

Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

Name of School:

Apollo Elementary

Area:

North Area

Principal:

Dr. Pamella R. O’Kell

Area Superintendent:

Dr. Ronald Bobay

SAC Chairperson:

Mr. Obeth Diaz

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

To educate all students with excellence as the standard, working together in a safe professional learning community.

Vision Statement:

To inspire all children to learn at their highest potential, preparing them for tomorrow’s global expectations.

Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

Student Achievement Data--Data based on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT 2.0)

The FCAT is a standards-based test, which means it measures how well students are mastering specific skills defined for each grade by the state of Florida. In the 2011-2012 school year, the Florida Department of Education changed the grading criterion, making it tougher for a school to maintain a School Grade of “A”. Now, included in the calculation are all subgroup scores (i.e. ESOL and students with disabilities). Previously, those scores were extracted. The table below compares 3-years of achievement data showing School and State-average scores for the FCAT for level 3 (percent in achievement) and higher.

Grade 3	2010	State	2011	State	2012	State
Reading	87	(73)	83	(73)	72	(56)
Math	84	(79)	83	(78)	72	(58)

Grade 4	2010		2011		2012	
Reading	83	(72)	77	(72)	76	(62)
Math	81	(75)	80	(75)	72	(60)
Writing	84	(75)	98	(74)	82	(60)

Grade 5	2010		2011		2012	
Reading	76	(70)	71	(70)	78	(61)
Science	68	(49)	67	(51)	73	(51)
Math	79	(64)	58	(64)	72	(57)

Grade 6	2010		2011		2012	
Reading	89	(68)	83	(68)	72	(57)
Math	85	(76)	81	(58)	80	(53)

The data displays a three-year period; Apollo's scores exceed state averages in all subject areas, showing a trend of continuous improvement. Please note: 2012 FCAT 2.0 scores reflect the drastic change in which Florida scores are calculated, and the increased rigor of the tests themselves. All schools in Florida were affected proportionately. Nevertheless, Apollo's scores are well above state averages (shown in parenthesis). The data also shows state averages dropped significantly from 2011 to 2012 school years. However, Apollo's student scores maintained above average, and did not drop proportionately with the state average. To further explain, in third-grade Reading, the state average percentage dropped 17 points, while Apollo dropped 11 percentage points. In fourth grade Reading, the state average dropped 10 percentage points, while Apollo only dropped one percentage point. There was a significant increase in fifth-grade Math. The State's score lost 7 points, while Apollo gained 14 points. It is also important to point out the percentage of students receiving free/reduced lunch increased from 35% to 55% in a five-year span. The trend for continuous improvement is clear, especially in student- learning gains in Math and Reading.

Reading - 76% of Apollo students in Grades 3-6 were proficient on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment. This is a 10% decrease from the previous year. Although percentages of students at Level 3 or above decreased, there was an increase in the percentages of students making learning gains in Reading by 6%. In 2010, 73% of students make learning gains in Reading and in 2011, 74% of students made a learning gain in Reading. In 2012, 80% of students made learning gains in Reading. The data indicates a 7% increase in learning gains from the previous 2 years. Over the past 3 years, Reading scores have fluctuated. In 2010, Apollo scored 91% on Reading FCAT. In comparison, Apollo scored 86% on the 2011 Reading FCAT 2.0, and 76% in 2012. One major finding from analyzing the data, was 3rd grade scores. The data revealed a 10% decrease in students scoring Level 3 or above, but continued to show high marks compared to State and District averages. 72% of 3rd- grade students scored on or above grade level. We firmly believe that if our Kindergarten- 2nd grade teachers continue to lay a strong foundation, implementing Common Core State Standards, student achievement will increase, especially with our 3rd - 6th grade students. In addition, teachers will be successful in closing the achievement gap in all student subgroups.

Writing – Results of 2012 FCAT Writes indicate 82% of Apollo's 4th- grade students met high standards in Writing, scoring 3.0 or higher. The data indicates a 16% decrease from the previous year in writing. However, the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing had increased the rigor with mechanics and spelling conventions which increased testing difficulty. Nevertheless, Apollo students met or were equal to District and State averages. In comparison, 98% of Apollo's students were proficient in Writing in 2011, up from 84% in 2010. Teacher Learning Communities (TLC) will continue to address our Writing expectations of scoring a 4.0 or higher to meet high standards. Regularly, administration reviewed Writing samples for all 4th-grade students. This provided positive feedback to students. As administration observed students in the classroom, students were excited to share their stories.

Math – Results of 2012 FCAT 2.0, indicate 76% of students scored at grade level or higher, which is an 8% decrease from the previous year. The data also indicates that we are still below our Math score of 3 years ago. In 2012, we had 88% making learning gains in Math. This was an 11% increase from the previous two years. In 2010, 89% of Apollo students were proficient in Math. The data reflects an increase of 22% learning gains in Math. There was a 17% increase in learning gains for students in the lowest 25% from the previous year. In addition, 6th grade had the largest percentage (80%) of students scoring at level 3 or above. 6th grade students maintained their high scores from previous years, indicating a consistent pattern in this area. Teachers contribute implementing Higher-order thinking skills to their successful teaching. Three years analysis of the data also indicates that 4th grade have not been able to maintain an upward trend on their Math scores. Our Teacher Learning Communities will maintain a particular focus on these particular areas of concern.

Science – The 2012 FCAT2.0 Science scores indicate 73% of the 5th- grade students met high standards in Science, up from 67% in 2011. In 2010, 68% of Apollo students were meeting high standards in Science.

We will continue to adapt and focus on ensuring students continue to meet high standards at level 3 or higher. Higher-order questioning is utilized in classrooms as evidenced through the delivery of Science instruction. Teachers engage students in scientific inquiry, experiments, and discussions. We have implemented the use of Science notebooks/journals to self-progress monitor. Despite the fact, cut scores were changed for the 2012 FCAT 2.0, there is an upward trend in learning gains overall in the scores. The practice of keeping Science notebooks/journals will continue.

Increasing Level 4 and 5 students in all subjects will be an area of focus. The Reading Leadership Team along with the Data Teams give input for quantitative and qualitative data to progress monitor students at all grade levels, K-6 grades.

Results from the 2011-2012 Parent Survey showed over 84% of parents indicated they are “satisfied” with classroom instruction of all core subjects at Apollo Elementary.

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

Current practices in Reading, Writing, Math and Science for Apollo Elementary:

The Macmillan/McGraw-Hill Florida Treasures program is the adopted District Reading program. The 90-minute uninterrupted Reading block is scheduled daily. The 30-minute *iii* (Triple I Remediation) is set aside, daily, outside of the 90-minute uninterrupted Reading block. Differentiated instruction in small groups has been a focus in grades K-6, honing in on comprehension, fluency, and vocabulary skills. Progress Monitoring Plans are created and implemented for all below-grade level (BGL) students to address deficient areas. Additionally, 3rd-grade Level-1 students will be recommended for ASP (Academic Support Program) classes, as well as any Level-1 student in 3-6 grades. Voyager Reading Program will be used with second and third-grade students working BGL to differentiate instruction for areas in need of improvement. Diagnostic testing and a PASI/PSI 3.1 are administered to the lowest 25% of students in Reading, inclusive of all third-grade students working BGL in Reading, with emphasis on Level-1 students. Differentiated instruction in a flexible small group setting and *iii*, Tier 2, will be in place for the lowest 25% of students in Reading. Voyager, (2nd & 3rd grades) and Triumphs will be used for *iii* instruction, Tier 2, for BGL students in Reading for K-6 grades. Progress monitoring will take place for the lowest 25% of students, inclusive of all 3rd-grade students and Level-1 students in Reading. The Writing programs currently used for Writing in K-6 grades, consists of the *Piece By Piece* pacing guide, *Developing Artistic Writing Conventions* and *Writing Skills* in place. Two Writing books, *Mentoring Text*, and *Nonfiction Mentoring Text*, have been provided as professional development for teachers to further enhance Writing instruction, this year. Apollo Elementary has provided professional development in Writing instruction for the past several years. Last year, a school-wide Writing cadre was established. The Writing POC (Point of Contact), and a member of each grade level from K-6 grades, compose the Writing cadre. The Writing POC will relay communication from District meetings to the Writing cadre with updated information. A 30-minute time frame is scheduled each day allowing for student Writing instruction, outside of the 90-minute Reading block. District Writing assessments are analyzed in each grade level, adjusting instruction as necessary. The Writing cadre collaborates on ways in which to improve Writing instruction in areas indicated from the District Writing assessment.

Currently, Scott Foresman enVision (K-5 grades) and the Macmillan/McGraw-Hill Glencoe (6th- grade) Math programs are implemented for Mathematics instruction 90 minutes, daily. Formative Assessments and progress-monitoring data drive Math instruction. 3rd- grade classes will be conducting timed skill tests to improve student achievement in Math. Teachers and Title I instructors, incorporate differentiated instruction for students working BGL in Math, inclusive of the lowest 25% of students and all subgroups. Title I instructors and teachers will incorporate B.E.S.T. instructional strategies to retain and increase 2013 FCAT 2.0 scores of Level 4 & 5 students. New this year, SES (Supplemental Educational Services) tutoring will be provided for all Level-1 & 2 students from the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading and Math scores. Teachers work with BGL (below grade level) students using the following scientifically researched-based programs: FCAT Explorer, FCAT Focus, FCAT

TestMaker, Lexia Suite, Math Solutions, Heinemann Reading Program, Fountas and Pinnell Running Records, and Brain Pop. The 5th and 6th - grade teachers will be using SuccessMaker to help drive small-group instruction in reading and math skills. Progress monitoring and/or formative assessments takes place through the use of FAIR, SRI (Scholastic Reading Inventory), running records, district benchmark, DBQ's (Document Based Questioning) and inventory testing to determine student academic progress in Reading and Math. The FCAT 2.0 strands which need additional emphasis are: Reading Applications and Literary Analysis.

The Science curriculum, National Geographic, is currently in place for grades K-5. The 6th-grade curriculum is Discovery Education. Science instruction is aligned with the Next Generation of Florida Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS). Science literacy is developed by actively involving students in investigations, teaching content area as well as the essential process skills with real-world connections. Strands needing emphasis are Physical Science and Earth & Space Science. Increased attendance in Science ASP (Academic Support Program) classes is desired, as attendance has been low.

The data reflects increased student achievement with the current instructional strategies we are utilizing in the classroom, along with the proper implementation of our core programs. Currently, instructional strategies include an emphasis on differentiated instruction, Graphic Organizers and Higher-order thinking skills. Action plans were developed and implemented through the 2011-2012 School Improvement Plans. Teachers PGP's (Professional Growth Plans) coincided with the SIP objectives. However, research suggests that if we implement more Higher-order Questioning (HOQ) into lesson delivery, student achievement can increase. Apollo Elementary's Professional Learning Community provides for strong grade-level teams, meeting regularly to share data progress monitoring, strategies, and ideas to help increase student achievement. Teachers share the responsibility of disaggregating the data, collaborating to identify strengths and weaknesses to positively impact student learning. Teachers are provided a common planning time, meeting at least weekly, and with administrators and other supportive services. Additional time is given to teachers for peer observations, inputting data, and team meetings. Teachers visit each other's classrooms, helping one another to hone in on specific instructional strategies, or for sharpening their own lesson design. Productive feedback is given to teachers through informal meetings and observations. This was a big step for teachers to take, however, realizing the benefit, this practice permeated throughout the school. During meetings, student progress indicators are discussed, along with visual explanations (charts, etc.). We look for areas of needed improvement, brainstorming ways in which to help one another. Teachers were surveyed for input for School Improvement. They were asked, "if there was one strategy to implement this year that would be implemented with fidelity, what would it be?" The teachers chorally responded, "Higher-Order Questioning." Teachers understand the scaffolding techniques in HOQ that foster the conditions for increased critical thinking. They also understand that the critical thinking is embedded throughout the Common Core Standards. The ability to discern and comprehend increases the critically thinking ability. This fosters supportive conditions for a more cohesive PLC. However, we need to insure that all teachers have opportunities to collaborate and are provided consistent professional development. Thus, we believe that the continuation of Higher-Order Questioning will enable us to further close the achievement gap across in all subgroups. In order to meet Annual Measureable Goals, this is Apollo's focus.

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

Currently, Apollo teachers are learning to integrate HOQ into lesson delivery. As evidenced through administrative Classroom Walkthroughs, and by surveying teachers, progress is being made. However, HOQ is not consistently utilized throughout the school. Research tells us that in order to be globally competitive, higher levels of literal comprehension are necessary. Although the data above shows a trend of improvement, more work in HOQ must be done to continue the trend. In *Classrooms that Work* (2007), Cunningham and Allington purport by asking

questions that have more than one answer, engaging students in conversations, encouraging students to problem solve, and self-regulate and monitor their own comprehension...improves student achievement. Furthermore, in a study conducted by Wharton-McDonald, Pressley, & Hampston (1998), teachers in the highest-achieving classes utilized lots of scaffolding and coaching, emphasizing self-regulation and self-monitoring. The most effective teachers emphasized higher-level thinking skills. Quality questioning is at the heart of good teaching and learning giving teachers additional tools to reinforce techniques to focus on curriculum essentials (Walsh & Sattes, 2005). Apollo data indicates an overall focus should concentrate on an "in-depth" level of comprehension in all grade levels for all core subjects. In 2011, the Reading FCAT 2.0 score was 86% and in 2012, the Reading FCAT 2.0 score of 76% with a 10% drop school wide in comprehension standards. Although, there was an overall increase of learning gains in both Reading and Math for the 2012 FCAT 2.0 scores, there still needs to be more emphasis on comprehension across all subject areas. Each year, Apollo Elementary continues to build a wide repertoire of professional development in order to enhance instruction. By implementing additional Higher-Order-Questioning strategies, teachers will be able to reinforce their teaching techniques and continue to strengthen their skills, enhancing classroom strategies that promote rigor and relevance throughout the curriculum.

Questioning, thinking, and understanding are the three processes that interact in a dynamic fashion to advance student learning, performance, and achievement. (Walsh & Sattes, 2005) Marzano's *Essential Instructional Strategies* will continue to be implemented, this year, with a special emphasis on Higher-order Questioning. Questioning is one of the "essential nine" instructional practices identified by (Marzano, Pickering & Pollock, 2001). It is closely linked to higher-level thinking and Webb's Depth of Knowledge. Higher-Order Questioning techniques will be implemented with fidelity, and the HOQ best practices reflected in teachers' PGP's (Professional Growth Plans), aligning with this year's School Improvement Plan. This year we are planning to provide teachers more inservice on Higher-order questioning to keep the momentum going. We don't want to lose ground on what we have been implementing. Additional materials in HOQ and vocabulary will be ordered to provide more tools to use in classrooms. Administration will be consistent in monitoring the instructional delivery of HOQ.

CONTENT AREA:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Science	<input type="checkbox"/> Parental Involvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Drop-out Programs
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Language Arts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Studies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Arts/PE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Academic Support Classes Gr. 3-6		

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

Professional Learning Communities will integrate Higher-Order Questioning into core subjects.

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

Barrier	Action Steps	Person Responsible	Timetable	Budget	In-Process Measure
1. Professional Development	Provide teachers Professional Development on Higher-ordering Questioning and Vocabulary Provide District resources for faculty to engage in Higher-order Questioning staff development	Debbie Wood Blair Nave Administration District personnel	November 2012 December 2012 August 2012 – May 2013	N/A	Agenda Sign-In Sheet Handouts Steps To Quality Questioning Books Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs
2. Teacher and Student Materials	Order appropriate materials for teacher and student use	Assistant Principal	September 2012–May 2013	\$	Purchase Order Forms
3. Academic Vocabulary	Create Common Academic Language Through Word Walls Send Vocabulary lists home to parents Provide Professional Development in Ruby Payne Training	Vocabulary Committee Teachers Rick Dillon	September 2012–May 2013 September 2012–May 2013 February 2013	N/A	Agenda Schedule Minutes Sign-In Sheet Collaboration & Mutual Accountability Teams Copies of lists Hand-outs Sign-in sheets Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs
4. Time	Develop Model Classrooms For Higher-Order Questioning Monitor processes to support Higher-order Questioning	Teachers Administration	September 2012 –May 2013 Weekly	N/A	Agenda Schedule Sign-In Sheet Collaboration & Mutual Accountability Teams Classroom Walkthroughs Observation sheets Informal meetings with teachers

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

Monitoring what gets done is part of everything we do. Systematical use of checklists, anecdotal records, formative assessments, observation instruments, and test results will indicate successful implementation of professional practices throughout the school. Along with new HOQ knowledge and skills, teachers will continue implementation of Higher-order Questioning across the academic curriculum. Lesson plans will be consistently monitored and will reflect Higher-order Questioning aligned with CCSS (Kdg.-2nd Gr.) and NGSSS (3rd-6th Gr.). Professional development will be provided by District staff and “Quality Questioning” will be given to all teachers. Teachers will complete a self-assessment checklist for quality questions. Model classrooms will be established for peer mentoring observations for Higher-order Questioning (Walsh & Sattes, 2005). Teachers will reflect in their 2012-2013 PGP’s (Professional Growth Plans), Higher-order questioning and thinking strategies which reflect research and best practices. In May 2013, 100% of teachers will have implemented scientifically-researched based instructional practices for Higher-order questioning and thinking with students engaged in appropriate activities.

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

Students will set goals for individual achievement for all academic curriculums through the use of student notebooks and journals. A3 Vision, Edline, interims, and progress reports will document student achievement for all academic curriculums (CCSS Kdg-2nd Gr. & NGSSS Gr. 3-6). Through the increased use of these Higher-order Thinking strategies, there will be an increase in student achievement.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal 1	2012 Current Level of Performance <small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)</small>	2013 Expected Level of Performance <small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)</small>
Anticipated Barrier(s):		
Strategy(s):		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	In 2012, 24% (103 students)	In 2013, 20% of the

<p>Barrier(s): Increase of Level-1 and 2 students in Reading Applications and Literary Analysis 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0 Strands.</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. SES (Supplemental Education Services) Tutoring Services 2. Academic Support Classes 3. Title I –Teacher Support, in-school remediation 4. Developing collaboration & mutual accountability teams to focus on strategies to increase learning gains for Level-1 & 2 students.</p>	<p>of the students in Grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 at Apollo Elementary scored a Level 3 in Reading on the FCAT 2.0.</p>	<p>students in Grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 at Apollo Elementary will score a Level 3 in Reading on the FCAT.</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>		
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s): Students lack experience with informational text Students need additional enrichment activities Rigorous instruction aligned with NGSSS</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1. Integrate use of the interactive boards for additional enrichment activities 2. Provide teachers with additional professional development on rigorous instruction aligned with the standards. 3. Integrate Science and Social studies trade books into the Reading block. 4. Provide additional enrichment activities during school and after school.</p>	<p>In 2012, 49% (196) students at Apollo Elementary scored at Levels 4 or 5 in FCAT Reading.</p>	<p>In 2013, our goal would be to increase the percentage of students who score at Levels 4 or 5 by 2% (51%) at Apollo Elementary.</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>		

<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>		
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p> <p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>		
<p>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: The 2011-2012 Reading score is 76%, with a projection for 2013-2014 at 78%.</p> <p>Baseline data 2010-11: 70%</p>		
<p>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in Reading :</p> <p>White: →</p> <p>Black: →</p> <p>Hispanic: →</p> <p>Asian: →</p> <p>American Indian: →</p> <p>→</p> <p>→</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for current level of performance</p> <p>77% Asian</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance</p> <p>88% Asian</p>
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>		
<p>Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p>		

Strategy(s): 1.		
--------------------	--	--

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Higher-order Questioning District Training-Debbie Wood	November 2012	Handouts Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Student Journals/Notebooks District Assessments
Vocabulary-Blair Nave	December 2012	Handouts Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Student Journals/Notebooks District Assessments
Ruby Payne Training-Rick Dillon	February 2013	Handouts Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Student Journals/Notebooks District Assessments

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/ Speaking: <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">100% (1)</div>			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">100% (1)</div>			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing: <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">100% (1)</div>			

Mathematics Goal(s): 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1.		
Strategy(s): 1.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s): Increase of Level-1 and 2 students in 2012 Math FCAT 2.0 Strands. Strategy(s): 1. Provide SES (Supplemental Education Services) Tutoring Services 2. Provide Academic Support Classes for level 1 students. 3. Provide Title I –Teacher Support, in-school remediation 4. Develop collaboration & mutual accountability teams to focus on strategies to increase learning gains for Level-1 & 2 students.	In 2012, 24% (138 students) of the students in Grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 at Apollo Elementary scored a Level 3 in Math on the FCAT 2.0.	In 2013, 20% of the students in Grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 at Apollo Elementary will score a Level 3 in Math on the FCAT 2.0.
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Weakness in 3 rd Grade- Geometry & Measurement and Number Operations, and Statistics, 4 th Grade-Geometry and Measurement, and Number Operations & Problems, 5 th Grade-	In 2012, 42% (168) students at Apollo Elementary scored at Levels 4 or 5 in FCAT Math.	In 2013, our goal would be to increase the percentage of students who score at Levels 4 or 5 by 2% (44%) at Apollo

<p>Number Based Ten, and Fractions 6th Grade- Fractions, Ratios, Proportional Relationships and Statistics on the FCAT 2.0 Strands Students lack experience with manipulatives. Students need additional enrichment activities. Rigorous instruction must be aligned with NGSSS.</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide additional enrichment activities including manipulatives. 2. Integrate use of interactive boards to assist with additional enrichment activities. 3. Provide teachers with additional professional development on rigorous instruction aligned with the NGSSS. 		Elementary
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 		
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 		
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 		
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 		
<p>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: The 2011-2012 Math score is 76%, with a projection for 2014-2015 at 77%.</p> <p>Baseline Data 2010-11: 65%</p>		
<p>Student subgroups by ethnicity :</p> <p>White: →</p> <p>Black: →</p> <p>Hispanic: →</p>		

Asian: →	85% Asian	93% Asian
American Indian: →		
→		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics →	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Effective Questioning in Mathematics-D. Gard	December 2012	Agenda Hand-outs Sign-In Sheets Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-Throughs District Assessments

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Need additional materials and professional development for writing.		
Strategy(s): 1. Purchase writing materials aligned with NGSSS. 2. Provide professional development for teachers to explore ways to integrate curriculum and conventions in writing.		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement	In 2012, 82% (82)	In 2013, our goal

level 3.0 and higher in Writing	students) of the students in Grades 4 at Apollo Elementary scored a 3.0 in Writing on the FCAT 2.0.	would be to increase the percentage of students who score at Levels 4 and 5 by 6% (88%) at Apollo Elementary.
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in Writing		

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
<p>Barrier(s): Student learning gaps in science strands.</p> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use Thinking Maps to increase student achievement in higher order questioning. 2. Integrate Science literature into the 90 minute reading block. 3. Provide professional development for science with focus on Physical Science and Earth & Space Science FCAT 2.0 strands. 		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:	In 2012, 73% (71 students) of the students in Grade 5 at Apollo Elementary scored Level 3 or above in Science on the FCAT 2.0.	In 2013, 80% of the students in Grade 5 at Apollo Elementary will score a 3 or above on the Science FCAT 2.0.

Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	In 2012, 37% (36 students) of the students in Grade 5 at Apollo Elementary scored Levels 4 & 5 in Science on the FCAT 2.0.	In 2013, 41% of the students in Grade 5 at Apollo Elementary will score Levels 4 & 5 in Science on the FCAT 2.0.
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading		

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

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

APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS ONLY)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11 <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 50px; height: 20px; display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle; margin-left: 10px;"></div>		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. White: —————→ Black: —————→ Hispanic: —————→		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

Geometry EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students)

	that percentage reflects)	that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11 <input type="text"/>		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. White: → Black: → Hispanic: →		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		

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

Civics EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage)

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

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

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

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

Goal 1:			
Goal 2:			

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

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Provide professional development to encourage positive school relationships.	District Resource Teachers and Administration	May 2013
2. Provide induction and mentoring programs for new teachers.	Teachers and Administration	May 2013
3. Develop strong professional relationships through collaboration and decision making to continue a team-oriented culture.	Teachers and Administration	May 2013
4. Teacher recruitment includes selection of high-quality credentials for teachers with expectations for increased student achievement in the school culture.	Administration	May 2013

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming
---	--

effective	highly effective
<p>Nancy Miller-ESOL Sharon Davis-ESOL Sharon Irlbeck-ESOL Jennifer Kunkle-ESOL Megan Herron-ESOL</p> <p>The above listed teachers (9% -5 teachers) are teaching out of field.</p>	<p>Training is ongoing for the 9% of teachers (5) toward completion of an ESOL Endorsement at this time. Notification in writing to parents of these students for this information has been provided.</p>

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

<p>MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and its role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)</p> <p>The school Guidance Counselor, Lynn Santana, is training the staff this year on the MTSS/RtI process by meeting with each grade level team during team meetings. Mrs. Santana is also meeting with teachers individually on Mondays to discuss specific individual student cases. Once students are receiving a higher level of intervention and the interventions do not seem to be working, Mrs. Santana schedules a meeting with the school psychologist and staffing specialist to discuss the next step in the MTSS process. Administration has also brought over members of the District MTSS team, Janet Stephenson, to train teachers on the A3 Vision system.</p>
<p>PARENT INVOLVEMENT:</p> <p>In the 2011-2012 Parent Survey, over 84% of parents indicated they are “satisfied” with classroom instruction of all core subjects at Apollo Elementary. The 2011-2012 Parent Survey also indicates 89% of parents attending meetings and academic events at the school, thought the meetings or events were useful. During the 2011-2012 school year, over 25,000 volunteer hours were logged for Apollo Elementary. The parent dedication is a great contributing factor for the school’s overall success.</p>
<p>ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)</p> <p>The 2011-2012 attendance rate was at 96% and at 97% for 2012-2013. We anticipate attendance for the 2012-2013 school year to remain at or above 95%. Teachers will call parents when students are absent or tardy 3 days or more. A parent meeting will be scheduled with the guidance counselor to discuss the chronic absences and/or tardies.</p>
<p>SUSPENSION:</p> <p>Current suspensions for the 2012-2013 school year are at 17% (12 students). Of these students, all are male, with 7 of the 12 students from the minority population. The total 2011-2012 school year suspensions were: 115 students. At 16% suspension rate, 95 students were male and 20 students were female. From the majority population, there were a total of 54 students with 53 male and 1 female. The minority population, calculations indicate there were a total of 61 students with 42 male and 19 female.</p>
<p>DROP-OUT (High Schools only): N/A</p>

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

N/A