

Florida Department of Education

**DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1**

Proposed for 2012-2013

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

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Sunrise Elementary School	District Name: Osceola	Sch
Principal: John Campbell	Superintendent: Melba Luciano	Prin
SAC Chair: Heidi Dawson	Date of School Board Approval: October 2012	SAC

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	John Campbell	B.S. Psychology M.S. Educational Administration	7	17	History at Sunrise reflects constant growth as evidenced in the 7 year history. The school has earned three B's and four A's in the last four years.
Assistant Principal	Cara Colovos	B.S. Mass Communications, M.S. Varying Exceptionalities, Educational Leadership	4	11	Last four years at Sunrise, the school has earned an A grade.

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Language Arts	Diane Turner	B.S. Elementary Education, M.S. Elementary Education, Ph.D. Ed. Leadership, E.D. Ed Leadership	7	7	Sunrise Elementary has improved from a B grade in its first three years to an A grade in the last four years.
Math/ Science	Erin Cummings	B.A. Elementary Education M.A. Elementary Education	0	0	New hire

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
58	8%(5)	18.9%(11)	57%(33)	8%(5)	17%(10)	100%	17%(10)	6%(4)	79%(46)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Heather Brenneman	Kimberly Harrison	ESE background, teaching experience	Monthly Best Practice Reviews
Heidi Dawson	Emily Danks	3 rd grade chair	Monthly BP Reviews
Melissa Henry	Ashlee Mikels	Varied educational background and experience level	Monthly BP Reviews

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Assistant Principal, School Counselor, Literacy Coach, Learning Resource Teacher
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 RtI Leadership team conducts bi-monthly or at the least monthly meeting to review student data especially those students who are identified as Tier 2 or 3. As the team reviews the relevant data, recommendations are made to continue or stop at given Tier.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? There is a clear integration of the SIP and RtI because the academic and behavioral goals are schoolwide. The SIP is a collaborative effort and the whole staff (PSS and Instructional) are involved. The support is based on the student's need. Students performing outside of the 80% passing rate instructional support is given respectively. The higher the Tier, the more support.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. The core curriculum pieces are the state adopted materials and built in progress monitoring pieces are easily assessable along with district supported formative assessments.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Grade level meetings are used to in-service staff with curriculum support and academic interventions when needed.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. The whole RtI team is supported by district and in-house through routine brain storming sessions to incorporate tried and true strategies.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Literacy Coach, teacher representation from each grade level, Media Specialist
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). Literacy Council Meetings are held the first Wednesday of the month to discuss, plan, and implement yearly events sponsored by the Council.

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

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

50th Literacy Day

Fundraising to raise money to sponsor Summer Reading Initiatives and Book Giveaways for Literacy Night

Literacy Night

Vocabulary Word Walls

Vocabulary Parade

Summer Reading Program

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1A.1. None, if curriculum timelines are followed, progress monitoring is conducted with fidelity, and 90 minute reading block is constant.	1A.1.Small group differentiated instruction will be incorporated. Triple iii time will be made available. Extended Learning Opportunities offered throughout the week(2 hour sessions weekly) Excellence Labs instituted for targeted students.	1A.1.Classroom teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Media Specialist	1A.1.Data analysis from PLC groups. CIM in place	1A.1.FAIR, Formatives, ORF Fluency, District assessments		

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

<u>Reading Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Based on the 2013 FC AT, the percent of 3 rd -5 th grade scoring at Level 3 or higher will meet or exceed the district and state goals.							
	Based on the 2012 FCAT, 61% of our 3 rd - 5 th grade students scored at or above Achievement Level 3	Based on the 2013 Reading FCAT 70% of our 3 rd - 5 th grade students will score at or above Achievement Level 3					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	1B.1. Maintaining or improving the levels attained this year.	1B.1.Small group instruction, incorporating technology i.e. SMART board in the reading block. Prof. Development focusing on building vocabulary (word walls) and comprehension.	1B.1.Self contained ESE teacher, Literacy Coach, Administration	1B.1.Data analysis to lead instruction and curriculum goals.	1B.1. Pre/Post Test data		

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

<p>Reading Goal #1B: <i>Based on the 2013 FCAT, the percent of 3rd-5th grade scoring at Level 3 or higher will meet or exceed the district and state goals.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>Based on the 2012 FAA, 8% of 3rd-5th grade students scored a Level 4 or higher in Reading.</p>	<p>Based on the 2013 FAA, 25% of the 3rd-5th grade students will score a Level 4 or higher.</p>					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1. Maintaining or increasing the current level of performance.	2A.1. Focus on enrichment activities during iii. Leveled Readers incorporated for enrichment. Book studies	2A.1. Classroom teacher, Literacy Coach, Administration	2A.1. Data analysis from ongoing PLCs focusing on data trends.	2A.1. FAIR reports, District Assessments (Formatives), Pre/Post test, Benchmark assessments.		
Reading Goal #2A: <i>Based on the 2013 FCAT, the percent of 3rd-5th grade students scoring Level 4 or 5 in reading will meet or exceed the District and State averages.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	Based on the 2012 FCAT, 31% of 3 rd -5 th grade students scored Level 4 or higher in Reading.	Based on the 2013 FCAT, 40% of 3 rd -5 th grade students will score a Level 4 or higher in Reading.					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	

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

<p>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</p>	<p>2B.1. Moving the higher performing students to the top tier or the scale.</p>	<p>2B.1.Small group instruction with leveled readers; vocabulary development; iii.; Guided reading</p>	<p>2B.1.Self-contained ESE classroom teacher, Literacy Coach; Administration</p>	<p>2B.1.Progress monitoring; Focused PLC group meeting targeting this upper tier.</p>	<p>2B.1.Pre/Post testing, Skill checklist.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #2B:</u> Based on the 2013 FAA the percent of 3rd-5th grade students scoring Level 7 or higher in Reading will meet or exceed District or State averages..</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>Based on the 2012 FAA 8% of 3rd-5th grade students scored a Level 7 or higher..</p>	<p>Based on the 2013 FAA, 25% of 3rd-5th grade students will score a Level 7 or higher.</p>					
		<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	
		<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3A.1. Improving learning gains by 7% with historical data to the contrary.	3A.1. Target all students with iii for remediation and enrichment. Differentiated instruction in class. Triumphs, Ticket to Read	3A.1. Classroom teacher, Literacy Coach, Administration	3A.1. Data analysis from PLC groups, Rtl debriefings	3A.1. FAIR reports, District Assessments, Pre/Post test		
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u> Based on the 2013 FCAT, the percent of 4 th and 5 th grade students making learning gains in reading will meet or exceed the District and State averages.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	Based on the 2012 FCAT, 73% of 4 th and 5 th grade students made learning gains in Reading.	Based on the 2013 FCAT, 80% of 4 th and 5 th grade students will make learning gains in Reading					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.

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

<p>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</p>	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<p>Reading Goal #3B: In 2013, the percent of 4th and 5th grade students making learning gains in reading will meet District or State averages.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u></p>					
	Not able to disaggregate.	Not able to predict due to lack of data.					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. All the subgroups that make up the school population making such drastic gains(25%) in a subsequent year.	4A.1. Small group differentiated instruction; RtI targeted intervention; Triumphs; Ticket to Read; iii and Excellence Labs	4A.1. Classroom teacher, ESOL assistants, VE teachers, Literacy Coach, LRS, Administration	4A.1. Data analysis from strategic PLC groups.	4A.1. FAIR reports, District Assessments(Formatives), Pre/Post tests, Benchmark assessments		
Reading Goal #4: Based on the 2013 FCAT, the students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will meet or exceed the District and State averages.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	Based on 2012 FCAT, 81% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.	Based on the 2013 FCAT, 85% of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains.					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	CIM	CIM	CIM	CIM	50% closure	
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> Achievement gap is being closed by evidence of FCAT scores and historical trends over the past seven years that Sunrise has been a school.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> <i>With established Reading Goal for school the FCAT results will reflect</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

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

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

Reading Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

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

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Grade Level PLCs	All grades	Grade Level Chair	All teachers	Monthly meetings	Assessment Data	Administration
Literacy Council	Various grade levels	Literacy Coach	Literacy Themes	Monthly meetings	Information disseminated to all GL teams	Administration, Literacy Coach
Marzano Prof. Dev.	All grades	Vanguard Team	All staff	Three formal meetings	Classroom walkthroughs, GL debriefings	Administration

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Ticket to Read	Literacy Intervention	School-based	\$3500
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 Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. Students with than 2 years of English instruction; Students with learning disabilities in addition to ELL status.	1.1.Exposure to conversation and vocabulary in an inclusion setting; Use of ESOL strategies in Language instruction; ESOL support through paras.	1.1.Classroom teacher, ESOL staff, and Administration	Data disaggregation from PLC groups.	1.1.CELLA results	
CELLA Goal #1: Based on the 2013 CELLA the percent of ELL students scoring Proficient in Listening and Speaking will meet or exceed District or State averages	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	Based on the 2012 CELLA, 56% of ELL students scored at or above Proficiency Achievement Level.					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

<p>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</p>	<p>2.1. Students with less than 2 years of instruction in English; Students with learning disabilities coupled with ELL status.</p>	<p>2.1.Differentiate instruction with leveled readers from Treasures and Triumphs; iii remediation, ESOL support in classroom.</p>	<p>2.1.Classroom teacher, ESOL staff, and Administration</p>	<p>2.1.Data disaggregation from PLC groups.</p>	<p>2.1.CELLA results</p>	
<p><u>CELLA Goal #2:</u> Based on the 2013 CELLA the percent of ELL students scoring Proficient in Reading will meet or exceed District or State averages.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u></p>					
	<p>Based on the 2012 CELLA,39%_ of ELL students scored at or above the Proficiency Achievement Level.</p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>
		<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1. Students with less than 2 years of instruction in English; Planning, support, and conventions of English.	2.1.Narrative and Expository Core Connections for writing; Text deconstruction in both primary and intermediate grades using Core Connection for writing, modeling, writing frames, analysis and response practice.	2.1.Classroom teachers, Literacy Coach, ESOL support staff, and Administration.	2.1.Data analysis from PLC groups.	2.1.CELLA reports.	
CELLA Goal #3: Based on the 2013 CELLA the percent of ELL students scoring Proficient in Writing will meet or exceed District and State averages.	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					
	Based on the 2012 CELLA 32%_ % of ELL students scored at or above the Writing Proficiency Achievement Level.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. Number sense; Basic arithmetic facts; vocabulary cues; higher order application	1A.1. Differentiated Instruction with use of manipulatives; Intervention pieces of Go Math; in depth Go Math problem solving strategies; iii; ELO	1A.1. Classroom teacher, Math Coach, and Administration	1A.1. Data dissemination through PLCs and focus on deficit math trends among particular grade levels.	1A.1. District Assessments, Pre/Post test,.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u> Based on the 2013 FCAT the percent of 3 rd -5 th graders scoring Level 3 or higher in Math will meet or exceed district and state averages.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	Based on the 2012 Math FCAT 57% of 3 rd -5 th grade students scored at or above Achievement Level 3.	Based on the 2013 Math FCAT the percent of 3 rd -5 th graders scoring Level 3 will be 70% or higher.					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1. Number sense; Basic math facts; Vocabulary; Understanding math questions or higher order thinking vs. basic arithmetic facts.	1B.1. Differentiated Instruction with use of manipulatives; Vocabulary building activities; Practice concept development	1B.1. Self-contained ESE classroom teacher, MathCoach, and Administration	1B.1. Data analysis within PLC group.	1B.1. Pre/Post tests; Skill checklists.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: Based on the 2013 FAA the percent of 3 rd -5 th graders scoring Level 4,5, and 6 in Math will meet or exceed district or state averages.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
	Based on the 2012 FAA, 42% of 3 rd -5 th graders scored at 4,5,6	Based on the 2013 FAA 50% of 3 rd -5 th graders will score at a 4, 5, 0r 6					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1. Making or maintaining the Learning Gains with our higher achieving students.	2A.1. Gifted/Enrichment expanded to all grade levels through our iii; Math Olympiad participation; Cooperative Learning activities encouraging math problem solving in real world setting.	2A.1. Classroom teacher and Administration	2A.1. Data Analysis through our PLCs.	2A.1. District Assessments, Pre/Post tests		
Mathematics Goal #2A: Based on the 2013 FCAT the percent of 3 rd -5 th graders scoring Level 4 or higher in Math will meet or exceed District or State averages..	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	Based on the 2012 Math FCAT, 25% of our 3 rd -5 th graders scored Level 4 or higher	Based on the 2013 FCAT, 30% of our 3 rd -5 th graders will score a Level 4 or higher.					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	

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

<p>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</p>	<p>2B.1. Making greater Learning Gains with our higher achieving students; Concept mastery</p>	<p>2B.1. Individualized, advanced instruction; Guided Practice; expanding the use of manipulatives.</p>	<p>2B.1. Self-contained ESE classroom teacher and Administration.</p>	<p>2B.1. Data analysis in PLC group.</p>	<p>2B.1. Pre/Post tests; Skill checklist.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u> Based on the 2013 FAA, the percent of 3rd-5th graders scoring Level 7 or higher in Math will meet or exceed District or State averages.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>Based on the 2012 FAA, 42% of our 3rd-5th graders scored Level 4 or higher.</p>	<p>Based on the 2013 FAA, 50% of our 3rd-5th graders will score a Level 7 or higher.</p>					
		<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	
		<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	

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

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. Improving learning gains with high achievers.	3A.1. Advanced Instruction through Gifted/High Achieving classes; iii enrichment; Intervention through Go Math	3A.1. Classroom teacher, Math Coach, Administration	3A.1. Data analysis through PLC groups.	3A.1. District Assessments; Pre/Post tests.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u> Based on the 2013 FCAT the percent of 4 th and 5 th graders making Learning Gains in Math will meet or exceed District and State averages.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	Based on the 2012 Math FCAT 71% of our 4 th and 5 th grades demonstrated learning gains.	Based on the 2013 Math FCAT 75% of our 4 th and 5 th grades will demonstrate learning gains.					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	

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

<p>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	<p>3B.1. Making learning gains with higher achieving students.</p>	<p>3B.1. Advanced instruction using existing curriculum and resources.</p>	<p>3B.1. Self-contained ESE classroom teacher, Math Coach, and Administration</p>	<p>3B.1. Data analysis in established PLC group..</p>	<p>3B.1. Pre/Post tests. Skill checklist.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u> Based on the 2013 FAA the percent of 3rd-5th graders making Learning Gains will meet or exceed District or State averages.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u></p>					
	<p>Data not readily available.</p>	<p>Based on 2013 FAA, 3rd-5th graders will make learning gains.</p>					
		<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	
		<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1. Common trends with 2 or 3 deficit math standards.	4A.1. Differentiated instruction with emphasis on manipulatives, participation in ELO; Excellence Labs; Go Math intervention; incentives	4A.1. Classroom teacher, Math Coach, Administration.	4A.1. Data analysis through PLCs.	4A.1. District Assessments; Pre/Post tests.		
Mathematics Goal #4: Based on the 2013 Math FCAT, the lowest quartile will meet or exceed the District and State average..	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	Based on the 2012 FCAT, 67% of the lowest quartile made learning gains.	Based on the 2013 Math FCAT, 75% of the lowest quartile will make learning gains.					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	CIM	CIM	CIM	CIM		
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5A: Achievement gap is being closed by evidence of current FCAT scores and historical trends over the past seven years that Sunrise has been a school.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

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

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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
AIMS Training	K-5	LRS	Schoolwide	1 st 9wks	Classroom iObservations Data collecting; progress monitoring; Benchmark testing	Administration, LRS
Math RtI	K-5	LRS	GLMs	Ongoing(monthly)	Classroom iObservations, Data collecting; progress monitoring	Administration, LRS
Think Central	K-2	LRS	K-2	Ongoing	Classroom iObservations; Data collecting; progress monitoring	Administration, LRS

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. Mastering the Science Benchmarks within the curriculum timeline.	1A.1. Monitor the fidelity at which the science standards are mastered.	1A.1. LRS; Administration	1A.1. Monitoring Lesson Plans, Classroom walkthroughs.	1A.1. BOY, MOY Data Director testing.		
Science Goal #1A: We will continue to increase the number of students scoring at a Level 3 or greater proportionately.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 					
	60% of our 5 th grade students scored a Level 3 or higher.	The 5 th grade students will improve the science score by 10% on the FCAT.					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2A.1.Content or skill mastery	2A.1.Challenge students by inquiry and higher level thinking.	2A.1 Classroom teacher, LRS, Administration.	2A.1.Monitoring Lesson plans; classroom walkthroughs	2A.1.BOY, MOY Data Director test; End of Unit test.		
Science Goal #2A: The number of students scoring levels 4 & 5 will increase by 20%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	The number of students scoring Levels 4 & 5 on FCAT Science was 13%.	The number of students scoring Levels 4 & 5 will increase by 12% in 2013.					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1.Maintaining the same level of performance with new group.	2B.1.Continue lesson development and processing of science skills outlined in adopted curriculum.	2B.1.Self-contained ESE classroom teacher, LRS, Administration	2B.1.Monitoring weekly acquisition of science skills through lesson plans, checklists, etc.	2B.1.Pre-post test		

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

<u>Science Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Will maintain the goal of 100% scoring Level 7 and above on the Science portion of the FAA.							
	100% of the 5 th grade students taking the FAA scored a Level 7 or higher.	100% of 5 th grade students taking 2013 FAA will score a Level 7 or higher.					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
AIMS	K-5	LRS	K-5 teachers during GLMs	Early release Wednesday	Data collection and tracking	LRS, Principal

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

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

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

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1. Conventions in addition to background knowledge or schema.	1A.1. Practice prompts and practice proof reading strategically; Core Connection training; Peer scoring	1A.1. Classroom teacher, Literacy Coach, Administration.	1A.1. Peer review of writing prompts; Teacher writing exchange.	1A.1. Osceola Writes; FCAT Writes.		
Writing Goal #1A: <i>Based on the 2013 FCAT Writing, our 4th graders will meet or exceed District or State standards.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Based on 2012 FCAT results 90% of our 4th graders scored a 3.5 or above.</i>	<i>90% of the 4th graders will score 4.0 or above.</i>					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	

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

		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1B.1. Background knowledge and the new standards.	1B.1. Practice writing prompts: In-house scoring at time of writing.	1B.1. Self-contained ESE teacher, Literacy Coach, Administration.	1B.1. Writing exchange.	1B.1. State FAA		
Writing Goal #1B: <i>Students taking FAA will perform at the District and State Levels.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>On the 2012 FAA, 67% scored a 4 or higher.</i>	<i>On the 2013 FAA, 75% of our students will score 4 or higher.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Writing Professional Development

<p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a</p>							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Core Connections	Writing	Consultant	Grades 1,2,3,4	Sept., Oct., Jan., March	Review data with frequent monitor	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Admin
Literature Review	Writing	Literacy Coach	Grades 1,2,3,4	Sept., Nov., Jan., Feb.	Peer collaboration, conduct lessons	Teachers, Literacy Coach

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

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

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

Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1.Parent attitudes	1.1.Education concerning compulsory attendance.; Notification by phone and literature.	1.1.AIT members	1.1.Attendance records quarterly.	1.1.ADA from district office		
<u>Attendance Goal #1:</u> Sunrise will maintain an average daily attendance rate will meet or exceed the district's goal of 95%	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
	95% or 783 students had perfect attendance for 2012.	95% or greater will have perfect attendance.					

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

	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>					
	15 students had absences of 10 days or more.	No more than 5 students will have attendance issues of 10 or more absences.					
	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Tardies (10 or</u> <u>more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Tardies (10 or</u> <u>more)</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of students tardy in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of students tardy in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	

Attendance Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Stretch For Excellence	Schoolwide	Principal	All classroom teachers	Preplanning	Quarterly recognition/bar graphs	Principal

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.

Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total:\$3500.00
CELLA Budget	Total:
Mathematics Budget	Total:
Science Budget	Total:
Writing Budget	Total:
Civics Budget	Total:
U.S. History Budget	Total:
Attendance Budget	Total:
Suspension Budget	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:
STEM Budget	Total:
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total:

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

Grand Total:

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

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

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

Are you reward school? Yes No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community members who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting *Yes* or *No* below.

Yes No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
SAC Meetings are held on the first Wednesday of the month at 2:15pm. The SIP drives the focus of the SAC meetings.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
--	--------

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

SAC funds are allocated through the majority membership of the SAC when budget requests are submitted by staff. A good part of the funds focus on staff professional development and student incentives to enhance the school behavioral initiative. No new monies are available through state for 2012-13. Roll over funds makeup the balance.	\$2427.19
---	-----------