```````````````````

# Florida Department of Education

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

## Proposed for 2012-2013

**2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

## PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|---|---|
| School Name: Highlands Elementary School | District Name: Duval |
| Principal: Kimberlee Hayward | Superintendent: Ed Pratt Daniels |
| SAC Chair: | Date of School Board Approval: |

## <u>Student Achievement Data:</u>

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.)

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

High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

## <u>Highly Effective Administrators</u>

List your school's highly effective 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.

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ <br><br> 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |

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

| Principal | Kimberlee Hayward | BA-Elementary Education University of North Florida 1989; Masters in Educational Leadership, University of North Florida 2006 | 2 | 6 | Mrs. Kimberlee Hayward is an experienced educator. She has a total of 24 years as a professional educator in Duval County and is a graduate of University of North Florida. Mrs. Hayward began her career at Finnegan Elementary where she taught second grade and was successful in achieving gains among her students. Mrs. Hayward also taught at John Love Elementary, Chimney Lakes Elementary and Enterprise Learning Academy. During her tenure at Enterprise Learning Academy she was also a model classroom teacher. She also served as a Standards Coach at Enterprise Learning Academy where she implemented several initiatives that produced student gains. Following her experience at Enterprise, she served as an Assistant Principal at Biscayne Elementary for four years where she continued to set high expectations for the students and teachers and helped them achieve these goals. Mrs. Hayward spent a year working for the Florida Department of Education where she worked as a Regional Reading Coordinator and assisted failing schools. She assisted in implementing researched based strategies and helped to increase the school grades in the schools she provided services. Mrs. Hayward served as the Principal of Highland's Elementary during the 2011-2012 school year where she set high expectations for the staff and students and assisted in moving the school from an "F" to an "A". |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | 2011-2012 |
| | | | | | Highlands Elementary School, Principal |
| | | | | | School Grade A |
| | | | | | Reading Mastery 45%,Math Mastery 46%, Writing Mastery 83%, Science Mastery 44% |
| | | | | | Reading Gains 69%,Math Gains 73%, Lowest25%Reading Gains 82%, Lowest25% Math Gains 73% |
| | | | | | 2010-2011: Florida Department of Education Regional Office |

| | | | | | Regional Reading Coordinator |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Pinedale Grade A |
| | | | | | Long Branch Grade A |
| | | | | | North Shore Grade D |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | 2009-2010: Assistant Principal of Biscayne Elementary |
| | | | | | Grade C. Reading Mastery: 67%, Math Mastery: 53%, Science Mastery: 20%, Writing Mastery: 78% AYP: 79%, Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading or Math. |
| | | | | | 2008-2009: Assistant Principal of Biscayne Elementary |
| | | | | | Grade C. Reading Mastery: 61%, Math |
| | | | | | Mastery: 52%, Science Mastery: 22%, |
| | | | | | Writing Mastery: 79% |
| | | | | | AYP: 87%, Black and Economically |
| | | | | | Disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading. |
| | | | | | Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math. |
| | | | | | 2007-2008: Grade C, Reading Mastery: |

| | | | | | 67%, Math Mastery: 51%, Science |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Mastery: 23%, Writing Mastery: 62% |
| | | | | | AYP: 85%, All subgroups met AYP in reading. |
| | | | | | Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math. |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | 2006-2007: Grade B, Reading Mastery: |
| | | | | | 63%, Math Mastery: 49%, Science |
| | | | | | Mastery: 17%, Writing Mastery: 84% |
| | | | | | AYP: 100%, All subgroups met AYP in both reading and math. |

## Highly Effective Instructional Coaches

List your school's highly effective 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 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| Literacy | Margaret Harbin | Elementary Education (K-6)  ESOL (K-12) | 2nd | 2nd | 2011-2012  Highlands Elementary School,  School Grade A  Reading Mastery 45%, Math Mastery 46%, Writing Mastery 83%, Science Mastery 44%  Reading Gains 69%, Math Gains 73%, Lowest 25% Reading Gains 82%, Lowest 25% Math Gains 73% |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Literacy | Arica Bridges | Elementary Education (K-6) ESOL Endorsed | 1 | 1 | 2011-2012  Biltmore Elementary School, 4th Grade Reading and Language Arts Teacher  School Grade A  Reading Mastery 52% , Math Mastery 54%, Writing Mastery 98%, Science Mastery 42%,  Reading Gains 67% , Math Gains 69%, Lowest 25% Reading Gains 53% , Lowest 25%  Math Gains 95% |

## 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 | Not Applicable  (If not, please explain why) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Regular meetings of new teachers with principal, district cadre and PDF. | Principal  Cadre  PDF | June 2013 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2. | Partnering new teachers with veteran teachers. | Principal<br><br>PDF | <br><br>June 2013 | |
| 3. | Weekly participation in Professional Learning Communities with grade levels to plan instruction, analyze student work and use data to drive instruction. | Principal<br><br>School academic coaches<br><br>Teachers | June 2013 | |
| 4. | Pre-planning Training | Principal<br><br>School Based Academic Coaches | August 17th, 2012 | |
| 5. | Individual Professional Development to strengthen teacher content knowledge. | Principal<br><br>School Based Coaches<br><br>District In-service Trainers | June 2013 | |
| 6. | Attend Teach for America Recruitment Fair | Principal<br><br>School academic coaches | June 2012 | |

## *Non-Highly Effective Instructors*

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

| Name | Certification | Teaching Assignment | Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Effective |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32 | 12% (4) | 50% (16) | 25% (8) | 15% (5) | 32% (10) | 100% (32) | 3% (1) | 0% (0) | 59% (19) |

### *Teacher Mentoring Program*

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cheryl Powell | Kelly Steckel | Ms. Powell has taught for 29 years and 23 years at Highlands Elementary. | Weekly meetings<br><br>Common planning of lessons and assignments<br><br>Mentor Observation Cycles |
| Angela Sevilla | Caroline Clark<br><br>Sophia Ridgell | Ms. Sevilla has taught for 7 years<br><br>and has taught 2nd and 3rd grade. | Weekly meetings<br><br>Common planning of lessons and assignments<br><br>Mentor Observation Cycles |

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Daisy Lucas | Bryan Ross | Ms. Lucas has taught for 6 years. She has taught second and third grade. Ms. Lucas has served as a member of the curriculum writing team for the district. | Weekly meetings<br><br>Common planning of lessons and assignments<br><br>Mentor Observation Cycles |
| Suzanne Verducci | Shannon Galligar | Ms. Verducci has taught for 5 years.<br><br>Her experience is in second and fifth grade.<br><br>She has served on the district curriculum writing team. | Weekly meetings<br><br>Common planning of lessons and assignments<br><br>Mentor Observation Cycles |

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Patti Weigel | Jennifer Bancroft | Ms. Weigel has taught in the CSS self-contained classroom and has served as the CSS Site Coach for the last 3 years. | Weekly meetings<br><br>Common planning of lessons and assignments<br><br>Mentor Observation Cycles |
| Patti Weigel | Christen Suratt | Ms. Weigel has taught in the CSS self-contained classroom and has served as the CSS Site Coach for the last 3 years. | Weekly meetings<br><br>Common planning of lessons and assignments<br><br>Mentor Observation Cycles |

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Melissa Floyd | Sara Claiborne | Ms. Floyd has taught 7 years in first grade, second grade, and V.E. Resource. | Weekly meetings<br><br>Common planning of lessons and assignments<br><br>Mentor Observation Cycles |

## 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<br><br>Funds are used to provide additional academic support and learning opportunities to help low-achieving students in reading and math. The funds are also used to provide professional development and other school initiatives that will increase the effectiveness of teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents. The school receives Title I funds for increasing parental involvement in the school. Additionally, these funds are used to provide parents with materials and trainings for working with their children in order to improve their academic achievement. Title I funds are also used to fund the Instructional, Math and Reading coach positions. |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant |
| Title I, Part D |

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

| |
|---|
| Title II |
| |
| Title III |
| |
| Services are provided to ensure that English Language Learners (ELLs) meet the academic content and English proficiency standards.  Title III funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide extra support to ELLs by offering internal and external safety nets in academic language acquisition. |
| |
| Title X- Homeless |
| |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) |
| |
| SAI funds will be coordinated with School Improvement funds to provide remediation for students identified as intensive according to FCAT, FAIR, and benchmark assessments. Students are afforded the opportunity to attend before/after school tutoring sessions for intensive remediation. |
| |
| Violence Prevention Programs |
| |
| Nutrition Programs |
| |
| Breakfast in the Classroom is provided each day for all students. Highlands Elementary also participates in the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program.  All students receive either a fresh fruit of fresh vegetable three days a week as a healthy, nutritional snack. |
| |
| Housing Programs |
| |
| Head Start |
| |
| Adult Education |
| Career and Technical Education |

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

| |
|---|
| Job Training |
| Other |

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

| School-Based MTSS/RtI Team |
|---|
| |

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Principal (Kimberlee Hayward):  Provides common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

RtI Facilitator/Guidance Counselor (Nana Vidal):  Liaison for implementation of MTSS at the school level which includes feedback to the Leadership Team, presentations to the faculty, work with school-based coaches, and work with small collaborative groups of teachers, and provide direct intervention services and support to students identified as needing Tier II or Tier III intervention services.

Select General Education Teachers (K-1st (Heather Vega, Tiffany Keen-Davis, Quanae Hall), 3rd-5th (Daisy Lucas, Suzanne Verducci): Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier I instruction/interventions, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrates Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teacher (Sherry Bolden): Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into tier III instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Communication/Social Skills Site Coach and ESE Liaison (Patti Weigel): Participates in development of behavior plans, observations, and collaboration with outside support system in the area of RtI Tier 2 and 3 behavior issues.

Reading and Math Interventionist- Reading, Math (Angela Sevilla, Bridgett Stroud): 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 needs 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.

Reading Coach (Arica Bridges, Margaret Harbin): Provides K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention.

Speech Language Pathologist (Nicole Spivey): 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 indentify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

School Technology Contact (Sheila Thompkins, Angela Sevilla): Develops technology necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development and technical support to teachers regarding data management and display.

Student Services Personnel (Lindon Britton): Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students.  In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral and social success.

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

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 school-based RtI Leadership Team will meet weekly to review student data and make instructional decisions. The meetings will focus around the implementation of RtI and identifying students needing Tier II or Tier III interventions. The team will meet weekly to engage in the following activities:

Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The RtI Leadership Team will meet to provide assistance in the development of the SIP. The team will provide data on Tier I, II, and III targets; academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; help set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship): facilitate the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing): and align processes and procedures.

**MTSS Implementation**

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

| |
|---|
| 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. |
| Baseline data: District Benchmark Math & Science, Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), District Writing Prompt, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Discipline Referrals, Attendance Data |
| Progress Monitoring: Formative Assessments, Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), FCAT 2.0-Released Tests, Benchmark, Pearson Limelight and Inform, Genesis, FCIM, Houghton Mifflin Florida Assessments, Learning Schedule Assessments, Progress Monitoring Assessments, DRA, District K-2 CCSS Math Assessment, District Writing Assessments |
| Midyear: District Benchmark Math & Science, Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA2), Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA), Number of Discipline Referrals, Attendance Data |
| End of year: FAIR, FCAT 2.0, Suspension data, DRA, Attendance Data, District K-2 CCSS Math Assessment |
| Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. |
| Professional development will be provided during PLCs and faculty meetings throughout the year.  The RtI team will also evaluate additional professional development that is needed during the RtI Leadership Team meeting. |

| Describe plan to support MTSS. |
|---|
| Bi-weekly Data Chats with individual teachers to identify students needing more intensive remediation.  Teachers will receive support with developing Tier II and Tier III interventions. |
| During PLCs teachers will receive professional development in development of documentation and data collection for the MTSS process. |
| Guidance Counselor and district support staff  will follow up with students needing any additional services |

*Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)*

| **School-Based Literacy Leadership Team** |
|---|

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

Principal (Kimberlee Hayward): Monitors the implementation of the CCRP, the K-12 Reading Plan, and the district curriculum. Visits classrooms daily and provides teachers with feedback from those visits along with next steps. Shares data with the Leadership team from classroom observations and helps identify next steps for professional development. Participates in weekly PLC meetings with all grade levels to analyze student data and determine the needs of individual students. Leads the decision-making process to identify areas of need in reading and helps to identify resources to meet those needs.

Reading Coach (Arica Bridges /Margaret Harbin): Reading coaches will model lessons, plan with teachers and provide professional development to support the teachers as they improve their reading instruction and implementation of the CCRP and/or district curriculum. Coaches will implement the Intensive Coaching Model in all classrooms. Based on their work in the school and monthly reading coach meetings, the coaches will help the leadership team to: analyze student data, develop the school's action plan to address students' instructional needs, develop the school-wide reading professional development plan, write the reading section of the school improvement plan, plan school-wide literacy events and schedule time for all teachers to visit the reading model classrooms.

Select General Education Teachers-Primary and Intermediate (a representative from each grade level) - Create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concerns across the school.

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

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

- The Literacy Leadership Team will meet monthly to address student achievement and best practices based on student data.

- The Literacy Leadership Team will report committee activities by posting agendas and minutes or making oral reports at faculty meetings. LLT will also organize and implement school-wide reading initiatives that include all staff, teachers, students, parents and community.

- Serves as the leadership for grade level or group in making decisions about curriculum practices in reading and writing

- Facilitates professional development workshops during Early Dismissal Days.

- Responsible for Reading and Writing Parent Nights

- Responsible for end of the year Reading Celebration

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

Oversee the implementation of Common Core Standards for Literacy

Increase the level of student proficiency around reading and writing

Increase parent involvement through Parent Nights

Increase number of students meeting reading goals and increased participation Reading Celebration

Themed literacy activities

Ongoing professional development during early release days and weekly Professional Learning Communities

School wide reading strategies

*Public School Choice*

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

- **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.

Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten is offered for 36 four year olds that live in Highland's attendance zone. The objectives for the program are comprehensive and provide a solid foundation for entry into basic kindergarten. Students experience hands on literacy activities that build pre-reading, oral expression and phonemic awareness skills. Math skills are enhanced through daily living activities that involve matching, sorting and counting. Within the first 45 days of enrollment, kindergarten students are given two assessments: Florida Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (FLKRS) is designed to screen each child's level of readiness for kindergarten. FLKRS includes a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System (ECHOS) and the first two measures of the FAIR assessment for kindergarten (Letter Naming Fluency and Initial Sound Fluency). These assessments are used to gather information on a child's development in emergent literacy. The results from these assessments are used to group students for differentiated instruction and to provide immediate intensive intervention.

# 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 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

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

| | **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 | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.** | 1a.1. New teachers are not familiar with an instructional delivery model that includes explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice, | 1a.1 School-based Academic Coaches will collaborate to develop an appropriate professional development plan focused on explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice, and independent practice as well as lesson assessment. | 1a.1 Principal, School-based Academic Coaches, | 1a.1 Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review, Data Notebook Review | 1a.1 DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | and independent practice as well as lesson assessment. | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #1a:<br><br>The percentage of students achieving FCAT Level 3 in reading will increase from 29% (38) to 33%<br><br>(50) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | *29% (38)* | *33% (50)* | | | | |

| | | 1a.2. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of the Common Core Standards and literacy block. | 1a.2. The Reading Coach will collaborate with district personnel to develop and present professional development focused on the implementation of the Common Core Standards and literacy block. | 1a.2. Principal, Reading Coach, district personnel | 1a.2 Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review | 1.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1a. 3. Teachers are not differentiating reading instruction based on individual student needs. | 1a.3. School-based Coaches will support teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing) to implement differentiated instructional strategies in daily instruction. | 1a.3. Principal, School-based Coaches, Teachers | 1a.3.  Focus Walks, Classroom Observations | FAIR Reading Assessment District Reading Benchmark Assessment Weekly Reading Theme Tests |
| | | 1a.4. Few teachers are conducting daily small group or one on one student conferences. | 1a.4 School based coaches will provide support through the Intensive Coaching Model to teachers on implementing daily student conferences. | 1a.4 School Based Coaches Teachers | 1a.4. Anecdotal Notes Classroom Observations Focus Walks | 1a.4. Anecdotal Notes |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1a. 5. Few teachers are incorporating Reader's Response Journals where students are required to record their independent thinking and application of reading strategies. | 1a.5 School Based Coaches will collaborate with teachers during PLCs to develop a system as well as plans for incorporating reader's response journals into daily instruction. | 1a.5 School Based Coaches<br><br>Principal<br><br>Teachers | 1a.5 Lesson Plans<br><br>Readers Response Journals<br><br>Classroom Observations | 1a.5. Rubric | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.** | 1b.1. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development on the implementation of Access Points. | 1b.1 CSS Site Coach will collaborate with District ESE Staff to provide professional development to implement Access Points in daily instruction. | 1b.1 District ESE Staff, Site Coach | 1b.1. Lesson Plans, Curriculum Data | 1b.1. Curriculum Based Assessments<br><br>Brigance Inventory of Early Development II | | |

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

| Reading Goal #1b:<br><br>The percentage of students achieving a level 4, 5, or 6 will be 50% since there is no data to show a gain. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *No data last year due to cell size..* | *50%(8)* | | | | | |
| | | | 1b.2. Teachers are not differentiating reading instruction based on individual student needs. | 1b.2 CSS Site Coach will support teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing) to implement differentiated instructional strategies in daily instruction.<br><br>. | 1b.2 Site Coach | 1b.2. Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review, Data Notebook Review | 1b.2. Curriculum Based Assessments<br><br>Brigance Inventory of Early Development II |
| 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<br><br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading. | 2a.1. Questioning strategies, such as probing, clarifying, connecting, and scaffolding are not being designed to promote critical, independent and creative thinking. | 2a.1. School-based Coaches will collaborate to develop and provide professional development to teachers on using Webbs Depth of Knowledge to promote higher order questioning when planning and delivering lessons. | 2a.1.Principal, District Coaches, School-based Coaches, Teachers | 2a.1. Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review | 2a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal #2a: The percentage of students achieving FCAT Levels 4 and 5 in reading will increase from 13% (17) to 14% (21) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 13% (17) | 14% (21) | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2a.2. Few teachers have been trained to use available supplemental materials to increase academic rigor. | 2a.2. School-Based Coaches will train teachers on the use of supplemental materials to include leveled classroom libraries, appropriate non-fiction texts, and literature circle texts. | 2a.2. Principal<br><br>School-Based Coaches | 2a.2. Focus Walks | 2a.2.  DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric |
| | | 2a.3. Some teachers are not using technology and other available supplemental materials to provide enrichment and/ or differentiated activities for students. | 2a.3. School based coaches will work in collaboration with teachers to develop enrichment and/or differentiated activities that incorporate the use of technology. | 2a.3   School-Based Coaches<br><br>Teachers | 2a.3 Focus Walks, Classroom Observations | 2a.3<br><br>FAIR Reading Assessment<br><br>District Reading Benchmark Assessment<br><br>Weekly Reading Theme Tests |
| | | 2.4 Few teachers are providing students the opportunity to work collaboratively in higher level texts with more complex tasks. | 2.4 School based coaches will work with teachers and students to implement literature circles using assigned job roles and anecdotal notes. | 2.4 School Based Coaches<br><br>Classroom Teachers | Classroom Observations<br><br>Reader Response Journals | Reader Response Journals |

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

| **2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.** | 2b.1. Some teachers are not using technology and other available supplemental materials to provide enrichment and/or differentiated activities for students. | 2b.1. CSS Site Coach will work in collaboration with teachers to develop enrichment and/or differentiated activities that incorporate the use of technology. | 2b.1. CSS Site Coach<br><br>Teachers | 2b.1. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations, Data Notebook Review | 2b.1. Unique Learning System Monthly Pre and Post Assessments | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal #2b:<br><br>The percentage of students achieving a level 7 will be 10% (2) since there is no data to show a gain. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | *No data due to cell size.* | *10% (2)* | | | | | |
| 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<br><br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.** | 3a.1. New teachers are unfamiliar with the test item specifications for FCAT 2.0 | 3a.1. The School based coaches will provide professional development on FCAT Test Item Specifications, Content Limits, and tested benchmarks for FCAT 2.0 | 3a.1. Principal, school-based coaches, Teachers | 3a.1. Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review<br><br>Board Configurations | 3a.1. Lesson Plans | | |
| Reading Goal #3a:<br><br>The percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase from<br><br>71% (68) to 73% (71) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 71% (68) | 73% (71) | | | | | |
| | | 3a.2. Most teachers are not analyzing data to effectively differentiate instruction for all students. | 3a.2. School based coaches will collaborate with teachers during weekly PLC meetings to analyze student data and develop instructional strategies (e.g., learning centers and small group guided reading) to address individual student needs during the 90 minute reading block. | 3a.2. Principal, School-Based Coaches<br><br>Teachers | 3a.2. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review | 3a.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.** | 3b.1. Teachers are not differentiating reading instruction based on individual student needs. | 3b.1. CSS Site Coach will support teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing) to implement differentiated instructional strategies in daily instruction. | 3b.1. Site Coach | 3b.1. Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review, Data Notebook Review | 3b.1. Curriculum Based Assessments Brigance Inventory of Early Development II | | |
| Reading Goal #3b: No data due to cell size. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | *No data due to cell size* | *No data due to cell size.* | | | | | |
| 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 | | |

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

| 4a. **FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.** | 4a.1. New teachers do not have a clear understanding of the FCIM process and therefore FCIM is not being implemented on a daily basis. | 4a.1. The principal and school based coaches will provide training on the FCIM process and will assist teachers in developing monthly FCIM calendars. | 4a.1. Principal, School-based Coaches, | 4a.1. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Classroom Observations, Monthly FCIM Calendars FCIM Monitoring Forms | 4a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric FAIR Reading Assessment District Reading Benchmark Assessment FCIM Assessments | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal #4a: The percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase from 86% (26) to 88% (27) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | 86% (26) | 87% (27) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 26) | | | | | | |
| | | 4a.2. Teachers need additional training in ways to identify students who are in need of RTI services. | 4a.2. The Guidance Counselor will provide additional training for teachers to help identify students who are in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions. | 4a.2. Principal, Guidance Counselor RTI Team | 4a.2. Anecdotal Notes Focus Walks Student Conferences | 4a.2. Student portfolios Reading Assessments FCIM Data | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 4a.3 Teachers are not effectively implementing differentiated instructional strategies during the literacy block. | 4a.3. School Coaches will collaborate with teachers to analyze data, plan and develop lessons that incorporate differentiated instructional strategies (e.g., learning centers and small group guided reading) to address individual student needs during the literacy block. | 4a.3. Principal, School-Based Coaches<br><br>Teachers | 4a.3. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review, Classroom Observations | 4a.3. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric<br><br>FAIR Reading Assessment<br><br>District Reading Benchmark Assessment<br><br>Weekly Reading Theme Tests | |
| | | 4a.4 Few teachers engage students during whole group and independent activities. | 4a.4 School Based Coaches will provide professional development on student engagement and will assist teachers with lesson plan development that include es a variety of student engagement activities. . | 4a.4<br><br>Principal<br><br>School Based Coaches<br><br>Teachers | 4a.4 Classroom Observations<br><br>Focus Walks<br><br>Lesson Plans | 4a.4 District Benchmarks<br><br>Common Assessments | |
| | | 4a. 5<br><br>Scheduling the students to have core instruction and time to be pulled out for instruction. | 4a. 5<br><br>Reading Interventionist will be pulling out the bottom quartile students for 30 minutes per day, based on formal and informal data. | 4a. 5<br><br>Principal<br><br>District Support Staff | 4a. 5<br><br>Weekly intervention logs<br><br>Ongoing progress monitoring | 4a. 5<br><br>FAIR Reading Assessment<br><br>District Reading Benchmark Assessment | |

## 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.<br><br>Few teachers are using the Quality Program Indicators consistently to enhance and encourage learning opportunities. | 4b.1.<br><br>CSS Site Coach and District ESE staff will provide professional development and monitoring the use of Quality Program Indicators in the classroom. | 4b.1.<br><br>CSS Site Coach<br><br>District ESE staff | 4b.1.<br><br>Focus Walks<br><br><br>Classroom Observations | 4b.1.<br><br>Quality Program Indicator Checklist | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal #4b:<br><br>No data due to cell size. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | *No data due to cell size.* | *No data due to cell size.* | | | | | |
| | | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | 4b.2. | |

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

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 39 | 44 | 50 | 55 | 61 | 67 | |
| **5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | **Baseline data 2010-2011** | | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #5A:<br><br>*Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* | | | | | | | |
| 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<br><br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | 5B.1. Black:<br><br>Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of explicit vocabulary instruction. | 5B.1.<br><br>School-based coaches will provide support for individual teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate content-specific common lessons that include appropriate content-specific vocabulary instruction. | 5B.1. Principal, District and School-Based Coaches | 5B.1. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review, Classroom Observations, DA instructional Review Indicators Rubric | 5B.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric<br><br>FAIR Reading Assessment<br><br>District Reading Benchmark Assessment<br><br>Weekly Reading Theme Tests | |
| Reading Goal #5B:<br><br>The percentage of Black students not making AYP in reading will decrease from 65% (77) to 58% (68) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Black:<br><br>±65% (77) | Black:<br><br>58% (68) | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. Some teachers are not incorporating appropriate content-specific vocabulary instruction. | 5B.2. School-based coaches will collaborate with the Regional Reading Coordinator to facilitate lesson planning during common planning time that includes appropriate content-specific vocabulary tasks and activities across the curriculum. | 5B.2. Principal, District and School-Based Coaches , RTI Team | 5B.2.  Anecdotal Notes , Focus Walks, Student Conferences | 5AB2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric<br><br><br>FAIR Reading Assessment<br><br><br>District Reading Benchmark Assessment<br><br><br>Weekly Reading Theme Tests | |
| | | 5B.3 Teachers are  not integrating research based reading and writing instruction during the literacy  block and have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of the Common Core Standards expectation in integration of reading and writing skills. | 5B.3. The Reading Coach and District Coaches will collaborate to develop and present professional development focused on the implementation of  Common Core Standards expectation in integration of reading and writing skills in the literacy block. | 5B.3.Principal, Reading Coach, District Coaches, | 5B.3Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review | 5B.3DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 5B. 4. Students do not have access to technology that supports prerequisite reading skills. | 5B. 4. School-Based Reading Coach will collaborate with teachers to provide professional development that focuses on implementation and monitoring of Success Maker. | 5B. 4. School-Based Reading Coach, Teachers | 5B. 4. Success Maker Reports | 5B. 4. Success Maker Assessments | |
| 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. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | | |
| Reading Goal #5C: *Not a cell.* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of<br><br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal #5D:<br><br>*Not a cell* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | _ | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. |
| | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | 5E.1. Many of the students lack life experiences that provide necessary background knowledge to facilitate reading comprehension. | 5E.1. Administrators and teachers will provide a variety of in school and after school opportunities to enhance life experiences. | 5E.1. Principal, School-Based Coaches<br><br>Teachers | 5E.1. Journal Review, Increased vocabulary and comprehension skills | 5E.1. Writing samples<br><br>Curriculum based assessments | |
| Reading Goal #5E:<br><br>The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making AYP in reading will decrease from 65% (84) to 58% (75) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | 65% (84) | 58% (75) | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 5E.2. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of explicit vocabulary instruction. | 5E.2. School-based coaches will provide support for individual teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate content-specific common lessons that include appropriate content-specific vocabulary instruction. | 5E.2. Principal, District and School-Based Coaches | 5E.2. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review, Classroom Observations, DA instructional Review Indicators Rubric | 5E.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric<br><br>FAIR Reading Assessment<br><br>District Reading Benchmark Assessment<br><br>Weekly Reading Theme Tests | |
| | | 5E.3 New teachers do not have a clear understanding of the FCIM process and therefore FCIM is not being implemented on a daily basis. | 5E.3 The principal and school based coaches will provide training on the FCIM process and will assist teachers in developing monthly FCIM calendars to show student weaknesses. | 5E.3Principal, District and School-based Coaches | 5E.3Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level),  Classroom Observations,<br><br>Monthly FCIM Calendars<br><br>FCIM Monitoring Forms | 5E.3DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric<br><br>FAIR Reading Assessment<br><br>District Reading Benchmark Assessment<br><br>FCIM Assessments | |

| | | 4a.4 Few teachers engage students during whole group and independent activities. | 4a.4 School Based Coaches will provide professional development on student engagement and will assist teachers with lesson plan development that includes a variety of student engagement activities. . | 4a.4<br><br>Principal<br><br>School Based Coaches<br><br>Teachers | 4a.4 Classroom Observations<br><br>Focus Walks<br><br>Lesson Plans | 4a.4 District Benchmarks<br><br>Common Assessments | |

## Reading 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<br><br>and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator<br><br>and/or<br><br>PLC Leader | PD Participants<br><br>(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules<br><br>(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Teachers will participate in professional development in order to understand the Common Core Standards in reading using the literacy block with fidelity. | K-5 | School-Based Coaches | School -wide | August 2012 – June 2013 | Class observations<br><br>Daily lesson plans | School-based Reading and Instructional Coaches |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Conduct professional development on the use of supplemental materials and effective instructional activities for use of leveled classroom libraries and non-fiction texts during Guided Reading. | K-5 | School-based Reading Coach | School –wide | October 2012 | Class observations<br><br>Daily lesson plans | School-based Reading Coach |
| Utilize the intensive coaching model to analyze student data and develop differentiated instruction (e.g., learning centers and small group guided reading) to address individual student needs during the 90 minute reading block. | K-5 | School-based Reading and Instructional Coaches | School –wide | August 2012 – June 2013 | Class observations<br><br>Daily lesson plans<br><br>Data Notebooks | School-based Reading and Instructional Coaches |
| Student Engagement | All grade levels | School Based Coaches | All teachers | August 2012 | Lesson Plans | Principal |
| Unpacking the NGSSS and Common Core Standards and FCAT 2.0 Item Specifications | All grade levels/ subjects | School Based Coaches | All teachers | Early Release and common planning<br><br>(August 2012– June 2013) | Classroom Observations<br>Monitoring lesson plans and classroom instruction | School Based Coaches<br>Principal, School-Based Coaches |
| Using FAIR data to plan for instruction | All grade levels | School Based Coaches | All teachers | Common Planning<br>August 2012 – June 2013 | Lesson Plans<br><br>Classroom Observations | Principal<br><br>School Based Coaches |
| Using the Gradual Release Model for Daily Instruction | All grade levels | Principal<br>Principal | All teachers | August 2012 | Classroom Observations | Principal, School Based Coaches |
| Conduct professional development on the use of Access Points | All grade levels on Access Points | CSS Site Coach<br><br>District ESE Staff | All ESE Teachers | Early Release and Common Planning<br><br>(September 2012) | Lesson Plans<br>Class observations<br><br>Daily lesson plans<br><br>Data Notebooks | CSS Site Coach |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Complete Autism Internet Modules to enhance the teachers' knowledge of the Quality Program Indicators | All grade levels on Access Points | CSS Site Coach<br><br>District ESE Staff | All ESE Teachers | Early Release and Common Planning<br><br>(September 2012 – June 2013) | | CSS Site Coach |
| Webbs Depth of Knowledge | All grade levels/ subject | Regional Reading Coordinator<br><br>School Coaches | All teachers | Early Release and<br><br>common planning<br><br>(October – June 2013) | Monitoring lesson plans and classroom instruction | Principal, School-Based Coaches |
| Differentiated Instruction | All grade levels/ subjects | Regional Reading Coordinator, Reading Coach, and district coaches. | All teachers | Co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing, data chats<br><br>(October 2012 –June, 2013) | Monitoring guided reading, small group instruction, and<br><br>RtI | Regional Reading Coordinator, Reading Coach, and District Coaches. |
| School-Based Reading Coach will collaborate with teachers to provide professional development that focuses on implementation and monitoring of Success Maker | 2 - 5 grade levels/ all subjects | School-Based Reading Coach, | 2 - 5 grade levels/ all subjects | October 2012 –June 2013 | Monitoring Success Maker ongoing progress | School Based Read Coach |

## Reading 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:** | | | |

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

| Professional Development | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Subtotal:** | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| **Subtotal:** | | | |
| **Total:** | | | |

*End of Reading Goals*

## Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

| Elementary Mathematics Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.** | 1a.1.Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of core math program and the math instructional block. | 1a.1. Teachers will participate in professional development provided by the school and district in order to implement the core math program using the math instructional block with fidelity. | 1a.1. Principal, District and School-Based Coaches | 1a.1. Focus Walks, Lesson Plans, Board Configurations | 1a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric | |
| Mathematics Goal #1a:<br><br>The percentage of students achieving FCAT level 3 in math will increase from 32% (42) to 36% (54) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | 32% (42) | 36% (54) | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1a.2. Many teachers are not creating daily lessons that follow an instructional delivery model that includes explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice, and independent practice as well as a lesson assessment. | 1a.2. School-Based Coaches will collaborate with teachers during PLCs to design instruction that follows an instructional delivery model that includes explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice as lesson assessment. | 1a.2. Principal, District and School-Based Coaches | 1a.2. Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review, Data Notebook Review | 1a.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric | |
| | | 1a.3. Student data is not being used for ongoing progress monitoring. | 1a.3. School-Based Math Coach and District Math Coach will collaborate to provide teachers with professional development that focuses on using data to modify instruction that meets the needs of individual students. | 1a.3. Principal, Math, Coach, and District Math Coach | 1a.3. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plans, Monitoring Forms | 1a.3. Diagnostic assessments, FCIM assessments, End-of_Unit assessments, and district benchmark assessments that are aligned with the Next Generation Math Standards | |
| | | 1a.4. Few teachers utilized math journals consistently for students to record their thinking. | 1a.4. School based math coach will collaborate with teachers during PLCs to develop strategies teachers can use to implement math journals | 1a.4. School based math coach<br><br>Classroom Teacher<br><br>Principal | 1a.4. Classroom observations<br><br>Lesson Plans<br><br>Board Configurations | 1a.4. District Benchmarks<br><br>Common Assessments | |

| | | 1a. 5. Teachers are not effectively implementing differentiated instructional strategies during the math block | 1a. 5. School-Based Math Coach will plan, develop and implement lessons with teachers that address individual student needs through the Intensive Coaching Model | 1a. 5. Principal<br><br>School-Based Coach<br><br>Teachers | 1a. 5. Data Notebook Review<br><br>Data Chats (individual and grade level)<br><br>Classroom Observations<br><br>Lesson Plans | 1a. 5. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric<br><br>Math Assessments<br><br>District Math Benchmark Assessment | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:**<br>**Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.** | 1b.1. Teachers are not differentiating instruction based on individual student needs as defined in the IEP. | 1b.1 CSS Site Coach will support teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing) to implement differentiated instructional strategies in daily instruction as defined in the IEP. | 1b.1<br><br>CSS Site Coach | 1b.1.<br><br>Focus Walks,<br><br>Lesson Plan Review,<br><br>Data Notebook Review | 1b.1.<br><br>Curriculum Based Assessments<br><br>Brigance Inventory of Early Development II<br><br>Brigance Comprehensive Inventory of Basic Skills II | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1b:<br><br>The percentage of students achieving a level 4, 5, or 6 will be 50% (8) on the Florida Alternate Assessment. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*  | | | | | |
| | *No data due to cell size.* | 50% (8) | | | | | |

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

| | | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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.** | 2.1. Scaffolding, pacing, prompting and probing techniques are not used when asking questions designed to promote higher-order thinking | 2.1. The district instructional mathematics specialist and school-based mathematics coach will collaborate to develop and implement professional development to design higher-order questioning and discourse for daily instruction. | 2.1. Principal, District and School-Based Coaches | 2.1. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations<br><br>Lesson Plans | 2.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric | | |

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

| Mathematics Goal #2a: | 2012 Current Level of Performance·* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance·* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of students achieving FCAT Levels 4 and 5 in math will increase from 12% (16) to 13% (20). | | | | | | | |
| | 12% (16) | 13% (20). | | | | | |
| | | 2.2 Teachers are not utilizing student data to effectively provide enrichment activities for all students. | 2.2 School-based math coach and district math coach will provide professional development for teachers on using data to plan appropriate enrichment activities for all students.<br><br>The school-based math coach will facilitate analysis of student data during common planning time. | 2.2 Principal, Math Coach, and District Math Coach | 2.2. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plans | 2.2. Diagnostic assessments, FCIM assessments, End-of-Unit assessments, and district benchmark assessments that are aligned with the Next Generation Math Standards | |

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. | 2b.1. Some teachers are not using technology and other available supplemental materials to provide enrichment and/or differentiated activities for students. | 2b.1. CSS Site Coach will work in collaboration with teachers to develop enrichment and/or differentiated activities that incorporate the use of technology. | 2b.1. CSS Site Coach Teachers | 2b.1. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations, Data Notebook Review | 2b.1. Curriculum Based Assessments | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal #2b: The percentage of students achieving a level 7 will be 10% (2) on the Florida Alternate Assessment. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | *No data due to cell size.* | *10% (2)* | | | | | |
| | | 2b.2. | 2b2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.** | 3a.1. Scaffolding, pacing, prompting and probing techniques are not used when asking questions designed to promote higher-order thinking. | 3a.1. The district instructional mathematics specialist and school-based mathematics coach will collaborate to develop and implement professional development to design higher-order questioning and discourse for daily instruction. | 3a.1. Principal<br><br>District and School-Based Coaches | 3a.1. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans | 3a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric | | |

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

| Mathematics Goal #3a: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of students making learning gains in math will increase from<br><br>76% (100) to 78% (103) | | | | | | |
| | 76% (100) | 78%(103) | | | | |
| | | 3a.2. Teachers are not identifying learning styles for use in developing appropriate instructional strategies to meet the needs of all students | 3a.2. School-Based academic coaches will work in collaboration with teachers through PLCs to create lesson plans that address individual students' learning styles during math instruction. | 3a.2. Principal<br><br>District and School-Based Coaches | 3a.2. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans | 3a.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 3a.3. Teachers are not utilizing data to effectively provide manipulative activities for all students | 3a.3. School-Based academic coaches will provide professional development for teachers on using data to plan appropriate manipulative activities for all students.<br><br>The School-Based Math Coach will facilitate analysis of student data during common planning time. | 3a.3. Principal<br><br>District Math Coach<br><br>School-Based Math Coach | 3a..3. Data Notebook Review<br><br>Lesson Plans<br><br>Data Chats (individual and grade level) | 3a.3. Diagnostic assessments, FCIM assessments, End-of-Unit assessments, and district benchmark assessments that are aligned with the Next Generation or Common Core Math Standards | |
| | | 3a.4<br><br>Scheduling the students to have core instruction and time to be pulled out for instruction. | 3a.4<br><br>Math Interventionist will be pulling out the bottom quartile students for 30 minutes per day, based on formal and informal data. | 3a.4<br><br>Principal<br><br>District Support Staff | 3a.4<br><br>Weekly intervention logs<br><br>Ongoing progress monitoring | 3a.4 | |

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

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. | 3b.1. Few teachers are using the Quality Program Indicators consistently to enhance and encourage learning opportunities. | 3b.1. CSS Site Coach and District ESE staff will provide professional development and monitoring the use of Quality Program Indicators in the classroom. | 3b.1. CSS Site Coach District ESE staff | 3b.1. Focus Walks Classroom Observations | 3b.1. Quality Program Indicator Checklist | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics  Goal #3b:  No previous data due to cell size. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | *No data due to cell size..* | *No data due to cell size..* | | | | | |
| | | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | 3b.2. | |

## 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. Teachers do not have a clear understanding of the FCIM process and therefore FCIM is not being implemented on a daily basis. | 4a.1. The principal and School-Based Coaches will provide training on FCIM process and will assist teacher sin developing monthly FCIM calendars to show student weaknesses. | 4a.1. Principal<br><br>District and School-Based Coaches | 4a.1. Data Notebook Review<br><br>Data Chats (individual and grade level)<br><br>Classroom Observations<br><br>Monthly FCIM Calendars<br><br>FCIM Monitoring Forms | 4a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric<br><br>District Math Benchmark Assessment<br><br>FCIM Assessments | | |
| Mathematics Goal #4a:<br><br>The percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in math will increase from 86% (26) to 88% (27) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 86% (26) | 88% (27) | | | | |
| | | 4a.2. Many of the students lack the prerequisite math skills that are needed to be successful. | 4a.2. Through the use of vertical team planning, teachers will provide students with skills necessary to be proficient in math. | 4a.2. Principal<br><br>School-Based Coach<br><br>Teachers | 4a.2. Vertical Team Meetings<br><br>Learning Schedules | 4a.2.<br><br>Student Portfolios<br><br>Math Assessments<br><br>FCIM Data | |
| | | 4a.3 Teachers are not effectively implementing differentiated instructional strategies during the math block | 4a.3. School-Based Math Coach will plan, develop and implement lessons with teachers that address individual student needs through the Intensive Coaching Model | 4a.3. Principal<br><br>School-Based Coach<br><br>Teachers | 4a.3. Data Notebook Review<br><br>Data Chats (individual and grade level)<br><br>Classroom Observations<br><br>Lesson Plans | 4a.3. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric<br><br>Math Assessments<br><br>District Math Benchmark Assessment | |
| | | 3a.4 | 3a.4 | 3a.4 | 3a.4 | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4b. Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.** | 4b.1. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development on the implementation of Access Points. | 4b.1 CSS Site Coach will collaborate with District ESE Staff to provide professional development to implement Access Points in daily instruction. | 4b.1 District ESE Staff, Site Coach | 4b.1. Lesson Plans, Curriculum Data | 4b.1. Curriculum Based Assessments<br><br>Brigance Inventory of Early Development II | | |
| Mathematics Goal #4b:<br><br>No previous data due to cell size. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | *No data due to cell size.* | *No data due to cell size.* | | | | | |

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

| | | 4b.2<br><br>Scheduling the students to have core instruction and time to be pulled out for instruction. | 4b.2<br><br>Math Interventionist will be pulling out the bottom quartile students for 30 minutes per day, based on formal and informal data. | 4b.2<br><br>Principal<br><br>District Support Staff | 4b.2<br><br>Weekly intervention logs<br><br>Ongoing progress monitoring | 4b.2.<br><br>Student Portfolios<br><br>Math Assessments<br><br>FCIM Data | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | **2011-2012**<br><br><br>**41** | **2012-2013**<br><br><br>**47** | **2013-2014**<br><br><br>**52** | **2014-2015**<br><br><br>**57** | **2015-2016**<br><br><br>**63** | **2016-2017**<br><br><br>**68** | |
| **5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | **Baseline data 2010-2011** | | | | | | |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of<br><br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | 5B.1  Black:<br><br>Teachers do not have a clear understanding of the FCIM process and therefore FCIM is not being implemented on a daily basis. | 5B.1  Black:<br><br>The principal and School-Based Coaches will provide training on FCIM process and will assist teacher sin developing monthly FCIM calendars to show student weaknesses. | 5B.1 Principal<br><br>District and School-Based Coaches | 5B.1 . Data Notebook Review<br><br>Data Chats (individual and grade level)<br><br>Classroom Observations<br><br>Monthly FCIM Calendars<br><br>FCIM Monitoring Forms | 5B.1 DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric<br><br>District Math Benchmark Assessment<br><br>FCIM Assessments | |
| Mathematics Goal #5B:<br><br>The percentage of Black students not making AYP in math will decrease from<br><br>59% (70) to 53% (63) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br> | | | | |
| | Black:<br><br>59% (70) to | Black:<br><br>53% (63) | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 5B.2. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of explicit math instruction | 5B.2. School-Based coaches will provide support for individual teachers through the coaching model (e.g. co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate content specific common lessons that include appropriate content specific math instruction. | 5B.2. Principal<br><br>School-Based Coaches | 5B.2.. Data Notebook Review<br><br>Data Chats (individual and grade level)<br><br>Classroom Observations<br><br>DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric | 5B.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric<br><br><br>District Math Benchmark Assessment<br><br><br>Math Assessments | |
| | | 5B.3. Student data is not being used to monitor student progress. | 5B.3. School-Based Math Coach and District Math Coach will collaborate to provide teachers with professional development that focuses on using data to modify instruction that meets the needs of individual students.<br><br><br><br>School-Based Math Coach will facilitate analysis of student data during common planning time. | 5B.3. Principal, Math, Coach, and District Math Coach | 5B.3. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review | 5B.3. Diagnostic assessments, FCIM assessments, End-of_Unit assessments, and district benchmark assessments that are aligned with the Next Generation Math Standards | |
| | | 5B.4 Few teachers engage students during whole group and independent activities. | 5B.4 School Based Coaches will provide professional development on student engagement and will assist teachers with lesson plan development that includes a variety of student engagement activities. . | 5B.4<br><br>Principal<br><br>School Based Coaches<br><br>Teachers | 5B.4 Classroom Observations<br><br>Focus Walks<br><br>Lesson Plans | 5B.4 District Benchmarks<br><br>Common Assessments | |

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

| | | 5 B.5. Students are lacking prerequisite math skills | 5 B.5. School Based Coaches will provide professional development to teachers to implement and monitor students using the Quantile Framework technology to identify and address students math skill level | 5B.5. School Based Math Coach  Teachers | Quantile Framework Assignments | Quantile Framework Assessments | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of  Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5D:<br><br><br>*Not a cell.* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | *Not a cell.* | *Not a cell.* | | | | | |
| | — | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |

| | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| **5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | 5B.1 Teachers do not have a clear understanding of the FCIM process and therefore FCIM is not being implemented on a daily basis. | 5B.1 The principal and School-Based Coaches will provide training on FCIM process and will assist teacher sin developing monthly FCIM calendars to show student weaknesses. | 5B.1 Principal<br><br>District and School-Based Coaches | 5B.1 . Data Notebook Review<br><br>Data Chats (individual and grade level)<br><br>Classroom Observations<br><br>Monthly FCIM Calendars<br><br>FCIM Monitoring Forms | 5B.1 DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric<br><br>District Math Benchmark Assessment<br><br>FCIM Assessments | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5E:<br><br>The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease from 62 % (80) to 56% (72) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 62 % (80) | 56% (72). | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 5E.2. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of explicit math instruction | 5E.2. School-Based coaches will provide support for individual teachers through the coaching model (e.g. co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate content specific common lessons that include appropriate content specific math instruction. | 5E.2. Principal<br><br>School-Based Coaches | 5E.2.. Data Notebook Review<br><br>Data Chats (individual and grade level)<br><br>Classroom Observations<br><br>DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric | 5E.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric<br><br>District Math Benchmark Assessment<br><br>Math Assessments | |
| | | 5E.3. Student data is not being used to monitor student progress. | 5E.3. School-Based Math Coach and District Math Coach will collaborate to provide teachers with professional development that focuses on using data to modify instruction that meets the needs of individual students.<br><br>School-Based Math Coach will facilitate analysis of student data during common planning time. | 5E.3. Principal, Math, Coach, and District Math Coach | 5E.3. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review | 5E.3. Diagnostic assessments, FCIM assessments, End-of_Unit assessments, and district benchmark assessments that are aligned with the Next Generation Math Standards | |
| | | 5E. 4. Students do not have access to technology that supports prerequisite math skills. | 5E. 4. School-Based Math Coach will collaborate with teachers to provide professional development that focuses on implementation and monitoring of Success Maker. | 5E. 4. School-Based Math Coach, Teachers | 5E. 4. Success Maker Reports | 5E. 4. Success Maker Assessments | |

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

**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 Activity** | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator | PD Participants | Target Dates and Schedules | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| and/or PLC Focus | | and/or | (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | | |
| Collaborate with teachers in grade level groups to design instruction that follows an instructional delivery model that includes explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice as well as lesson assessment. | K-5 | PLC Leader District and school -based Math Coach | School-wide | October 2012 | Class observation  Daily lesson plans | School -based Math Coach |

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

| | K-5 | District and school -based Math Coach | School-wide | October 2012- June 2013 | | School -based Math Coach |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The district instructional mathematics specialist and school-based mathematics coaches will utilize the intensive coaching model (e.g., lesson planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing) to support individual teachers in implementing questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | | | | | Class observation  Daily lesson plans | |
| Unpacking the NGSSS and Common Core standards and FCAT 2.0 Item Specifications | All grade levels/ subjects | Regional Reading Coordinator | All teachers | Early Release and common planning  (August 2012 – June 2013) | Monitoring lesson plans and classroom instruction | Principal, School-Based Coaches |
| Differentiated Instruction | All grade levels/ subjects | Math Coach, and District Math coaches. | All teachers | Co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing, data chats  (October 2012 –June 2013) | Monitoring small group math instruction, and  RtI | District Math Coaches. |
| School-Based Math Coach will collaborate with teachers to provide professional development that focuses on implementation and monitoring of Success Maker | 2 - 5 grade levels/ all subjects | Math Coach, and District Math coaches. | 2 - 5 grade levels/ all subjects | October 2012 –June 2013 | Monitoring Success Maker ongoing progress | School Based Math Coach |
| Student Engagement | All grade levels | School Based Coaches | All teachers | August 2012 | Lesson Plans | Principal |
| Conduct professional development on the use of Access Points | All grade levels on Access Points | CSS Site Coach  District ESE Staff | All ESE Teachers | Early Release and Common Planning  (September 2012) | Classroom Observations Class Observations  Daily lesson plans  Data Notebooks | School Based Coaches CSS Site Coach |

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

| Complete Autism Internet Modules to enhance the teachers' knowledge of the Quality Program Indicators | All grade levels on Access Points | CSS Site Coach<br><br>District ESE Staff | All ESE Teachers | Early Release and Common Planning<br><br>(September 2012 – June 2013) | End of module certificate<br><br>Classroom Observations | CSS Site Coach |

## 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 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Subtotal:** | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| **Subtotal:** | | | |
| **Total:** | | | |

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

*End of Mathematics Goals*

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| Elementary and Middle Science Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

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

| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. | 1a.1. Teachers lack science content knowledge.<br><br>Few teachers effectively use the 5E's research-based model to deliver instruction in science. | 1a.1. Collaborate with teachers during PLCs to offer professional development and to develop lessons that incorporate the 5E's research-based instructional model. | 1a.1. Principal<br><br>District Based Science Coach | 1a.1. Focus Walks<br><br>Lesson Plans<br><br>Classroom Observations | 1a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Science Goal #1a:<br><br>The percentage of students achieving FCAT level 3 in science will increase from 44% (20) to 47% (25) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 44% (20) | 47% (25) | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1a..2. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of the 5 E's instructional model. | 1a..2. Support science teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing) to implement the 5E's research-based instructional model. | 1a..2. Principal, District Based Science Coach | 1a..2. Focus Walks<br><br>Lesson Plans<br><br>Classroom Observations | 1a..2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric | |
| | | 1a..3. Teachers do not follow an appropriate progression of rigor according to the Webb's Depth of Knowledge Levels | 1a..3. Provide professional development in Webb's Depth of Knowledge and use this information to develop lessons that incorporate a higher level of cognitive complexity. | 1a..3. Principal<br><br>Regional Reading Coordinator<br><br>District Science Coach<br><br>Teachers | 1a..3. Focus Walks,<br><br>Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans | 1a..3. Lesson Plans<br><br>Appropriate Observation Instrument<br><br>Maintain activity logs that include classroom observations | |

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

| 1b. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science. | 1b.1.<br><br>Students need to be exposed to a variety of science concepts with hands-on experience through the scientific method. | 1b.1.<br><br>Students will participate in the scientific method of exploration with hands-on opportunities to develop an understanding of science concepts. | 1b.1.<br><br>CSS Site Coach<br><br>Teachers | 1b.1.<br><br>Lesson Plans<br><br>Classroom Observations<br><br>Data Notebook | 1b.1.<br><br>Pre and Post Curriculum Based Assessments | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Science Goal #1b:<br><br>The percentage of students achieving FAA level 4, 5, and 6 will be 50% (8) since there is no data to show a gain. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | *No data due to cell size..* | *50% (8)* | | | | |
| | | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.** | 2a.1. Scaffolding, pacing, prompting and probing techniques are not used when asking questions designed to promote higher-order thinking in science instruction. | 2a.1. Collaborate to develop and implement professional development for all teachers on understanding and use of Webb's Depth of Knowledge model to design higher-order questioning and discourse for daily science instruction. | 2a.1.Principal, District and School-Based Coaches | 2a.1. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations | 2a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric | | |
| Science Goal #2a:<br><br>The percentage of students achieving FCAT Levels 4 and 5 in science will increase from<br><br>5% (2) to 10% (4) | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | *5% (2)* | *10% (4)* | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2a.2. Students are not making a connection between classroom investigations and concepts being taught. | 2a.2  Full implementation of science instruction via the learning schedule, instructional calendar, test specifications document<br><br>Provide enrichment opportunities via field trips<br><br>Teachers provide relevant classroom experiences to connect the investigations with concepts taught | 2a.2. Principal, School-based Coaches, Teachers, | 2a.2. Classroom observations, Student journals<br><br>Lesson Plans | 2a.2 Lesson Plans<br><br>Classroom artifacts<br><br>Appropriate observation instrument<br><br>Maintain activity logs that include classroom observations | |

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

| 2b. **Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.** | 2b.1. Teachers need professional development on the scientific method in order to enhance and encourage student learning in science concepts. | 2b.1. Teachers will use the scientific method of exploration with hands-on opportunities (for students to develop a better understanding of science concepts. | 2b.1. CSS Site Coach  Teachers | 2b.1. Lesson Plans  Classroom Observations  Data Notebook | 2b.1. Pre and Post Curriculum Based Assessments | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Science Goal #2b:  The percentage of students achieving FAA level 7 will be 10% (2) since there is no data to show a gain | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | *No data due to cell size.* | 10% (2). | | | | | |
| | | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | 2b.2. | |

*End of Elementary and Middle*

## 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 and/or | PD Facilitator and/or | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Lesson planning using the 5E's research-based instructional model | K-5 Teachers | PLC Leader District-Based Science Coach | K-5 science teachers by grade level | September 2012 - October 2012 | Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review | Principal |
| Understanding and use of Webb's Depth of Knowledge model to design higher-order questioning and discourse in science | K-5 teachers | Regional Reading Coordinator | PreK-5 teachers school-wide | October 2012 –December 2012 | Focus Walks, Classroom Observations | District and School-Based Coaches Principal

District and School-Based Coaches |

## 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 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: | | | |

*End of Science Goals*

## Writing Goals

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

| Writing Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

# 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 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1a. FCAT:** **Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.** | 1a.1 Teachers are not providing students with strategies for revising and editing writing products. | 1a.1 Teachers will be provided training in the implementation of Step-Up to Writing. | 1a.1 Principal, School-based Coaches | 1a.1 There will be evidence of organization in students completed published pieces in their writing portfolio and journals. | 1a.1 Monitoring the Writing folder and journals. District Writing Prompt Response School Monthly Writing Prompt Responses | | |
| <u>Writing Goal #1a:</u> Students achieving FCAT level 4 and higher will increase from 8% to 20% Students achieving FCAT level 3 will increase from 83% to 91% | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | Level 3: 83%(40) Level 4: 8% (3) | Level 3+: 91% (35) Level 4+: 20% (7) | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1a.2. Teachers are not modeling effective writing strategies and/or the writing process effectively. | 1a.2. The School-based Coaches will facilitate professional development on modeling effective writing strategies and writing process. | 1a.2. Principal, <br><br> School- based Coaches <br><br> Teachers | 1a.2. Focus Walks <br><br><br> Lesson Plans <br><br><br> Classroom Observations | 1a.2. Student performance on district's monthly writing assessments <br><br><br> Student portfolios | |
| | | 1a.3 <br><br> Teachers are not implementing Writing and Literacy Block with fidelity on a daily basis. | 1a.3 <br><br> School based coaches will provide professional development on the implementation of Writing and Literacy Block in all grade levels. | 1a.3 <br><br> School Based Coaches <br><br> Teachers | 1a.3 <br><br> Focus Walks <br><br> Lesson Plans <br><br> Board Configurations <br><br> Classroom Observations | 1a.3 <br><br> Student Portfolios | |
| | | 1a.4. Small group instruction is not currently being implemented. | 1a. 4. School-Based Coaches will provide professional development during PLCs on effective small group differentiated instruction | 1a.4. <br><br> Principal <br><br> School-Based Coaches <br><br> Teachers | 1a.4. <br><br> Classroom Observations <br><br> Differentiated Lesson Plans | 1a.4. <br><br> Student Portfolio | |
| | | 1a.5. Teachers need to establish conferencing and peer conferencing in the Literacy Block. | 1a.5. School-Based Coaches will provide professional development during PLCs on effective conferencing during the Literacy Block. | 1a.5. <br><br> Principal <br><br> School-Based Coaches <br><br> Teachers | 1a.5. <br><br> Conference Journals | 1a.5. <br><br> Conference Journal | |
| | | 1a.6. Students are not currently using writing journals and sourcebooks effectively. | 1a.6. School-Based Coaches will provide professional development during PLCs on implementation of writing journals and sourcebooks. | 1a.6.  Principal <br><br> School-Based Coach <br><br> Teachers | 1a.6. <br><br> Writing Journals and sourcebooks | 1a.6. <br><br> Writing Journals | |

| | | 1a.7. New teachers that are unfamiliar with Florida Writing Assessment expectations. | 1a.7. School-Based Coaches and Fourth grade writing teachers will collaborate to analyze the State Writing Scoring rubric through PLCs.<br><br>School-Based Coaches will model how to analyze and score student work using the State Scoring Rubric. | 1a.7. Principal<br><br>School-Based Coach<br><br>Teachers | 1a.7. Focus Walks<br><br>Writing Plans | 1a.7. Writing Prompt Responses | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.** | 1b.1. Teachers are not modeling effective writing strategies and/or the writing process effectively. | 1b.1. The School-based Coaches will facilitate professional development on modeling effective writing strategies and incorporating rigorous writing instruction across the curriculum | 1b.1. School Based Coaches<br><br>Teachers | 1b.1. Focus Walks<br><br>Lesson Plans | 1b.1. Student Portfolios | | |

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

| Writing Goal #1b: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance·* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *The percentage of students scoring a 4 or higher on Florida Alternate Assessment will be 30% (5)* | | | | | | | |
| | No data due to cell size. | 30% (5) | | | | | |
| | | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | 1b.2. | |
| | | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | 1b.3. | |

# Writing Professional Development

**Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity**

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

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K -5 Teachers | District coach | K – 5 Teachers | | Monitoring teacher lesson plans, instruction, student portfolios and journals | Principal |
| Step-Up to Writing | | | | August 2012 – October 2012 | | School-based Coaches |
| Writer's Workshop Training | K-5 Teachers | School coaches | K-5 Teachers | October 2012- November 2012 | Monitoring teacher lesson plans, instruction, student portfolios | Principal |
| | | | | | | School-based Coaches |
| | K-5 | Regional Reading Coordinator | School-wide | October 2012 – June 2013 | District Monthly writing prompts | |
| Modeling effective writing strategies and incorporating rigorous writing instruction across the curriculum. | | | | | Student portfolios | School –based Coaches |
| Coaches model (e.g., co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate modeling effective writing strategies and rigorous writing instruction across the curriculum | K-5 | School-based Coaches | School-wide | October 2012 – June 2013 | Student portfolios | |
| | | | | | Class observations | School-based Coaches |
| School-Based coaches will provide professional development on effective small group instruction, writing journals and conferencing | K-5 | School Based Coaches | School-wide | August – October 2012 | Monitoring writing journals, conference logs and lesson plans during PLCs | Principal |
| | | | | | Classroom Observations | Literacy Coach |

**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 |
| | | | |
| **Subtotal:** | | | |
| **Total:** | | | |

*End of Writing Goals*

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

| **Attendance** | **Problem-** | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| Goal(s) | 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 | | |

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

| 1. Attendance | 1. Lack of parental compliance with the district's attendance policy; Parental involvement/ communication; disconnected telephone numbers; change of address; | 1.1. Truant officer/ guidance counselor will make home visits as needed; frequently update student information cards; speak to parents in student drop off/pick up zone; weekly/ monthly reminders to repeated attendance issues | 1.1. Principal, CRT Operator, Guidance Counselor, Truant Officer | 1.1. Monitoring of the number of truancy cases opened and then closed due to improved attendance. | 1.1.Review of the monthly attendance | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

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

| Attendance Goal #1:<br><br>There will be a decrease in the percentage/number of students with excessive tardies and excessive absences by 10%. | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:* | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *93.8%* | *96%* | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 200 | | | | |
| | *223* | *200* | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | | |
| | *149* | *134* | | | | |
| | | 2. High mobility due to the make up of the community (mainly apartments). Many of the students move without giving prior notice to the school. | 1.2. Collaboration with our Family Engagement Center to educate parents and teachers and encourage increased home/school communication. | 1.2. Parent Liaison | 1.2. Monitoring of the number of truancy cases opened, and then closed due to improved attendance. | 1.2. Review of monthly attendance |

| | | 1.3. Need to strengthen the referral process from teacher to administration | 1.3. School Culture/Foundations committee will revise and communicate the attendance referral process from teacher to administration | 1.3. Principal Guidance Counselor School Culture/Foundations Committee | 1.3. Increased attendance referrals and decreased absences. | 1.3. Increased attendance referrals and decreased absences. | |

**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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|

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

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Subtotal:** | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Subtotal:** | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Subtotal:** | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| **Subtotal:** | | | |
| **Total:** | | | |

*End of Attendance Goals*

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Suspension Goal(s) | Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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<br><br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| 1. Suspension: | 1.1. Inconsistent implementation of rituals and routines and CHAMPS | 1.1. Foundations/Safe and Civil Schools | 1.1. Principal, Foundations Team, Teachers, Guidance Counselor | 1.1. Monthly Data Report | 1. | Safe Schools survey, Common area assessment, Staff observations, | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Behavior charts | | | | |
| | | Development of School wide Discipline Plan | | Second Steps curriculum taught by teachers | | Behavior contract | | |
| | | Second Steps Student Success Through Prevention Curriculum (anti-bullying) | | | | | | |
| | | Character Education lessons bi-weekly with the Guidance Counselor | | | | | | |
| | | CHAMPS school-wide implementation | | | | | | |
| | | Common area station training for students in grades K-5th | | | | | | |
| | | Positive incentive programs for classes that demonstrate behaviors that meets school-wide expectations. | | | | | | |
| | | Parent conferences/ behavior contracts for moderate to severe | | | | | | |

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

| | | behavior | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Suspension Goal #1:<br><br>There will be a decrease in the number of students who are placed in Out-of-School Suspension.<br><br>. | 2012 Total Number of  In –School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of ___<br><br>In- School Suspensions | | | | | |
| | There were no In-School Suspensions during the 2011-2012 school year | *0 in school suspensions for the 2012-2013 school year* | | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended ___<br><br>In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended ___<br><br>In -School | | | | | |
| | 0 | *0* | | | | | |
| | 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions ___<br><br>Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of ___<br><br>Out-of-School Suspensions | | | | | |
| | *18* | *16* | | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended ___<br><br>Out- of- School | 2013 Expected Number of Stuents Suspended ___<br><br>Out- of-School ___ | | | | | |
| | *18* | *16* | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

## 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Second Step Program | As Needed | Guidance Counselor | As Needed | Individual Basis | Classroom Observations | Principal |
| CHAMPs Training | As Needed | CHAMPs Trainer | As Needed | Individual Basis | Classroom Observations | Guidance Counselor Principal |

## Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

*End of Suspension Goals*

## 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 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |

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

| 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**<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br><br>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.* | | | | | |
| Parent Involvement Plan is uploaded online. | 2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:* | 2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:* | | | |
| | | | | | |

## 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

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

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## Parent Involvement Budget

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Improve students' reading comprehension | Leveled Readers | Title I Parent Involvement | |
| | | | |
| **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 |
| Increase Parent Involvement | Transportation | Title I Parent Involvement | |
| Increase Parent Involvement | Child Care | Title I Parent Involvement | |

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Increase Parent Involvement | Catering Services | Title I Parent Involvement | |
| Increase Parent Involvement | Translators | Title I Parent Involvement | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: | | | |

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

e the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

| Additional Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| 1. Additional Goal | 1.1. | 1.1 | 1.1. | 1.1 | 1.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Some of the parents in the school do not want to follow the procedures of the school. | Parents are required to sign in and out each time upon arriving and leaving the school campus. They must show a valid ID and obtain a visitor's badge. Parents must stay in vehicles when picking up students at the end of the school day.<br><br>All walkers are dismissed at the same location and parents are asked to wait at the gate for their child. | School based Leadership Team.<br><br>Classroom Teachers<br><br>Front Office Staff<br><br>Custodians | The number of parents who are stopping by the front office each day.<br><br>Faculty and staff stopping anyone without a visitor's badge.. | Visitor's Logs maintained by the office staff. | | |
| Additional Goal #1:<br><br>***School safety will increase by 10%.*** | 2012 Current Level :*| 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |
| | ***No data from previous year.*** | ***10% increase in school safety.*** | | | | | |

| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Faculty and staff members unlock the gates during the school day. | All gates are kept locked and closed each day. | All school based faculty and staff. | Checks thought-out the days to ensure the gates are locked. | Ongoing daily log of the gates. . | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

## Additional Goals Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity** | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |

## Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district | | | |
|---|---|---|---|

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

| funded activities /materials. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Subtotal:** | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Subtotal:** | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Subtotal:** | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Subtotal:** | | | |
| **Total:** | | | |

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

## Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Please provide the total budget from each section. |
|---|
| **Reading Budget** |
| **Total:** |
| **Mathematics Budget** |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| | **Total:** |
| **Science Budget** | |
| | **Total:** |
| **Writing Budget** | |
| | **Total:** |
| **Attendance Budget** | |
| | **Total:** |
| **Suspension Budget** | |
| | **Total:** |
| **Dropout Prevention Budget** | |
| | **Total:** |
| **Parent Involvement Budget** | |
| | **Total:** |
| **Additional Goals** | |
| | **Total:** |
| | |
| | **Grand Total:** |

## Differentiated Accountability

**School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance**
Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. double click the desired box; 2.when the menu pops up, select "checked" under "Default Value" header; 3. Select "OK", this will place an "x" in the box.)

| School Differentiated Accountability Status | | |
|---|---|---|
| ☐Priority | ☐Focus | ☐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. |
| SAC will work with the school based Leadership Team to determine needs for increased student proficiency. SAC will work closely with the school to monitor student achievement. |

| Describe the projected use of SAC funds. | Amount |
|---|---|
| SAC funds will be used for implementation of the School Improvement Plan. |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |