and communication with parents concerning MTSS/RtI plans and activities.

Selected General Education Teachers: (Recommend at least one Primary Teacher and one Intermediate Teacher) – Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2/3 interventions; and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials/ instruction in tiered interventions; collaborates with general education teachers.

Academic Intervention Facilitator: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk,” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical evaluation; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities.

MTSS/RtI Behavior Representative (PBS): Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systematic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

Guidance Counselor: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. Communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students’ academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

Technology Specialist: Develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data, provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and graphic display.

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?

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will focus meetings on how to improve school/teacher effectiveness and student achievement using the Problem Solving Model.

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet at least once per month (or more frequently as needed) to engage in the following activities:

- Review school-wide, grade level, and teacher data to problem solve needed interventions on a systemic level and identify students meeting/exceeding benchmarks as well as those at moderate or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. This will be done at least three times per year or more frequently if new data is available.
- Help referring teachers design feasible strategies and interventions for struggling students by collaborating regularly, problem solving, sharing effective practices, evaluating implementation, assist in making decisions for school, teacher, student improvement.
- Facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.
- Focus on improving student achievement outcomes with evidence based interventions implemented with fidelity and frequent progress monitoring.

Intervention teams also foster a sense of collegiality and mutual support among educators, promote the use of evidence-based interventions, and support teachers in carrying out

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

intervention plans.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures.
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. Tier 1 Academics: We will use Discovery for Reading, Math, and Third, Fourth, and Fifth Grade Science, resource created prompts for writing as well as end of the unit tests and STAR. Tier 2 Academics: We will use the results of Fountnas and Pinell, Extended Reading Passages, Oral Reading Fluency for Reading, along with math facts computation and Wylies Warm up for Math, in addition to all of the data sources for Tier 1. Tier 3 Academics: We will gather information from Tier 1 and 2 evaluations as well as include Odyssey Specific Skill Assessment and Discovery Targeted Diagnostics. IDEAs and Progress Reports will be used to retrieve data and Excel will be used for summary purposes as needed. Tier 1 Behavior: The initial data source will be from the Clipboard Check-Off Sheets provided by the teacher and PBS Behavior Charts. Tier 2 Behavior: In addition to the Tier 1 data, the teacher will complete a behavioral tracking tool; a Behavior Contract will be developed for the student. Tier 3 Behavior: All information from Tier 1 and Tier 2 will be utilized, additionally the teacher will begin implementation of a Behavior Intervention Plan. The progressive documentation will included: Teacher Clipboard, Teacher Notes, Referrals, Behavior Intervention Plan.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Professional development will be provided during the teachers' common planning time and sessions will occur throughout the year. The MTSS/RtI Overview will be provided in mid-August/September. The District has other mini-modules that will be provided throughout the year for Guidance and PBS/RTI members. The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will evaluate additional staff Professional development needs during the monthly MTSS/RtI Leadership Team meetings.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. Guidance Counselor and Admin Team conducts grade level meetings two times a month to support teachers' understanding of MTSS/RTI to support and provide professional development. Teacher Trainer, Guidance Counselor and Admin Team develop professional development to support teachers with classroom management. Tier 2 meetings are held weekly with Admin Team, Guidance Counselor, Teacher Trainer and LEA Facilitator to problem solve student deficiencies academically, behaviorally and/or attendance.

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Principal, Assistant Principal, AIF, LFS Coach, Teacher Trainer, 1 teacher from each grade level and the Media Specialist
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The team meets monthly to review data, identify target, enrichment, and intensive students, discuss curriculum, review instructional strategies and refine/adjust as indicated.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? To ensure curriculum is aligned to the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and to meet the rigor and relevance of FCAT 2.0. Incorporate High Yield Strategies across content such as summarizing, extended thinking, vocabulary development, cooperative learning, and writing in the content area.

Public School Choice

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

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

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

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

Alta Vista houses 3 pre-school sites with one 8x8 and two ESE units. Pre K students are continuously progress monitored and work within each one of the Individual Educational Plans (IEP). All Preschool teachers complete a data analysis sheet, on each student, to administration to describe specific skills and knowledge as well as the ability to form meaningful relationships. Those with low readiness receive intensive intervention with Speech and Language program plus assistance from local programs such as Head Start. In April, Pre K parents are encouraged to attend a Kindergarten Round-Up. Parents with their children are able to tour Kindergarten classrooms and meet teachers. Pre K parents are also given an orientation to assist in the transition by going over state mandates, district expectations, and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. Within the first 20 days of Kindergarten, students receive FLKRS, IDEL, and On-Going Assessments to measure academic and physical capabilities. After receiving data PreK and Kindergarten teachers meet to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the students. These results assist PreK teachers in a needs assessment of last year's outcomes. It also gives Kindergarten teachers a foundation of the student's academic knowledge. Funding for the Pre-K program comes entirely from the District budget.

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. Students struggle with higher order questioning and complex text.	1A.1. Teachers will increase the use of expository text from 50% to 80% using online material by focusing on the use of Higher Order Thinking Strategies through writing to summarize, extended thinking lessons, and the use of HOT questions. (70% of questions posed will be HOT.)	1A.1.Administration, School Leadership Team, Teachers	1A.1.Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	1A.1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
57% (182) (of the students tested will receive a Level 3 in Reading as indicated in the School Grades Report.	21% (81) of the students tested received a level 3 in reading on the 2012 FCAT.	57% (182) of the students tested will receive a Level 3 in Reading as indicated in the School Grades Report.	1A.2. Many teachers lack knowledge of high yield instructional strategies specific to their discipline or grade level which will increase student achievement.	1A.2. Professional development provided in the areas of how to write HOT questions, writing to summarize in the content area and how to determine text complexity.	1.Principal, AP/C/A, Instructional Facilitators/Teachers 2. Principal, AP/C/A, Instructional Facilitators/Teachers/PLCs 3. Principal, AP/C/A, Instructional Facilitators/Teachers/bi-weekly PLCs	1.Administer Formative assessments 2.Data Day Chats 3.Data Chats to make curricular/instructional decisions based on review of student data and artifacts 4.Data Chats to make	1. Discovery Assessments 2.Initial creation of MTSS Tier matrix of grade level scores by subject. 3.Common Assessments (Teacher made by grade level and

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

				<p>4. Principal, AP/C/A, Instructional Facilitators/Teachers/PLCs Simultaneous: 5.Principal, AP/C/A 6.School Leadership Team</p>	<p>curricular/instructional decisions based on review of student data and artifacts Simultaneous: 5.Daily classroom walk-throughs (3-5') Informal observations (10-25') Formal observations (30' or more) 6.2 Live Meetings 1st Progress Monitoring and Mid-Year)</p>	<p>subject) 4.Adjusted barriers and strategies by MTSS Tier matrix of grade level and subject 3 times within a school year. Simultaneous: Aggregated data by teacher, grade level, and subject area 6.Questions for Progress Monitoring</p>
<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</p>		1B.1. Does not apply	1B.1. Does not apply	1B.1. Does not apply	1B.1. Does not apply	1B.1. Does not apply
<p>Reading Goal #1B:</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>				
<p>Does not apply</p>	<p>Does not apply</p>	<p>Does not apply</p>				

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. Inconsistent or lack of connecting content to real world application.	2A.1. Build a real world connection by integrating all curriculum content, when possible, through the use of problem solving, extended thinking strategies, and online virtual acceleration. 2A.1. Initial CISM training for 4 th and 5 th grade teachers.	2A1. Administration, School Leadership Team	2A1. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	2A1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery, FCAT 2.0
29% (93) of the students tested will receive a Level 4 or higher in Reading as indicated in the School Grades Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * 19% (70) of the students tested in 2012 received a Level 4 or higher in Reading as indicated in the School Grades Report.	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 29% (93) of the students tested will receive a Level 4 or higher in Reading as indicated in the School Grades Report.					
	=		2A.2. Student assignments lack rigor.	2A.2. Webb's Depth of Knowledge Quad 4 will be used in all instructional strategies, stem questions, and assignments.	2A.2. Administration, School Leadership Team	2A.2. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	2A.2. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery, review of student work
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
Does Not Apply	2012 Current Level of Performance: * Does Not Apply	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * Does Not Apply					

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. Students reading and writing below grade level due to vocabulary development.	3A.1. Vocabulary development taught through the use of Word Walls, Making Words, Marzano's 6 Steps, and writing to summarize. 3A.1. Visual aids and consistent use of Florida's Common Language of Instruction by all staff to increase foundational principals and practices through the Common Core and NGSSS.	3A.1. Administration, School Leadership Team	3A.1. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	3A.1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery, review of student work
Reading Goal #3A: 100% (320) of the students tested will show Learning Gains indicated in the School Grades Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * <i>In grades 3-5, 73% of the students tested showed Learning Gains 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 100% (320) of the students tested will show Learning Gains indicated in the School Grades Report.					
			3A.2. Students may not be motivated to read.	3A.2. Provide multilevel, high interest text, with a visible reward system through AR and 100 Book Challenge.	3A.2. Administration, School Leadership Team, Classroom Teacher	3A.2. Review of Lesson Plans, AR Points and 100 Book Challenge Student Records	3A.2. AR Points and 100 Book Challenge Student Records, Discovery
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
Does Not Apply	2012 Current Level of Performance: * Does Not Apply	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * Does Not Apply					

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>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p> <p><u>Reading Goal #4A:</u></p> <p>100% of the students in the Lowest 25% will show Learning Gains indicated in the School Grades Report.</p>			<p>4A.1. Student's lack of understanding and comprehension skills when reading text due to limited language acquisition.</p>	<p>4A.1. Teachers will provide extensive opportunities for students to show, tell, explain and prove their answers using cooperative learning, Every Pupil Response and writing to summarize.</p>	<p>4A.1. Administration, School Leadership Team</p>	<p>4A1. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation</p>	<p>4A1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>86% of the students in the Lowest 25% showed Learning Gains indicated in the 2012 School Grades Report.</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>100% of the students in the Lowest 25% will show Learning Gains indicated in the School Grades Report.</p>						
			<p>4B.2. Students not making learning gains may need additional time to learn.</p>	<p>4B.2. Differentiated instruction will be used through an analysis of performance data to place students into guided reading groups, tutorial instruction, Intensive Instruction, and Extended Learning, tutoring before/after school will also be provided.</p>	<p>4B.2. Administration, School Leadership Team</p>	<p>4B.2 Review of participating student Discovery Test Scores as well as Pre/Post testing.</p>	<p>4B.2. Discovery Testing, Pre/Post testing.</p>

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

4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1. Does not apply	4B.1. Does not apply	4B.1. Does not apply	4B.1. Does not apply	4B.1. Does not apply
<u>Reading Goal #4B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Does not apply	Does not apply	Does not apply					

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 34%	40%	45%	51%	56%	62%	67%
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> By 2017 67% of the students tested will receive a Level 3 or higher in Reading on the PARCC.							

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 subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #5B:</p> <p>In grades 3-5 , the percentage of the students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report will be: Black: 39% Hispanic: 51% White: 72%</p>	<p>5B.1. Black: Hispanic: Students entering 3rd grade are reading and comprehending below grade level.</p>	<p>5B.1. Instructional practices will connect the Lesson Essential Question to prior knowledge, cultural relevance, and checking for understanding using Every Pupil Response. The use of Leveled Literacy Intervention Program in grades K-2 and the United Way ReadingPals program in Pre K - Kindergarten will also be incorporated.</p>	<p>5B.1. Title 1, Administration, School Leadership Team</p>	<p>5B.1. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation</p>	<p>5B.1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery</p>
	<p>5B.2. Students not making learning gains may need additional time to learn.</p>	<p>5B.2. Performance data will be used for targeted interventions including Extended Learning; tutoring before/after/during school, 30 minutes SSR time, use of FCAT Explorer/Odyssey and reading zones throughout school.</p>	<p>5B.2. Administration, School Leadership Team</p>	<p>5B.2 Review of participating student Discovery Test Scores as well as Pre/Post testing.</p>	<p>5B.2. Discovery Testing, Pre/Post testing, Cause Data</p>

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 have limited incoming vocabulary and experience with word attack (reading) and word usage (writing).	5C.1. Vocabulary will be explicitly and pervasively instructed using Marzano's 6 Steps throughout the content areas. Word Walls, Making Words, and cooperative learning strategies will be used to develop oral and written language.	5C.1. Administration, School Leadership Team	5C.1. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	5C.1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u> In grades 3-5, 45% of the English Language Learner students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report.	In grades 3-5, 35% of students of the English Language Learners made Learning Gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	In grades 3-5, 45% of the English Language Learner students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report..					
			5C.2. Students not making learning gains may need additional time to learn.	5C.2. Performance data will be used for targeted interventions including Extended Learning; tutoring before/after/during school, 30 minutes SSR time, use of FCAT Explorer/Odyssey and reading zones throughout school.	5C.2. Administration, School Leadership Team	5C.2 Review of participating student Discovery Test Scores as well as Pre/Post testing.	5C.2. Discovery Testing, Pre/Post testing.

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
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. Does not apply	5D.1. Does not apply	5D.1. Does not apply	5D.1. Does not apply	5D.1. Does not apply
Reading Goal #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Does not apply	Does not apply	Does not apply					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Students' lack of prior knowledge.	5E.1. Teachers will extensively use graphic organizers to structure learning, create activators to build on prior knowledge, and provide connections to content through visual aids, realia, etc.	5E.1. Administration, School Leadership Team	5E.1. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	5E.1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery
Reading Goal #5E:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In grades 3-5, there will be a 50% of the Economically Disadvantaged students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report.	<i>In grades 3-5, 40% of the Economically Disadvantaged students achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.</i>	<i>In grades 3-5, there will be a 50% of the Economically Disadvantaged students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report.</i>					
			5E.2. Students not making learning gains may need additional time to learn.	5E.2. Performance data will be used for targeted interventions including Extended Learning; tutoring before/after/during school, 30 minutes SSR time, use of FCAT Explorer/Odyssey and reading zones throughout school.	5E.2. Administration, School Leadership Team	5E.2 Review of participating student Discovery Test Scores as well as Pre/Post testing.	5E.2. Discovery Testing, Pre/Post testing.

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

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
Use of High Yield Strategies	All grades, all teachers	Admin	All classroom teachers	On Going during Tuesday and Thursdays grade level common planning time.	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin
Writing HOT Questions	All grades, all teachers	Admin	All classroom teachers	On Going during Tuesday and Thursdays grade level common planning time.	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin
Writing to Summarize	All grades, all teachers	Admin	All classroom teachers	On Going during Tuesday and Thursdays grade level common planning time.	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin
Writing in the Content Area	All grades, all teachers	Admin, Writing Resource	All classroom teachers	On Going during Tuesday and Thursdays grade level common planning time.	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin, Writing Resource
Determining Text Complexity	All grades, all teachers	District Personnel	All classroom teachers	On Going during Tuesday and Thursdays grade level common planning time.	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin
Effective Use of 100 Book Challenge	Fourth Grade Teachers	American Reading Specialist	Fourth Grade Teachers, Language Arts Resource	September 12, 2012	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin
Making Words	All grades, all teachers	Admin	All classroom teachers	Tuesday and Thursdays during grade level common planning time in September.	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin

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

Word Walls	All grades, all teachers	Admin	All classroom teachers	Tuesday and Thursdays during grade level common planning time in October.	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin
------------	--------------------------	-------	------------------------	---	--	-------

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide a variety of books to increase student interest in reading	100 Book Challenge	Title 1	11,400
Increase student vocabulary, phonemic awareness, phonics, and language awareness.	Making Words	Title 1	500
			Subtotal: 11,400
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
Support for A/R Program and Media Specialist	Media Para	Title 1	38,820
Title 1 Compliance	Program Facilitator		58,123
After School Tutoring	Teacher Pay and Busing	Title 1	11,650
			Subtotal: 108,593
			Total: 119,993

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		5C.1. Students have limited incoming vocabulary and knowledge of the English language.	5C.1. Vocabulary will be explicitly and pervasively instructed using Marzano’s 6 Steps throughout the content areas. Word Walls, Making Words, and collaborative structures will be used to develop oral language.	5C.1. Administration, School Leadership Team	5C.1. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	5C.1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery
CELLA Goal #1: In grades K-5 48% (174) of the students tested will be proficient in Listening Speaking as indicated by the 2013 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment Report.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 45% (164) of the students tested Spring 2012 were proficient in Listening Speaking as indicated by the Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment Report.					
		1.2. Students with limited incoming vocabulary may need additional time to learn.	1.2. Performance data will be used for targeted interventions including Extended Learning; tutoring before/after/during school, 30 minutes SSR time, use of FCAT Explorer/Odyssey and reading zones throughout school.	1.2. Administration, School Leadership Team	1.2 Review of participating student Discovery Test Scores as well as Pre/Post testing.	1.2. Discovery Testing, Pre/Post testing.

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

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
<p>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</p> <p><u>CELLA Goal #2:</u></p> <p>In grades K-5, 32% (115) of the students tested will be proficient in Reading as indicated by the 2013 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment Report.</p>	<p>2.1. Students lack oral reading fluency and comprehension strategies.</p>	<p>2.1. Teachers will pervasively use guided instruction with skill focus, modeled Think Alouds, and fluency practice throughout the content areas.</p>	<p>2.1. Administration, School Leadership Team</p>	<p>2.1. Review data from classroom tests, Discovery testing and FCAT Scores</p>	<p>2.1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery</p>
	<p>2.2. Students with limited incoming vocabulary may need additional time to learn.</p>	<p>2.2. Distribute ESOL Reading Back Packs and Summer Totes Performance data will be used for targeted interventions including Extended Learning; tutoring before/after/during school, 30 minutes SSR time, use of FCAT Explorer/Odyssey and reading zones throughout school.</p>	<p>2.2. Administration, School Leadership Team</p>	<p>2.2 Review of participating student Discovery Test Scores as well as Pre/Post testing.</p>	<p>2.2. Discovery Testing, Pre/Post testing.</p>

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.		3.1. Lack of grammar development and vocabulary.	3.1. Teachers will use Word Walls and FCIM Conventions to develop vocabulary and grammar. Writing will be used frequently to respond to new learning through summarizations, journals and graphic organizers.	3.1. Teacher	3.1 Observation of student application of vocabulary words from both direct instruction as well as words introduced using technology as evidenced in student writing	3.1. . Formal and informal vocabulary assessments, writing samples
<p><u>CELLA Goal #3:</u></p> <p>In grades K-5, 34% (121) of the students tested will be proficient in Writing as indicated by the 2013 Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment Report.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u></p> <p>In grades K-5, 31% (111) of the students tested Spring 2012 were proficient in Writing as indicated by the Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment Report..</p>					
		3.2. Students with limited incoming vocabulary may need additional time to learn.	3.2. Distribute ESOL Reading Back Packs and Summer Totes Performance data will be used for targeted interventions including Extended Learning; tutoring before/after/during school, 30 minutes SSR time, use of FCAT Explorer/Odyssey and reading zones throughout school.	3.2. Administration, School Leadership Team	3.2 Review of participating student Discovery Test Scores as well as Pre/Post testing.	3.2. Discovery Testing, Pre/Post testing.

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
256Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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 lack an in depth knowledge of the state standards	1A.1. Training for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade to analyze the FCAT 2.0 Content Focus Reports and Test Item Specifications	1A.1.Administration, Math Coach	1A.1.Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	1A.1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery
<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
58% (186) of the students tested will receive a Level 3 in Math as indicated in the School Grades Report.	28%(104) of the students tested received a level 3 in math on the 2012 FCAT.	58% (186) of the students tested will receive a Level 3 in Math as indicated in the School Grades Report.					
			1A.2. Teachers lack in depth knowledge of content and use of strategies that promote mathematical thinking.	1A.2. Provide professional development "Teaching Student Centered Mathematics" by Van de Walle to increase the use of pictorial to abstract representations of mathematics K-5.	1.Principal, AP/C/A, Instructional Facilitators/Teachers 2. Principal, AP/C/A, Instructional Facilitators/Teachers/PLCs 3. Principal, AP/C/A, Instructional Facilitators/Teachers/bi-weekly PLCs 4. Principal, AP/C/A, Instructional Facilitators/Teachers/PLCs	1.Administer Formative assessments 2.Data Day Chats 3.Data Chats to make curricular/instructional decisions based on review of student data and artifacts 4.Data Chats to make curricular/instructional decisions based on review of student data	1. Discovery Assessments 2.Initial creation of MTSS Tier matrix of grade level scores by subject. 3.Common Assessments (Teacher made by grade level and subject) 4.Adjusted barriers and strategies by

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

				Simultaneous: 5.Principal, AP/C/A 6.School Leadership Team	and artifacts Simultaneous: 5.Daily classroom walk-throughs (3-5') Informal observations (10-25') Formal observations (30' or more) 6.2 Live Meetings 1 st Progress Monitoring and Mid-Year)	MTSS Tier matrix of grade level and subject 3 times within a school year. Simultaneous: Aggregated data by teacher, grade level, and subject area 6.Questions for Progress Monitoring
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Achievement Level 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.		1B.1. Does Not Apply	1B.1. Does Not Apply	1B.1. Does Not Apply	1B.1. Does Not Apply	1B.1. Does Not Apply
Mathematics Goal #1B: Does Not Apply	2012 Current Level of Performance: Does Not Apply	2013 Expected Level of Performance: Does Not Apply				

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4, and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Students lack connections between mathematical concepts.	2A.1. Provide professional development for teachers to build their knowledge on mathematical connections to assist students on understanding how the different mathematical concepts are interrelated.	2A1. Administration, Math Coach	2A1. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	2A1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
28% (90) of the students tested will receive a Level 4 or higher in Math as indicated in the School Grades Report.	19% (71) of the students tested received a Level 4 or higher in Math as indicated in the 2012 School Grades Report	28% (90) of the students tested will receive a Level 4 or higher in Math as indicated in the School Grades Report					
			2A.2 . Teachers need to probe students to find more than one solution to solve problems.	2A.2. . Use of Extended Thinking Strategies and HOT questioning in mathematical problem solving. 2A.2. Provide students with the opportunity to justify their thinking in writing.	2A.2. Administration, Math Coach	2A.2. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	2A.2. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery, review of student work

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

2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply
Does Not Apply	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply					
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. Teacher adjusts instruction to respond to formative assessment.	3A.1. Teachers will frequently check for understanding and make consistent modifications of instructional strategies such as: Targeted interventions, reteach, Data Chats and opportunities to practice. 5th grade will be provided a 1 hour computer block to increase math skills/strategies on the computer.	3A.1. Administration, Math Coach	3A.1. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	3A.1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery, review of student work
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
100% (320) of the students tested will show Learning Gains in Math indicated in the School Grades Report.	72% (270) of the students tested showed Learning Gains in Math.	100% (320) of the students tested will show Learning Gains in Math indicated in the School Grades Report.					
			3A.2. Teachers do not provide sufficient opportunity for formative assessments.	3A.2. Teachers will frequently use Cooperative Learning through collaborative pairs, use of white boards for Every Pupil Response, and Think Alouds.	3A.2. Administration, Math Coach	3A.2. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	3A.2. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery, review of student work

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

3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1. Does Not Apply	3B.1. Does Not Apply	3B.1. Does Not Apply	3B.1. Does Not Apply	3B.1. Does Not Apply
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#3B: Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply					

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
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Students lack knowledge of basic math facts.	4A.1. Increase time spent allocated to fact fluency using Math Party and online practice of fact fluency.	4A.1. Administration, Math Coach	4A.1. Review of Lesson Plans, test scores, Targeted observation	4A.1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery, review of student work
<u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u> 100% of the students tested will show Learning Gains in Math indicated in the 2013 School Grades Report.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 67% of the students tested showed Learning Gains in Math indicated in the 2012 School Grades Report.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 100% of the students tested will show Learning Gains in Math indicated in the 2013 School Grades Report.					
			4A.2. Teacher needs to provide extensive opportunities for computation mastery.	4A.2. Provide professional development for strategies such as doubles, doubles plus 1, skip counting.	4A.2. Administration, Math Coach	4A.2. Review of Lesson Plans, test scores, Targeted observation	4A.2. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery, review of student work.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1. Does Not Apply	4B.1. Does Not Apply	4B.1. Does Not Apply	4B.1. Does Not Apply	4B.1. Does Not Apply
<u>Mathematics Goal #4B:</u> Does Not Apply	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Does Not Apply	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Does Not Apply					

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%. <u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> By 2017 69% of the students tested will receive a Level 3 or higher in Math on the PARCC.	Baseline data 2010-2011 <u>37</u>		47%	48%	53%	58%	63%	69%
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> In grades 3-5, the percentage of the students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report will be: Black: 40% Hispanic: 62% White: 71%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Black:30% Hispanic:52% White:61%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In grades 3-5, the percentage of the students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report will be: Black: 40% Hispanic: 62% White: 71%	5B.1. All Ethnic/Racial Subgroups: Students lack the strategies to successfully answer word problems.	5B.1. Provide professional development for the 4 Step Problem Solving Process with priority given to the first step – understanding the problem.	5B.1. Administration, Math Coach	5B.1. Review of Lesson Plans, test scores, Targeted observation	5B.1 Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery, review of student work.	
			5B.2. Students not making learning gains may need additional time to learn.	5B.2. Performance data will be used for targeted interventions including Extended Learning; tutoring before/after/during school using V Math, FCAT Explorer	5B.2. Administration, Math Coach, Lab Manager	5B.2 Review of participating student Discovery Test Scores as well as Pre/Post testing.	5B.2. Discovery Testing, FCAT Explorer and Odyssey Reports.	

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

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

			and Odyssey as tutorials.			
--	--	--	---------------------------	--	--	--

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. Mathematics Goal #5C: In grades 3-5 , 53% of the English Language Learner students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report.			5C.2. Students lack the vocabulary to problem solve.	5C.2. Teachers will use Shape Bait, What’s My Place, What’s My Value, and Number Literacy to increase vocabulary development.	5C.2. Administration, Math Coach	5C.2. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	5C.2. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery, review of student work.		
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></td> <td><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>43% of the ELL students tested were proficient in Math indicated in the 2012 School Grades Report.</td> <td>In grades 3-5 , 53% of the English Language Learner students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report.</td> </tr> </table>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	43% of the ELL students tested were proficient in Math indicated in the 2012 School Grades Report.	In grades 3-5 , 53% of the English Language Learner students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report.	5C.2. Students not making learning gains may need additional time to learn.	5C.2. Performance data will be used for targeted interventions including Extended Learning; tutoring before/after/during school using V Math, FCAT Explorer and Odyssey as tutorials.
<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>								
43% of the ELL students tested were proficient in Math indicated in the 2012 School Grades Report.	In grades 3-5 , 53% of the English Language Learner students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report.								

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
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. Does Not Apply	5D.1. Does Not Apply	5D.1. Does Not Apply	5D.1. Does Not Apply	5D.1. Does Not Apply
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply					
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. Teacher needs to allow students more time to explore and talk about mathematical concepts.	5E.1. Provide more time in math block schedule to utilize Kagan structures, Every Pupil Response, and written summaries.	5E.1. Administration, Math Coach	5E.1. Review of Lesson Plans, test scores, Targeted observation	5E.1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery, review of student work.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5E:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In grades 3-5 , 57% of the Economically Disadvantaged students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report.	47% of the Econ Disa. students tested were proficient in Math indicated in the 2012 School Grades Report.	In grades 3-5 , 57% of the Economically Disadvantaged students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report.					
			5E.2. Students not making learning gains may need additional time to learn.	5E.2. Performance data will be used for targeted interventions including Extended Learning; tutoring before/after/during school using V Math, FCAT Explorer and Odyssey as tutorials.	5E.2. Administration, Math Coach, Lab Manager	5E.2 Review of participating student Discovery Test Scores as well as Pre/Post testing.	5E.2. FCAT Explorer Reports and Odyssey reports.

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

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
Mathematical concepts, relationships, and real world problem solving	K-5	Admin, Math Coach	All classroom teachers	On Going during Tuesday and Thursday grade level common planning time.	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin, Math Coach
Bait Trainings	K-5	Math Coach	New teachers school-wide	September 12, 2012	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin, Math Coach
Test Specifications	K-5	Math Coach	3 rd -5 th	September 17, 2012	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin, Math Coach
Student Centered Math	K-5	Math Coach	All classroom teachers	On Going	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin, Math Coach

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Effective Math Instruction	Math Resource	Title 1	50,969
			Subtotal: 50,969
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Use of FCAT Explorer and Odyssey	Lab Manager	Title 1	29,972
After School Tutoring	Teacher Pay and Busing	Title 1	11,650
			Subtotal: 41,622
			Total: 92,591

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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. Many teachers lack an understanding of the misconceptions in Science.	1A.1. Professional development by AIF about common scientific misconceptions and on the use of Test Item Specifications to clarify content focus and limitations.	1A.1. Administration, Science AIF	1A.1. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	1A.1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery
Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In grade 5 34% (36) of the students will score a Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Science Test as evidenced by the School Grades Report.	In grade 5, 24% (27) of the students achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test	In grade 5 34% (36) of the students will score a Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Science Test as evidenced by the School Grades Report.					
			1A.2. Teachers lack the knowledge of how to develop meaningful inquiry activities that provide HOT opportunities in Science.	1A.2 Provide professional development on meaningful inquiry and implement at least one inquiry-based activity in Science lab for every unit of instruction.	1A.2. Administration, Science AIF	1A.2. . Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	1A.2. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1. Does Not Apply	1B.1. Does Not Apply	1B.1. Does Not Apply	1B.1. Does Not Apply	1B.1. Does Not Apply
Science Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply					

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. Inadequate opportunity for students to practice meaningful construction of Science inquiry to solve problems.	2A.1. Teacher will provide opportunities for these students to participate in lab inquiry activities, with a focus on the Methods of Science, through collaborative structures, distributive practice and distributive summarizing	2A.1. Administration, Science AIF	2A.1. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	2A.1. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery
Science Goal #2A: In grade 5 16% (17) of the students will score a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science Test as evidenced by the School Grades Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * In grade 5 10% (11) of the students scored a Level 4 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Science Test as evidenced by the School Grades Report.	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * In grade 5 16% (17) of the students will score a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science Test as evidenced by the School Grades Report.			
	2A.2. Students are not engaged in purposeful reading and writing about advanced science concepts.	2A.2. Professional development on Literacy in Science Inquiry (Focus). 2A.2. Students will increase time spent reading expository text as related to Science and respond, in writing, to HOT prompts. CISM	2A.2. Administration, Science AIF	2A.2. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	2A.2. Teacher Evaluation System, Discovery

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

2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1. Does Not Apply	2B.1. Does Not Apply	2B.1. Does Not Apply	2B.1. Does Not Apply	2B.1. Does Not Apply
<u>Science Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply					

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Test Item Specifications	3-5	Science AIF	Classroom Teachers 3-5	September 2012	Review of Lesson Plans, Walk-Throughs	Admin, AIF
Scientific Inquiry	3-5	Science AIF	Classroom Teachers 3-5	On Going	Review of Lesson Plans, Walk-Throughs	Admin, AIF

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
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Effective Science Instruction	Science AIF	Title 1	
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Students lack of grammatical and language development.	1A.1. Writing and grammatical editing will be increased using daily oral language development strategies and revision of writing assignments that correlate to the FCAT 2.0 rubric.	1A.1. Administration, Writing Resource Teacher	1A.1. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	1A.1. FCAT 2.0 Rubric, Teacher Evaluation System
Writing Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In grade 4 , 100% (110) of the students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report.	In grade 4, 89% (116) of the students achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test	In grade 4 , 100% (110) of the students will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report.					
			1A.2. Lack of consistent writing expectations from grade to grade.	1A.2. Both horizontal and vertical teaming to evaluate the rigor and expectations of student writing using FCAT 2.0 and school scoring rubrics.	1A.2. Administration, Writing Resource Teacher	1A.2. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	1A.2. FCAT 2.0 Rubric, Teacher Evaluation System

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			Does Not Apply	1B.1. Does Not Apply	1B.1. Does Not Apply	1B.1. Does Not Apply	1B.1. Does Not Apply
Writing Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply	Does Not Apply					

ADDITIONAL GOAL: Students scoring at Achievement Level 4.0 and higher in writing.			1B.1. Formulaic writing is no longer sufficient to achieve a 4 or above on FL Writes.	1B.1. Teachers will review 2012 Anchor Sets, FCAT 2.0 Rubric, Calibration Guide, and FL Writes Q & A released by FL DOE. Student writing samples will be evaluated monthly using FCAT 2.0 rubric to provide students with high quality feedback.	1B.1. Administration, Writing Resource Teacher	1B.1. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	1B.1. FCAT 2.0 Rubric, Teacher Evaluation System
Writing Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In grade 4 , 90% (99) of the students will score a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report.	In grade 4, 34% (36) of the students achieved mastery on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Writing Test	In grade 4 , 90% (99) of the students will score a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing Test as evidenced by the School Grade Report.					
			1B.2. Some students may experience difficulty in thinking critically while reading, writing and /or understanding content area curriculum.	1B.2. Students write to respond to new learning in all content areas through summarizing, journaling, and/or paraphrasing.	1B.1. Administration, Writing Resource Teacher	1B.1. Review of Lesson Plans, Targeted observation	1B.1. FCAT 2.0 Rubric, Teacher Evaluation System

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Making Words	All grades, all teachers	Admin	All classroom teachers	Tuesday and Thursdays during grade level common planning time in September.	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin, Writing Resource
Word Walls	All grades, all teachers	Admin	All classroom teachers	Tuesday and Thursdays during grade level common planning time in October.	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin, Writing Resource
Anchor Sets, Calibration Guide, FCAT 2.0 Rubric	All grades, all teachers	Admin	All classroom teachers	Tuesday and Thursdays during grade level common planning time in October.	Classroom Observation, Review of Plans	Admin, Writing Resource

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

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
			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
Support for Effective Writing Instruction	Writing Resource Teacher	Title 1	52,293
After School Tutoring	Teacher Pay and Busing		11,650
			Subtotal: 63,943
			Total: 63,943

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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. Inadequate Parent/Teacher communication	1.1. Phone calls, home visits, and/or mail to families regarding Attendance Contract established in the PBS/RTI manual. Professional Development with Guidance Counselor to review Attendance issues and strategies.	Attendance Manager, Guidance Counselor, Social Worker, Admin	Attendance Records	Genesis/Elegrade reporting system
Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
The attendance rate for Alta Vista Elementary during the 2012-2013 school year, as reported in Genesis, will be 96%.	<i>In 2011-12 the District Average Attendance was 95.08% while the attendance rate during the 2011-2012 school year was 95.25% for Alta Vista Elementary.</i>	<i>The attendance rate for Alta Vista Elementary during the 2012-2013 school year, as reported in Genesis, will be 96%.</i>					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	1.2. Parent understanding of school/district policies/procedures.	1.2. Conduct Parent meetings to build communication of policies and procedures for attendance and hold intervention conferences for students with excessive tardies and/or absences			
	31% (243)	<i>The expected number of excessive absences for 2012-13 at Alta Vista, as reported in Genesis, should be 193 or less.</i>	1.3 Students lack interest in school.	1.3. Provide incentives for students at the end of each 9 weeks for 100% attendance.			

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

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	8.7% (68)	<i>The expected number of excessive tardies for 2012-13 at Alta Vista, as reported in Genesis, should be 58 or less.</i>					

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

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Understanding Attendance Problems	K-5	Admn/Guidance	Schoolwide	September	Review of Elegrade	Admin, Guidance
School/District Policies/Procedures for Parents	Parents	Admin/Guidance	Parents	September 25	Review of Elegrade	Admin, Guidance

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

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

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension					
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Suspension			1.1. Students lack social skills.	1.1. Implement Positive Behavior Support with Hornet Bucks reward system and provide teachers with problem solving strategies for maximizing instructional and non instructional on task student behaviors.	1.1. Admin, PBS/RTI Committee, Guidance Counselor, Teacher Trainer, Network Manager	1.1. Teacher submitted referrals	1.1. Records of referrals on Genesis.	
Suspension Goal #1: The Total number of Suspensions for Alta Vista Elementary during the 2012-2013 school year, as reported in Genesis, will be decreased by 5%.	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions						
	25 incidents	<i>It is expected that In-School Suspensions will be 20 students or less</i>						
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School	1.2. Teacher inconsistent use of PBS.	1.2. Teachers will consistently provide students with consistent and appropriate feedback using sensitivity, openness, and respect to build a positive rapport in the classroom. Provide teachers with updated PBS training and use of preventative techniques. School-wide expectations will be modeled through lessons provided on AVTV.				
	23 students	<i>It is expected that the number of students assigned In-School Suspensions will be 20 or less.</i>						
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions						
	64 incidents	<i>It is expected Suspensions will be 60 or less.</i>						
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	1.3. Students lack effective role models.	1.3. Implement mentoring program with local high schools.					
40 students	<i>It is expected the number of students assigned Suspensions will be 35 or less.</i>							

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PBS Review	K-5	Guidance Counselor, PBS team	School-wide	September 2012	Observations, PBS charts, Referrals	Admin, Guidance, Teacher Trainer

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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
Assist teachers with effective classroom management skills	Teacher Trainer	Title 1	51,969.00
			Subtotal:
			Total: 51,969.00

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.</i>	See Alta Vista Parent Involvement Plan submitted on the state Template October, 2012.				
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Parent Friendly Office	All	District	Office Staff	Fall 2012	Observation/Comment Cards	administration

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			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
Bilingual Contact for Parents	Parent Involvement Para	Title 1	24,506
Means of Parent Communication	Wednesday Folders and Student Agendas	Title 1	7,000
			Subtotal: 31,506
			Total: 31,506

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p><u>STEM Goal #1:</u> Alta Vista will show 100% learning gains in math and science, through the increase use of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics in our STEM labs.</p>	<p>1.1. Teachers lack of in depth knowledge in the content areas to implement STEM's</p>	<p>1.1. Teachers will plan and co-teach with the Science and Math AIF's in the labs so students will be critical thinkers and build connections to real world applications.</p>	<p>1.1. Admin, Leadership Team, District Content Personnel</p>	<p>1.1. Review of Action Plan</p>	<p>1.1. Action Plan</p>
	<p>1.2. Time to plan implementation.</p>	<p>1.2. STEM lab schedule will be built into Science and Math Block times. Science and Math AIF will plan cooperatively with classroom teacher for the use of high yield strategies in the STEM lab.</p>	<p>1.2. Admin, Leadership Team</p>	<p>1.2. School Calendar</p>	<p>1.2. Action Plan</p>

STEM Professional Development

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

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

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total: 119,993
CELLA Budget	Total:
Mathematics Budget	Total: 92,591
Science Budget	Total:
Writing Budget	Total: 63,943
Civics Budget	Total:
U.S. History Budget	Total:
Attendance Budget	Total:
Suspension Budget	Total: 51,969
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total: 31,506
STEM Budget	Total:
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total:
	Grand Total: 348,852

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

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

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

- 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.

School Advisory Councils assist in the preparation, implementation, and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan. The Council makes recommendations and assists the school administration in all areas of school improvement. These functions are performed through participatory decision-making by parents, educators, school staff, business people, and other community members who are stakeholders in the school.

The SAC Council is in effect for the duration of each school year. 51% of the School Advisory Council membership will be composed of parents are elected to the School Advisory Council by parents, and in the event that the elections do not constitute a membership that is balanced by ethnicity, race, socioeconomic, status of the student population, the principal may appoint member.

Community members are appointed by the principal with input from the School Advisory Council membership. All new members joining the Council will receive training prior to or during the first meeting in September. Any member who accumulates 2 consecutive unexplained absences from noticed meetings will be replaced by the principal with School Advisory Council approval. Meeting times and places will be agreed upon by all members of the School Advisory Council at the first meeting. Each meeting shall be held at 9:30 a.m. Each year the time, date, and place of any meeting may be modified based upon the consensus vote of the members present at any meeting. Notice of each meeting will be given 2 weeks prior to each scheduled meeting by email, mail, phone call. The notice will include any votes that will be presented for a vote to the membership. The operation of the School Advisory Council is governed by Florida Statute 229.58 the policies of the Polk County School District and the Government in the Sunshine Law. Decisions made by the School Advisory Council must be made within the boundaries of Polk County School Board policy. School Board members may review School Advisory Council By-Laws. School Board

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

members approve School Advisory Membership and the School Improvement Plan. The School Advisory Council at Alta Vista Elementary functions using all perimeters above and assures the continuous progress of Florida's eight education goals in the school. The SAC operates within the policies of the School Board and the parameters established by the state legislature. Our school advisory council is composed of teachers, parents, the principal, support staff, business and community representatives that reflect the ethnic, racial and socio-economic background of our community. They also participate in the decision-making process regarding school improvement at the school level. The SAC also helps to develop and monitors the activities and progress of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) as well as the school's annual budget. This includes but not limited to lottery allocations and school recognition funds. The SAC assists in the development of the budget and SIP plan by meeting and reviewing data. After reviewing data recommendations are given to assists in the area of student achievement and progress.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Student Incentives, Academic Programs, and Materials	