Spook Hill Elementary
<u>Title I:</u> Yes

2012 School Grade	**B**
2011 School Grade	**B**
2010 School Grade	**B**

Reading Goal

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

	Current Proficiency	Projected Proficiency	Barriers	Strategies	Progress Monitoring Goals		
					1	**2**	**3**
Level 3	24% (66)	37%	1. Summarizing 2. independent reading	1. PD on summarizing 2. SRA/Voyager	3rd –15% 4th – 19% 5th -19%		
Level/s 4 & 5	26% (73)	36%	1. extend thinking 2. lower achieving students	1.Extended Reading Passages 2. Alpha Inclusion	3rd –14% 4th – 20% 5th -17%		
Learning Gains	58%(109)	100%	1. Extended thinking 2. Summarizing	1.SRA Voyager 2. ERPs			
Lowest 25%	36% (36)	100%	1. Phonics 2. comprehension	1. Words Their Way 2. ERPs			
Subgroup/s Not Meeting Proficiency <u>Only</u>							
Name Subgroup/s	**Current Proficiency**	**Projected Proficiency**	**Barriers**	**Strategies**	**Progress Monitoring Goal**		
					1	**2**	**3**
White, Black, Hispanic, ELL, SWD, ED	White: 43% (60) Black: 62% (44) Hispanic: 56% (25) ELL: 77% (10) SWD: 73% (24) ED: 55% (122)	White: 33% Black: 52% Hispanic: 46% ELL: 67% SWD : 63% ED: 45%	1. Vocabulary Fluency 1. Summarizing	Elements of Reading Voc, SRA Corrective, SES, CISM, Common Core	White: 42% Black: 25% Hispanic: 25% ELL:11% SWD: 11% ED: 31%		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) In six years, schools will reduce their achievement gap by 50%, in their reading performance target.							

2010-2011 Baseline	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
69%	50%	58%	66%	74%	80%	84%	

Writing Goal

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

	Current Proficiency	Projected Proficiency	Barriers	Strategies	Progress Monitoring Goals		
					1	2	3
Score of 3	88% (89)	90%	1. Consistent writing program 2. fidelity	1. Polk Writes w/ Kathy Robinson Writing 2. Resource teacher	N – 5% E – 10%		
Score of 4 and Above	30% (30)	40%	1. Consistent writing program 2. fidelity	1. Polk Writes w/ Kathy Robinson Writing 2. Resource teacher	N – 0% E – 0%		

Math Goal

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

	Current Proficiency	Projected Proficiency	Barriers	Strategies	Progress Monitoring Goals		
					1	2	3
Level 3	29% (81)	39%	1. Problem Solving 2. Rigor	1. Math Super Stars 2. KR Math Centers, Everglades	3rd –24% 4th – 19% 5th -13%		
Level/s 4 & 5	21% (22)	31%	1. Extended thinking 2. Real world application	1.Math journals/ summarization 2.Hands on manipulatives, technology, integration of math into science	3rd –15% 4th – 13% 5th - 20%		
Learning Gains	40% (75)	100%	1. Transfer skills 2. Hands on activities	1. Wylie's Warm Up (2-5) 2. SMATH night			
Lowest 25%	21% (10)	100%	1. HOT problems 2.Unfamiliar with depth of knowledge	1. Math Super Stars, Everglades, SmartBoard, student response systems 2. Common Core			
Subgroup/s Not Meeting Proficiency Only							
Name Subgroup/s	Current Proficiency	Projected Proficiency	Barriers	Strategies	Progress Monitoring Goals		
					1	2	3

White, Black, Hispanic, ELL, SWD, ED	White: 45% (64) Black: 53% (38) Hispanic: 51% (23) ELL: 69% (9) SWD: 70% (23) ED: 54% (121)	White: 35% Black:43% Hispanic: 41% ELL: 59% SWD: 60% ED: 44%	1. HOT problems 2.Depth of knowledge	1. Math Super Stars, Everglades, SmartBoard, student response systems 2. Common Core	White: 41% Black: 26% Hispanic :29 % ELL: 21% SWD: 21% ED: 33%		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) In six years, schools will reduce their achievement gap by 50%, in their math performance target.							
2010-2011 Baseline	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
76%	50%	59%	68%	77%	83%	88%	

Science Goal

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

	Current Proficiency	Projected Proficiency	Barriers	Strategies	Progress Monitoring Goals		
					1	2	3
Level 3	30% (27)	40%	1. Lack of exposure to science materials 2. Lack of hands on practice	1. CISM, Science Weekly, Interactive SMARTboard 2. Weekly use of science lab	3rd –14% 4th – 21% 5th -27%		
Level/s 4, 5	12% (11)	22%	1. Extended thinking opportunities 2. Lack of time	1. CISM, Science Weekly, Kagan, SMARTboard and student response lessons 2. STEM	3rd –2% 4th – 2% 5th - 8%		

Principal Assurance Statement:

 Our school improvement plan is designed to achieve the state education priorities pursuant to S. 1000.03(5), F.S. and student proficiency on the Sunshine State Standards pursuant to s. 1003.41, F.S.

The plan addresses student achievement goals and strategies based on state and school district proficiency standards and includes an accurate, data based analysis of student achievement and other school performance data pursuant to s. 1001.42(18) (a), F.S. Please verify the statement above by placing an X in the Yes or No box below.

Yes   No