

# Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

**Name of School:**

**Area:**

South Area

Indialantic Elementary

**Principal:**

**Area Superintendent:**

Dr. Mark Mullins

Dr. Richard Dunkel

**SAC Chairperson:**

Kathleen Register

**Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli**

**Mission Statement:**

To provide the highest quality of education for  
all students.

**Vision Statement:**

Creating a quality world one child at a time.



# Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

## RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

Over the past three years, there have been several shifts in the configuration of state testing in Florida. In 2011, the state adopted the use of FCAT 2.0, which increased the rigor and expectations for students. Likewise, we are now preparing for the implementation of Common Core State Standards, which will use The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) as an end of year assessment tool to monitor adequate yearly progress. This will be fully in place in the 2014-2015 school year. Furthermore, in 2012, scoring for FCAT Writes administered to fourth grade students increased its rigor.

The analysis of the data over the past three years, indicates that our learning gains are not improving at the rate of our proficiency levels. For example, our level 5 students in both reading and math are our lowest performing subgroup in terms of learning gains. Additionally, the lowest 25% in reading perform at about the same level as all students making learning gains, however it appears that the gap in performance is more pronounced in the area of math.

Furthermore, it has been noted during classroom walkthroughs that the instructional focus was geared toward support for the lowest 25% of students and not necessarily focused on strategies that target higher level students' growth. Also, collaboration meetings focused on creating plans to scaffold and reinforce skills for our lowest performing students without a plan for increased rigor for the higher students.

#### **Reading**

Learning gains for student at Level 5	All students scoring 3 and above in reading
09-10 <b>54%</b> made learning gains in grades 4-6.	09-10 <b>84%</b> of students proficient or higher in grades 3-6
10-11 <b>68%</b> made learning gains in grades 4-6.	10-11 <b>96%</b> of students proficient or higher in grades 3-6
11-12 <b>59%</b> made learning gains in grades 4-6.	11-12 <b>84%</b> of students proficient or higher in grades 3-6
Lowest 25% making learning gains	All students making annual learning gains in reading
09-10 <b>71%</b> made learning gains in grades 4-6.	09-10 <b>70%</b> of students in grades 4-6

10-11 **81%** made learning gains in grades 4-6.

10-11 **81%** of students in grades 4-6

11-12 **66%** made learning gains in grades 4-6.

11-12 **68%** of students in grades 4-6

**Math**

Learning gains for student at level 5

All students scoring 3 and above in math

09-10 **62%** made learning gains in grades 4-6.

09-10 **86%** of students proficient or higher in grades 3-6

10-11 **55%** made learning gains in grades 4-6.

10-11 **95%** of students proficient or higher in grades 3-6

11-12 **52%** made learning gains in grades 4-6.

11-12 **83%** of students proficient or higher in grades 3-6

Lowest 25% making learning gains

All students making annual learning gains in

09-10 **55%** made learning gains in grades 4-6.

09-10 **68%** of students in grades 4-6

10-11 **86%** made learning gains in grades 4-6.

10-11 **77%** of students in grades 4-6

11-12 **62%** made learning gains in grades 4-6.

11-12 **71%** of students in grades 4-6

**Science**

09-10: **76%** at level 3 or above

10-11: **86%** at level 3 or above

11-12: **78%** at level 3 or above

**Writing**

09-10: **94%** at level 4 or above

10-11: **100%** at level 4 or above

11-12: **95%** at level 3 or above

**FAIR Data**

**Kindergarten**

09-10: **84%** of Kindergarten students were proficient in listening comprehension

10-11: **89%** of Kindergarten students were proficient in listening comprehension

11-12: **91%** of Kindergarten students were proficient in listening comprehension

**First Grade**

09-10: 36% of first grade students reading on grade level according to FAIR

10-11: 61% of first grade students reading on grade level according to FAIR

11-12: 60% of first grade students reading on grade level according to FAIR

### Second Grade

09-10: 49% of second grade students reading on grade level according to FAIR

10-11: 74% of second grade students reading on grade level according to FAIR

11-12: 79% of second grade students reading on grade level according to FAIR

### Third Grade

09-10: 88% of third grade students scored 40% or higher in reading comprehension

10-11: 73% of third grade students scored 40% or higher in reading comprehension

11-12: 83% of third grade students scored 40% or higher in reading comprehension

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

Michael Schmoker believes that we are in a time of “curriculum chaos”, filled with an abundance of resources and options available for instructional delivery and content. Additions, deletions and changes in emphasis create a lack of unified focus. This independent decision making in the classroom often creates gaps in our students’ knowledge of grade level skills. Through a more focused curriculum of standards, student achievement would improve exponentially. “Exemplary practice is defined as practices, strategies, and activities that exist on a consistent and pervasive basis in exemplary schools.” (Thompson, 2011). Research states that the higher the percentage of free/reduced lunch, the more structured and precise your literacy instruction must be. However, with 17% free and reduced lunch at Indialantic Elementary, there is a vast range of curriculum, instruction, and assessment options used by teachers at each grade level. Collaborative practice ensures common goal setting as well as combined effort to work toward more focused outcomes in terms of student achievement. This will lead us to balanced achievement, or the point at which all students are on or above grade level in all areas. This is established by utilizing a research-based framework and a support system set in place to continue a focus on learning. Based on the research of Max Thompson, there are six levels of Balanced Achievement. They include:

1. Leadership-Consistent and pervasive focus on learning and continuous improvement.
2. Curriculum- Prioritized curriculum, mapping, standards driven.

3. Research-based instruction- Connecting five or more of the most effective strategies, planning and instruction is linked to professional development.
4. Integrated literacy- Literacy and math blocks, writing in content everyday.
5. Catching kids up- Multiple options for acceleration and scaffolding, and differentiation.
6. Assessments- Common assessments, continuous formative assessments, and rubrics.

Coupled with the research of Dr. Robert Marzano, over thirty strategies have been found that link to student achievement in some way. Of those strategies, extended thinking and summarizing prove to have the largest percentile gains in student learning of 45% and 34% respectively. Extended thinking allows for students to utilize the knowledge and skills they have acquired for a more advanced and deeper level of thinking. This involves writing to prompts and across the content areas. Likewise, summarizing is a learning strategy that allows learners to develop a schema of the information and knowledge to be stored and remembered for a longer period of time. These strategies also provide a formative assessment option to locate confusions, misconceptions, and misunderstandings. (Thompson, 2011).

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

In 2011-2012 Indialantic Elementary migrated from professional learning communities to a more collaborative approach to disaggregate and analyze student data. This was a necessary move based, in part, on the research of Dr. Rick DuFour. "Powerful collaboration is a systematic process in which teachers work together to analyze and improve their classroom practice. This process...leads to higher levels of student achievement." Our collaborative teams/groups were based on grade levels. Within our groups we focused on our lowest performing students in the subject area of ELA (English Language Arts). As a grade level, we developed Response to Intervention (RtI)/small remediation groups that targeted the skills/concepts that needed to be reinforced and/or developed. Through this corrective teaching, our goal was to support a student's strengths, while teaching and practicing skills and strategies the student needed. Instructional time (RtI) was scheduled to fulfill these priorities and to provide instructional balance.

A majority of the teachers at Indialantic used the published materials and lesson planning information from the adopted textbooks as an instructional tool. Most supplemented as necessary. They followed a sequence of procedures and plans with a suggested course of action. Additionally, teachers at Indialantic made instructional decisions based on a particular methodology for teaching and a variety of options for completing each procedural step. Furthermore, teachers used a literacy based approach for instruction. A literacy based instructional method is founded upon an understanding of reading comprehension and response. The teacher is knowledgeable about a wide range of materials and methods. This knowledge helped to make decisions about what to teach and how to teach it. This approach allowed teachers to adapt lesson plans and activities within a set of materials (the adopted programs) and to select from several different methods to teach a lesson. Decisions were deliberate, reasoned, and consistent with the beliefs and needs of our current population. Most teachers used the instructional strategy proposed by the BEST Model, I do + We do + You do.

## CONTENT AREA:

Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Parental Involvement	Drop-out Programs
Language Arts	Social Studies	Arts/PE	Other:		

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

Indialantic Elementary will adopt the Learning-Focused Strategies Model created by Dr. Max Thompson. As we begin the 2012-2013 school year we will focus on developing Summarizing and Extended Thinking Strategies as well as implementing Common Core State Standards.

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

<i>Barrier</i>	<i>Action Steps</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Timetable</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>In-Process Measure</i>
1. Teacher Buy In. Reference to teacher comfort level, time to understand philosophy and collaboration time.	1. Set aside time weekly for grade level meetings to address Learning Focused Strategies (LFS) 1 a. Monthly faculty meetings to model/discuss Common Core State Standards 1.b. Opportunities to share/discuss implementation of learned CCSS and LFS skills	Administration	Weekly	.00	Grade Level Meeting Forms
		CCSS Launch Team Teachers	8/21, 9/18, 10/16, 11/27, 1/22, 2/19, and 4/30	.00	Meeting Handouts/ PowerPoint
		Administration	9/4, 10/2, 11/27, 12/11, 2/19, and 3/12	.00	Team created Lesson Plan

2. Professional Development in the Learning-Focused Strategies Model	2. Six scheduled faculty meetings will be dedicated to Summarizing and Extended Thinking Strategies  2. a. Schedule selected teachers to attend Dr. Max Thompson training in West Palm Beach	LFS in house trainers  Administration and selected teachers	9/11, 10/09, 11/13, 1/15, 2/12, and 3/19  November 2012	.00  \$3,000.00	Teacher Lesson Plans/ Classroom Walk-Through Observations  Reflection of training by selected teachers. Hand-outs and agendas from share out to faculty.
3.	3.				
4.	4.				
5.	5.				
6.	6.				
7.	7.				
8.	8.				

## EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

Teacher leaders and administration attended a two day summer training entitled “Creating a High Performing Learning Culture”. As a result of this training and additional research into the ideology of Dr. Max Thompson, we are focusing on extended thinking and summarizing.

Our expectation, after training and implementation in these two strategies, is that 100% of our teachers will incorporate aspects of these two focus areas into every content subject. Evidence of this will be gathered from classroom demonstration of the targeted skills during administrative walk-throughs, teacher lesson plans, and participation in monthly faculty trainings. Qualitatively, teacher reflection and collaboration is evidence of the level of teacher comfort and understanding.

Additionally, teachers will develop Professional Growth Plans (PGP) that incorporate Dr. Max Thompson’s strategies



and furthermore connect teacher's PGPs to the School Improvement Plan. The plans will be evaluated for development and implementation utilizing the district established rubrics.

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

Qualitatively, our expectation is to observe writing across all content areas, justification of student thinking processes, and the ability to explain and defend their ideas in all grade levels. Student knowledge will be demonstrated through the use of journaling, in which students will effectively synthesize and summarize the information that has been presented to them.

Quantitatively, the expectation of Indialantic Elementary is to increase student achievement in reading comprehension, as evidenced by FAIR (Assessment Period 3) data in grades 1<sup>st</sup> from 60% to 63%, 2<sup>nd</sup> from 79% to 82%, and 3<sup>rd</sup> from 83% to 86%. In grades 4-6, the expectation is to increase student learning gains in reading comprehension from 68% to 71%.

## APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

<b>Reading Goal</b> 1. <b>Reading goals have been addressed within our school based objective.</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance</b> <small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)</small>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance</b> <small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)</small>
<b>Anticipated Barrier(s):</b> 1.		
<b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.		
<b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at Achievement Level 3  <b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.	25%	28%

<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <p>1.</p>	NA	NA
<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <p>1.</p>	58%	61%
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <p>1.</p>	NA	NA
<p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <p>1.</p>	NA	NA
<p><b>FCAT 2.0</b> Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <p>1.</p> <p><b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p><b>Barrier(s):</b></p> <p><b>Strategy(s):</b></p> <p>1.</p>	69%	72%
<p><b>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</b></p> <p><b>Baseline data 2010-11:</b></p>		

<b>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :</b>  <div style="text-align: right;"> White: 16%  Black: 0%  Hispanic: 21%  Asian: 37%  Multi-racial: 21%  American Indian: 0% </div>	Enter numerical data for current level of performance	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance  13% 0% 18% 34% 18% 0%
<b>English Language Learners (ELL)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Reading <b>Barrier(s):</b> <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1.</b>	37%	34%
<b>Students with Disabilities (SWD)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Reading <b>Barrier(s):</b> <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1.</b>	65%	62%
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b> Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading <b>Barrier(s):</b> <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1.</b>	30%	27%

### Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Dr. Max Thompson Focused Based Learning Model Conference	November 2012	Reflection of training by selected teachers. Hand-outs and agendas from share out to faculty.
Teacher Leader monthly training of Summarizing and Extending Thinking Strategies	9/11, 10/09, 11/13, 1/15, 2/12, and 3/19	Teacher Lesson Plans/ Classroom Walk-Through Observations

<b>CELLA GOAL</b>	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Person / Process / Monitoring</b>
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Listening/ Speaking:</b>  73%	Fluency	Read Alouds with reading partner	Classroom Teachers/ Running Records
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Reading:</b>  73%	Vocabulary	Small Group Intensive vocabulary instruction (IE: Frayer Model)	Classroom Teachers/ Vocabulary Tests/ MAZE from FAIR
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in <b>Writing:</b>  55%	Spelling	Explicit instruction in the six syllable types	Classroom Teachers/ Word Analysis Data from FAIR

<b>Mathematics Goal(s):</b> 1. <b>Mathematics goals have been addressed within our school based objective.</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance</b> (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance</b> (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
<b>Anticipated Barrier(s):</b> 1.		
<b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.		
<b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 <b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.	29%	32%
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.	NA	NA

<b>FCAT 2.0</b> Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1.</b>	53%	56%
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1.</b>	NA	NA
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1.</b>	NA	NA
<b>FCAT 2.0</b> Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1.</b>	65%	68%
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics <b>Barrier(s):</b>  <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1.</b>	NA	NA
<b>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs).  In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</b>  <b>Baseline Data 2010-11:</b>		
<b>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading:</b>  <div style="text-align: right; padding-right: 20px;"> White:                      </div> <div style="text-align: right; padding-right: 20px;">Black:                       </div> <div style="text-align: right; padding-right: 20px;">Hispanic:                   </div> <div style="text-align: right; padding-right: 20px;">Asian:                       </div> <div style="text-align: right; padding-right: 20px;">Multi-Racial:              </div> <div style="text-align: right; padding-right: 20px;">American Indian:         </div>	<b>16%</b>  <b>0%</b>  <b>21%</b>  <b>37%</b>  <b>21%</b>  <b>0%</b>	<b>13%</b>  <b>0%</b>  <b>18%</b>  <b>34%</b>  <b>18%</b>  <b>0%</b>
<b>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics</b>	37%	34%
<b>Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics</b>	65%	62%

<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b> Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	30%	27%
--	-----	-----

## Mathematics Professional Development

<b>PD Content/Topic/Focus</b>	<b>Target Dates/Schedule</b>	<b>Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring</b>
Training in Common Core State Standards in Mathematics	9/18, 11/27, and 2/19	Meeting Handouts/PowerPoint/Team created Lesson Plan

<b>Writing</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance</b> (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance</b> (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
<b>Writing goals have been addressed within our school based objective.</b>		
<b>Barrier(s):</b> <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.		
<b>FCAT:</b> Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	95%	97%
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	NA	NA

<b>Science Goal(s)</b> <b>(Elementary and Middle)</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance</b> (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance</b> (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
1. <b>Science goals have been addressed within our school based objective.</b>		

<b>Barrier(s):</b>		
<b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:	42%	45%
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	NA	NA
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	34%	37%
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading	NA	NA

1. <b>Science Goal(s) (High School)</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>
<b>Barrier(s):</b> <b>Strategy(s):</b> 1.		
<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		

<b>Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  <b>White:</b> <b>Black:</b> <b>Hispanic:</b> <b>Asian:</b> <b>American Indian:</b>		
<b>English Language Learners (ELL)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
<b>Students with Disabilities (SWD)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b> not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

## APPENDIX B



(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

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

<b>Geometry EOC Goal</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>
<b>Barrier(s):</b> <b>Strategy(s):</b> <b>1.</b>		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:		
<b>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11</b>		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  <p style="text-align: right;"><b>White:</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Black:</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Hispanic:</b></p>		
<b>English Language Learners (ELL)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
<b>Students with Disabilities (SWD)</b> not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b> not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		

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

<b>Civics EOC</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)</b>
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Civics:		

Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics:		
--	--	--

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

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

<b>Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)</b>	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Person/Process/Monitoring</b>
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:  <b>Goal 1:</b>  <b>Goal 2:</b>			

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

## APPENDIX C

### (TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

#### **Highly Effective Teachers**

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

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1.		
2.		
3.		

#### **Non-Highly Effective Instructors**

	Page 21	
--	---------	--

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

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

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

**MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI** (Identify the MTSS leadership team and its role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)  
 The MTSS leadership team consisted of the Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Guidance Counselor and School Psychologist. The Reading Coach and Assistant Principal conducted a school wide training on the step by step process of analyzing data, determining need from that data, strategies to focus on needs, on going progress monitoring and documentation. The School Psychologist conducted follow up training during grade level meetings where she provided sample materials and a flow chart diagramming the process. In the process of preparing for Individual Problem Solving Team meetings, it was noted that accessing A3 showed a limited amount of intervention data was inputted by teachers. Furthermore, it was observed during meetings that this was a lack of understanding on the role of the teacher in providing

and documenting interventions. The MTSS leadership team determined that additional training was needed and district personnel were contacted and scheduled to provide training. In addition, the MTSS resource teachers will attend grade level meetings for more personalized instruction and several teachers were scheduled to attend a MTSS training on the first district wide Professional Development Day.

**PARENT INVOLVEMENT:** Indialantic Elementary enjoys a very active and positive parent involvement in many capacities. The Parent Teacher Organization supports the school in a multitude of ways with the greatest impact of providing funds for technology and a science lab. Various parents provide academic support in the area of reading, math and science. Indialantic has two parents that prepare, organize and conduct science experiments in the school science lab. A large number of parent volunteers assist in small group instruction in reading and math. The Brevard Parent Survey that is conducted each spring indicated an increase of positive response in all categories from communication to friendliness of faculty and staff from the previous year. Due to the overwhelming support of the Indialantic Elementary parents, there is not a necessity to create a plan for increased involvement.

**ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)**  
Our school wide attendance rate in 2011-2012 was 95.35%, slightly lower than the district rate of 95.6%. 2011-2012 was the first year of the implementation of our School Wide Plan to improve attendance/tardy rates by the guidance department. 2.4% of identified students were chronically absent in 2011-2012. 10% of those students improved their attendance by at least 80%. In 2012-2013, guidance will continue with this comprehensive plan to raise attendance to 96%. Additionally, plans to recognize good attendance, as well as increasing individual attention to children (and parents) that are chronically absent will be implemented to support this goal.

**SUSPENSION:** Indialantic Elementary had a total of 36 suspensions for the 2011-2012 school year. By focusing on summarizing and extending thinking strategies, students will be engaged in higher order thinking activities, therefore less likely to exhibit poor behavior choices. In the event that an infraction occurs, teachers will utilize the school-wide discipline plan which incorporates discipline partners at different grade levels. Through implementation of the above listed strategies, our intent is to decrease suspensions during the current school year by 10%.

**DROP-OUT (High Schools only): NA**

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

**NA**