

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Southport Elementary School	District Name: Bay
Principal: Dianne Miller	Superintendent: Bill Husfelt
SAC Chair: Latisha Shields	Date of School Board Approval:

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.

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

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	Dianne Miller	BS, MA, EDS Elementary Education; Educational Leadership	15 years	22 years	For the 2012 school year, Southport Elementary was graded as a B school. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Learning Gains: 63% • Reading Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%: 58% • Math Learning Gains: 53% • Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%: 62% • AMO Progress: 72% of 3rd-5th grade students were proficient in reading. 61% were proficient in math. Previous Years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1997-2011: Served as Assistant Principal and Principal at Southport Elementary. The school moved from a C to a B, then maintained an A for ten consecutive years. • 1990-1997: Served as AP at Lynn Haven Elementary before state accountability grades and NCLB AYP.
Administrative Assistant	LeAnn Kibler	BA English MA Educational Leadership	1 month	2 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Served as the 9th grade administrator at Mosley High School for the 2010-2011 school year as they moved from a B to an A. • Served as the administrator for testing at Mosley High School for the 2011-2012 school year with results pending.

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)
Reading	Jeannie Williams		1	1	2011-2012 Performance Record: Pending

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

Math	Jeremy Centeno	BS Elementary Education BS Biblical Studies MS Curriculum Instruction and Design ESOL Endorsed	3	3	2011-2012 Performance Record: Pending

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. Employ peer teacher to support and mentor beginning teachers in their professional development, data analysis, classroom management, and assessment skills.	Principal	May 2013
2. Provide staff development and parent involvement workshop stipends.	Principal	May 2013
3. Schedule common planning times for grade groups.	Principal	May 2013
4. Provide curriculum planning days.	Principal	May 2013

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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
100 percent of instructional staff and paraprofessionals received an effective or highly effective rating. One teacher taught an ESOL student out of field last year.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional staff will continue to refine professional skills through the use of the Bay District Teacher Appraisal System. 2. Use of weekly newsletters, emails, and other forms of communication. 3. Continued use of Curriculum Team and Grade Group Meetings.

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
29	0%	21% (6)	34% (10)	45% (13)	38% (11)	100% (pending)	10% (3)	17% (5)	38% (11)

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
Sally Kelley/Reading Demonstration Teacher	All K-5 teachers district-wide in their first three years of teaching	An experienced teacher with a new teacher	Teachers will observe a selected model teacher all day. They will debrief during planning: reflecting on what they observed, have any questions answered, and learn the research behind practices used. Selected model teachers include: K- Kim Gann, 1st-Andrea Purdie, 2nd&3rd-Sally Kelley, and 4th&5th-Leigh Brannon

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A
 Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation receive assistance. Title I, Part A provides much needed services through materials and equipment, professional development for teachers and paraprofessionals, release time for teachers to attend professional development, stipends for professional development, educational

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

classroom resources, parent involvement resources, parent involvement workshops, a parent center, and technology. One of the most beneficial services provided is after school tutoring. Title I pays for instructors, materials, and busing students home.
Title I, Part C- Migrant Migrant services and support for our eligible students/families are provided by our District and the Panhandle Area Educational Consortium.
Title I, Part D Eligible neglected and delinquent students receive support and services in conjunction with the District's Drop-out Prevention programs.
Title II The District receives supplemental funds for professional development and stipends to teachers. The District's instructional specialists provide aide to the schools. Our MTSS Staff Training Specialist has been provided through this fund and will assist us in intervention of at-risk students.
Title III ELL students are provided support through this fund with materials & interpreters. Title III funds provide staff development opportunities for instructional staff to attend conferences, district trainings, and participate in ESOL endorsement activities.
Title X- Homeless The District's Homeless program personnel are provided through Title X funds and offer homeless families contact to services, agencies, and resources. Staff members serve as vital links between the school and these families. They provided uniforms, eyeglasses, school supplies, and other specific needs for children/families classified as homeless.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds assist in activities to improve the school grade through prevention, intervention, remediation, and enrichment for students. SAI funds can be used for tutoring.
Violence Prevention Programs Our school offers a safe and drug free school program to students that incorporates lessons, community service projects, counseling, and access to school resource deputies. The Bay County Sheriff's Office deputies attend our Fall Festival and sponsor booths at our annual Celebration of Learning where they discuss issues such as safety, bullying, and internet abuse.
Nutrition Programs A Free and Reduced lunch program is offered at our school. The Bay County Health Department is also a resource for nutritional awareness. Newsletters with lunch menus and nutrition information are sent home to parents monthly.
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start N/A
Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education N/A
Job Training N/A
Other N/A

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

School-Based MTSS/MTSS Team		
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.</p> <p>Dianne Miller – Principal LeAnn Kibler, Administrative Assistant Susan Frazier – School-Based ESE Resource Teacher</p> <p>Tina Maddox – Guidance Counselor Diane Weherley – Classroom Teacher Barbara Wackowski – Speech Language Therapist</p> <p>Kathy Smith– District ESE Resource Teacher Janice Shipbaugh – School Psychologist Tammy Boyer – MTSS Staff Training Specialist</p>		
<p>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?</p> <p>Southport Elementary’s MTSS Leadership Team will meet monthly to address concerns expressed by members and individual classroom teachers. Members of the MTSS Leadership Team will also meet with grade groups during weekly grade group meetings to provide support, assistance, or clarification on interventions needed with individual concerns. MTSS meetings with individual parents and teachers will be scheduled on Mondays to include the use of the MTSS Staff Training Specialist, District ESE Resource Teacher, and School Psychologist.</p>		
<p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the MTSS problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP.</p> <p>The MTSS Leadership Team has been instrumental in the development of our school improvement plan by reviewing the plan, making suggestions of interventions for different academic areas, participating in curriculum team meetings to review specific academic areas and identify goals, objectives, and strategies, and by participating in faculty meetings to finalize plan components and details.</p>		
MTSS Implementation		
<p>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.</p> <p>Classroom teachers will be given a data sheet developed by a classroom teacher to document data during the 2012-2013 school year. The collection of data will include classroom assessments, FCAT, Discovery Education Assessments (DEA), Dibels, EASYCBM, and any additional data relating to individual needs of a student. Data sheets will be reviewed during monthly progress monitoring meetings with administrators, guidance counselor, and MTSS Staff Training Specialist.</p> <p>Southport Elementary’s MTSS Leadership Team will give classroom teachers examples of individual data collection charts to use as a monitoring tool. Classroom teachers will select or develop one that best fits their individual needs and bring completed data sheets to meetings when specific students are discussed at CST, MTSS, or Administrative meetings.</p>		
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MTSS Staff Training Specialist will attend monthly MTSS inservice training at the District level • Faculty will receive periodic updates during grade group meetings and faculty meetings or via email by the MTSS Staff Training Specialist and team members • MTSS Leadership Team and MTSS Staff Training Specialist will assist individual teachers with MTSS questions and needs as requested 		
<p>Describe the plan to support MTSS.</p> <p>MTSS will be supported through training at the district and school level, leadership and data meetings, and by open communication of all staff in collaborating to support student success.</p>		

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team		
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).		
Dianne Miller, Principal	Holly Schulte, Kindergarten Teacher	Susan Street, Fourth Grade Teacher
LeAnn Kibler, Administrative Assistant	Kathryn Pajak, First Grade Teacher	Kelly Kirvin, Fifth Grade Teacher
Tina Maddox, Guidance Counselor	Theresa Rowell, Second Grade Teacher	Susan Frazier, ESE Resource Teacher
Judy Radke, Media Specialist	Jeannie Dutton, Third Grade Teacher	Barbara Wackowski, Speech/Language Teacher
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).		
The Literacy Leadership Team meets the 4th Wednesday of each month after school. The team's main purpose is to create a capacity of reading knowledge for the school. The LLT collaborates and encourages a literate climate that supports effective teaching and learning. The ultimate goal is to become a catalyst for school-wide literacy change.		
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?		
The major initiatives of the LLT this school year will be to collect and analyze data, formulate recommendations for the Reading Curriculum Team and MTSS Team, attend trainings in new strategies/content, assist with course instruction, identification of tutoring and enrichment needs, and provide a school-based support system for all faculty. It is the responsibility of the LLT to implement the CRP with fidelity.		

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

****Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition***

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

Southport Elementary School provides immense support for the preschool student's transition from Pre-K into Kindergarten. Beginning early in Pre-K, the preschool students are introduced to how the importance of learning Pre-K concepts will benefit future learning in Kindergarten. In order to ease anxiety that some preschool students possess, many books are read to the students about kindergarten and the activities students will participate in the following year. Beginning mid-year, workstations are implemented similar to workstations in the kindergarten classrooms. Later in the preschool year, students are introduced to each of the Kindergarten teachers. The preschool students tour kindergarten classrooms to observe similarities in the classrooms and activities. During the last few weeks of school, the preschool students join the kindergarten students during lunchtime and recess on the kindergarten playground.

On the first day of the new school year, Southport Elementary School hosts a Kindergarten Orientation for parents and students. This orientation provides parents and students an opportunity to become acquainted with their child's new teacher and our school. During orientation, parents are informed of policies and procedures, have questions answered, and take a tour of the school while the students are familiarizing themselves with their new classroom. Parental involvement and communication are top on our priority list of key components to a successful kindergarten experience.

Southport Elementary School participates in a staggered start for all kindergarten students. A welcome letter is sent to all parents of incoming kindergarten students with notification of the date for orientation (first day of school) and whether their child will attend class on the second or third day of the new school year. Staggering the start date allows for each student to become acclimated with the school on a more one-on-one basis with the classroom teacher. Half of the students in each kindergarten class are scheduled to attend school on the second day and the other half are scheduled to attend on the third day of school. All kindergarten students will attend on the fourth day of school.

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. Planning time for lesson design/recordkeeping of the progress of individual MTSS students	1A.1. Provide intervention for K-5 students reading below grade level utilizing the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)	1A.1. Administrators, LLT, Reading Curriculum Team, SIP Team, MTSS Staff Training Specialist, Guidance Counselor	1A.1. Review notes from monthly MTSS data chats	1A.1. FCAT Reading Test results DEA data EASYCBM data DIBELS data
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>34% of third – fifth grade students will score a Level 3 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the School Accountability Report (School Report Card).</i>	31% (59)	34%(62)					
			1A.2. Personal knowledge of Kagan structures	1A.2. Continue use of Bay District’s Reading Plan incorporating Kagan structures	1A.2. LLT, Reading Curriculum Team, SIP Team, Administrators	1A.2. Review of weekly grade-level meeting reports, classroom walk-throughs/fidelity checks, baseline and mid-year data	1A.2. FCAT Reading Test results Baseline and mid-year DEA data
			1A.3. Personal knowledge of the teacher appraisal process	1A.3. Instructional staff will continue to refine professional skills through the use of the Bay District Teacher Appraisal System	1A.3. Administrators	1A.3. Completion and review of the appraisal system	1A.3. Annual teacher evaluations as defined by the Bay District Teacher Appraisal System
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B:	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>					
N/A			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 in reading.			2A.1. Personal knowledge and use of the teacher functions in Bay District's approved software programs	2A.1. Provide daily computer-assisted instruction that offers accommodations for advanced academic achievement	2A.1. LLT, Reading Curriculum Team, SIP Team, Classroom Teachers	2A.1. Evaluation of computer-generated growth reports such as Study Island, SuccessMaker, Harcourt, Education City, and FCAT Explorer	2A.1. FCAT Reading Test Computer-generated reports DEA data
Reading Goal #2A: <i>25% of third – fifth grade students will score a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the School Accountability Report (School Report Card).</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 22%(42)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 25%(46)	Unanticipated computer hardware problems				
			2A.2. Participation limited due to implementation costs beyond district funding	2A.2. Self-selected instructional staff members will participate in Lesson Study and / or a book study	2A.2. Media Specialist Reading Demonstration Teacher Select Classroom Teachers	2A.2. Lesson Study Group will review lesson presentation and student responses Book Study will use Emodo to evaluate effectiveness of study	2A.2. FCAT Reading Test DEA data
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.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 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. Personal knowledge and use of the teacher functions in new software programs	3A.1. Provide differentiated reading instruction based on state standards including small group/ individual instruction, shared reading, Kagan structures, the use of SMART	3A.1. LLT, Reading Curriculum Team, Administrators	3A.1. Classroom walk-throughs/ fidelity checks Baseline/ mid-year data	3A.1. FCAT Reading Test DEA data SuccessMaker reports
Reading Goal #3A: <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Unanticipated SMART board and					

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

66% of fourth and fifth grade students will make learning gains in reading as evaluated by the FCAT Reading Test and reported by the School Accountability Report (School Report Card).	63%(120)	66% (120)	computer hardware problems	boards, and computer-assisted instruction			
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.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 group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. Planning time for lesson design/ recordkeeping of the progress of individual MTSS students	4A.1. Provide intervention for K-5 students reading below grade level utilizing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)	4A.1. Administrators, LLT, Reading Curriculum Team, MTSS Staff Training Specialist, Guidance Counselor	4A.1. Review notes from monthly MTSS data chats Review MTSS student folders Review DEA data	4A.1. FCAT Reading Test results DEA data EASYCBM data DIBELS data
Reading Goal #4: Baseline Data for 2010-2011: 50% of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			
	58%(28)	60%(28)	Student attendance		
6-Year AMO Goal: By the year 2015-2016 the percentage of non-proficient students in the Lowest 25% will be at 50% or less as reported by the CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment Reading Test.			4A.2	4A.2	4A.2

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

2012-2013 AMO Goal: 60% or more of students in the Lowest 25% in fourth and fifth grade will make learning gains as evaluated by the FCAT.						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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 57% Based 2010-2011 AYP report "Total" score		61% of students will score a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Reading Test. Results: 52% of all students scored a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Reading Test.	64% of all students will score a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Reading Test.	68% of all students will score a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Reading Test.	71% of all students will score "proficient" or higher on the CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment Reading Test.	75% of all students will score "proficient" or higher on the CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment Reading Test.	79% of all students will score "proficient" or higher on the CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment Reading Test.											
	Reading Goal #5A: By the conclusion of the 2016-2017 school year, 79% of all students will score "proficient" or higher as reported by the CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment Reading Test.																	
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. Reading Goal #5B: Baseline data for 2010-2011: 69% of White subgroup were proficient on the FCAT Reading Test. 6-Year AMO Goal: By the school year 2016-2017 the percentage of non-proficient White students will be reduced by 50% as reported by the CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment Reading Test. 2012-2013 AMO Goal: 64% of students in the White subgroup will make adequate yearly	<table border="1"> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> <tr> <td>White:61% (107)</td> <td>White: 64% (113)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black:</td> <td>Black:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic:</td> <td>Hispanic:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian:</td> <td>Asian:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>American Indian:</td> <td>American Indian:</td> </tr> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	White:61% (107)	White: 64% (113)	Black:	Black:	Hispanic:	Hispanic:	Asian:	Asian:	American Indian:	American Indian:	5B.1. White: Attendance, parental involvement Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1. Identification and data analysis of students in White subgroup	5B.1. LLT, Administrators	5B.1. Teachers will use FOCUS and assessment results to determine curriculum intervention LLT will review results	5B.1. Computer-based assessments Data notebook
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*																
	White:61% (107)	White: 64% (113)																
Black:	Black:																	
Hispanic:	Hispanic:																	
Asian:	Asian:																	
American Indian:	American Indian:																	
		5B.2. Unanticipated computer hardware problems Personal knowledge of the use of computer-based assessments	5B.2. Monitor student progress using computer-based assessment and provide interventions, including MTSS strategies, as determined by data analysis of assessments	5B.2. LLT, classroom teachers, MTSS Staff Training Specialist, Guidance Counselor	5B.2. Teachers will base curriculum interventions on computer-based assessments and MTSS strategies	5B.2. MTSS student folders Computer-based assessments Data notebook												
		5A.3. Time necessary to revise instructional focus calendars based	5A.3. Continued implementation of instructional focus calendars to	5A.3. Administrators, SIP Team	5A.3. Review of instructional focus calendars	5A.3. FCAT Reading Test results DEA data												

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

<p><i>progress in reading as evaluated by FCAT Reading Test.</i> 2013-2014=68% 2014-2015=71% 2015-2016=75% 2016-2017=79%</p>		<p>on data analysis before the district's due date</p>	<p>ensure students are placed in rigorous course work</p>			<p>Instructional focus calendars</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--	--------------------------------------

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.
<p>Reading Goal #5C: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</p>	N/A				
			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
<p>Reading Goal #5D: Baseline data for 2010-2011: 34% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) were proficient on the FCAT Reading Test.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 29%(14)</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 36% (17)</p>	<p>Understanding of the revised process for development of IPDP plans</p>	<p>Instructional staff will be given opportunities for staff development for the purpose of data analysis consistent with Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) targeting the needs of subgroups not meeting AMO goals</p>	<p>Administrators, SIP Team</p>	<p>Instructional IPDP plans will reflect attendance at staff development for AMO goals</p>	<p>Instructional IPDP's</p>
<p>6-Year AMO Goal: By the school year 2016-2017 the percentage of non-proficient SWD students will be reduced by 50% as reported by the CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment Reading Test.</p>			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

<p>2012-2013 AMO Goal: 36% of Students with Disabilities will achieve Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Reading Test. 2013-2014=42% 2014-2015=49% 2015-2016=55% 2016-2017=62%</p>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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				
<p>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>		5.E.1 Attendance, parental involvement	5E.1. Teachers will participate in quarterly data chats to monitor progress of the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup	5E.1. Administrators, Classroom Teachers, Guidance Counselor	5E.1. Maintain student progress reports in student data folders/ administrative data notebook	5E.1. FCAT Reading Test results DEA data Data Chat monthly notes				
<p>Reading Goal #5E:</p> <p>Baseline data for 2010-2011: 66% of Economically Disadvantages students were proficient on the FCAT Reading Test.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>57%(72)</td> <td>61% (77)</td> </tr> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	57%(72)	61% (77)					
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*									
57%(72)	61% (77)									
<p>6-Year AMO Goal: By the school year 2015-2016 the percentage of non-proficient Economically Disadvantaged students will be reduced by 50% as reported by the CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment Reading Test.</p> <p>2012-2013 AMO Goal: 61% of Economically Disadvantaged students will achieve Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Reading Test. 2013-2014=65% 2014-2015=69% 2015-2016=73% 2016-2017=77%</p>		5E.2 Time necessary to revise instructional focus calendars based on data analysis	5E.2 Continued implementation of instructional focus calendars to ensure students are placed in rigorous course work	5E.2 Administrators	5E.2 Review of instructional focus calendars	5E.2 FCAT Reading Test results DEA data Instructional focus calendars				
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.				

Reading Professional Development

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

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with 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
SMART boards and document cameras for instructional use	Grades K-5 Special Area	Teacher Experts District Technology TOSA	All Instructional Staff Members with new technology	August 2012 - May 2013	Individual review as needed	Media Specialist
Data Analysis	Grades K-5 Special Area Reading	SIP Team Literacy Coach	All Instructional Staff Members	August 2012 – May 2013	Instructional staff will have follow-up monitoring during monthly data chats	Administrators SIP Team Guidance Counselor
MTSS Procedures	Grades K-5 Reading	MTSS Staff Training Specialist/ Guidance Counselor	Classroom teachers	September 2012 – May 2013	MTSS Staff Training Specialist and Guidance Counselor will be available for follow-up monitoring	Guidance Counselor MTSS Staff Training Specialist
Instructional Focus Calendars	Grades K-5 Reading	LLT Team	Classroom teachers	Teachers will review use of instructional calendars during quarterly curriculum team meetings	Individual assistance will be available to teachers from a LLT member	LLT Team
Discovery Education	Grades K-5	Guidance Counselor / Media Specialist	All Classroom Teachers	October 2012 – May 2013	Individual review as needed	Guidance Counselor / Media Specialist
SM5	Grades K -5	Media Specialist	All K-5 Classroom Teachers	September 2012 – May 2013	Individual review as needed	Media Specialist
Kagan Training	Grades K-5	Consultants	Selected School Staff	June 2012 - May 2013	Program specialist to provide instructional staff with feedback from classroom observations	Administrators
Curriculum Issues	Grades K-5	Literacy Coach	All K-5 Classroom Teachers	September 2012 - May 2013	Individual review as needed	Literacy Coach

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
Provide intervention for K-5 students reading below grade level	Instructional stipends / materials for tutoring sessions	Title I	\$6,997.00
			Subtotal: \$6,997.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide differentiated reading instruction based on state standards including small group and individual instruction, shared reading, Kagan structures, SMART boards, and computer-assisted instruction	Computer for Lab	Title I	\$859.00

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

Subtotal: \$859.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide differentiated reading instruction based on state standards including small group and individual instruction, shared reading, Kagan structures, SMART boards, and computer-assisted instruction	Kagan facilitator and instructional materials for staff development	Title I	\$9,674.00
Instructional staff will continue to refine professional skills through the use of the Bay District Teacher Appraisal System	Reading by the Bay Conference Registration	Title I	\$250.00
Subtotal: \$9,924.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide differentiated reading instruction based on state standards including small group and individual instruction, shared reading, Kagan structures, SMART boards, and computer-assisted instruction	Paraprofessionals to provide interventions	Title I	\$22,285.00
Instructional staff will be given opportunities for staff development for the purpose of data analysis consistent with Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) targeting the needs of subgroups not meeting AMO goals	Stipends for planning for Southport School Improvement Plan	Title I	\$3,570.00
Continue use of Bay District's Reading Plan incorporating Kagan structures Provide intervention for K-5 students reading below grade level utilizing the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)	Supplemental Materials, pencil sharpener, stapler	Title I	\$9,243.00
Subtotal: \$35,098.00			
Total: \$52,878.00			

End of Reading Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			IA.1. Instructional knowledge of the Common Core Standards to be implemented in first grade	IA.1. Continue implementation of the state math standards (NGSS & CCSS)	IA.1. Administrators, Math Curriculum Team, SIP Team	IA.1. Classroom walk-throughs Review of baseline and mid-year data/narratives	IA.1. FCAT Math Test scores DEA data
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 24% (46)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 27% (49)					
27% of third-fifth grade students will score a Level 3 on the FCAT Math Test as reported by the School Accountability Report (School Report Card).							
			IA.2. Knowledge of Kagan Structures	IA.2. Implement the use of Kagan Structures with fidelity	IA.2. Administrators	IA.2. Classroom walk-throughs Feedback by Kagan representative/ administrators	IA.2. FCAT Math Test scores DEA data
			IA.3. Instructional staff proficiency in the use of SMART technology	IA.3. Continued implementation of SMART technology	IA.3. Administrators	IA.3. Classroom observations	IA.3. FCAT Math Test scores DEA data
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box. N/A							
			IB.2.	IB.2.	IB.2.	IB.2.	IB.2.
			IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.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. Unexpected computer hardware issues	2A.1. Provide daily access to computer-assisted instruction such as: FCAT Explorer, SuccessMaker, Harcourt, and ThinkCentral	2A.1. Media Specialist, SIP Team, Math Curriculum Team	2A.1. Review of computer-generated reports to include ThinkCentral, SuccessMaker, and FCAT Explorer	2A.1. FCAT Math Test scores DEA data
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2A: 20% of third – fifth grade students will score a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Math Test as reported by the School Accountability Report (School Report Card).	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 17% (32)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 20% (36)	2A.1. Unexpected interruptions in daily schedules				
			2A.2. Knowledge of Kagan Structures	2A.2. Implement the use of Kagan Structures with fidelity	2A.2. Administrators	2A.2. Classroom walk-throughs Feedback by Kagan representative/ administrators	2A.2. FCAT Math Test scores DEA data
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.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 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. Time necessary to prepare for implementation and monitoring of MTSS strategies	3A.1. Provide intervention for K-5 students working below grade level utilizing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) materials such as Number Worlds, SuccessMaker,	3A.1. Administrators, Math Curriculum Team, SIP Team, MTSS Staff Training Specialist, Guidance Counselor	3A.1. Review notes from monthly data chats	3A.1. FCAT Math Test results DEA data EASYCBM data
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

56% of third-fifth grade students will make learning gains in mathematics on the FCAT Math Test as reported by the School Accountability Report (School Report Card).	53% (101)	56% (102)		small group instruction, and other approved strategies			
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<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>					
N/A			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.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 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. Student attendance	4A.1. Data analysis of FCAT content areas during pre-school inservice	4A.1. Administrators, SIP Team	4A.1. Administrative review of instructional evaluations using class data sheets	4A.1. Class Data Sheets
<u>Mathematics Goal #4:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>			
<i>Baseline Data for 2010-2011: 83% of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</i>	<i>62% (30)</i>	<i>65% (31)</i>			
<i>6-Year AMO Goal: By the year 2016-2017 the percentage of non-proficient students in the Lowest 25% will 50% or less as reported by the CCSS-aligned PARCC</i>		4A.2. Funding	4A.2. Math Curriculum Team to design an incentive program to encourage math achievement	4A.2. Teacher Survey	4A.2. Survey Results
		4A.3. Adequate time to revise instructional focus calendars	4A.3. Teachers will develop instructional focus calendars and lessons based	4A.3. Administrators, Classroom teachers	4A.3. Monthly data chats

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

<p><i>Summative Assessment Math Test.</i></p> <p><i>2012-2013 AMO Goal: 65% or more of the lowest 25% of third-fifth grade students will make learning gains in mathematics as reported by the FCAT Math Test and the School Accountability Report (School Report Card).</i></p>		<p>based on data analysis</p>	<p>on the Bay District Comprehensive Math Plan and pacing guides to insure students are placed in rigorous course work</p>		<p>Grade group meeting notes</p>	
--	--	-------------------------------	--	--	----------------------------------	--

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				
<p>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</p>	<p>Baseline data 2010-2011</p> <p>71%</p> <p>Based on 2010-2011 AYP Report "Total" score.</p>	<p>74% of students will score a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Math Test.</p> <p>Results: 61% of all students scored a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Math Test.</p>	<p>77% of all students will score a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Math Test.</p>	<p>80% of all students will score a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Math Test.</p>	<p>84% of all students will score a Level 3 or higher on the CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment Math Test.</p>	<p>86% of all students will score a Level 3 or higher on the CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment Math Test.</p>	<p>86% of all students will score a Level 3 or higher on the CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment Math Test.</p>				
<p>Mathematics Goal #5A:</p> <p><i>By the conclusion of the 2016-2017 school year, 86% of all students will score a Level 3 or higher in the CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment Math Test.</i></p>											
<p>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:</p>		<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>					
<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>		<p>5B.1. White: Unanticipated interruptions to scheduled monthly meetings Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p>5B.1. Teachers will participate in quarterly data chats with administrators to monitor progress of White subgroup</p>	<p>5B.1. Administrators, Classroom Teachers, Guidance Counselor</p>	<p>5B.1. Maintain student progress reports in student data folders/ administrative data notebook</p>	<p>5B.1. FCAT Math Test results DEA data Data Notebook</p>					
<p>Mathematics Goal #5B:</p> <p><i>Baseline data for 2010-2011: 71% of students in the White subgroup were proficient on the FCAT Math Test.</i></p> <p><i>6-Year AMO Goal: By the school year 2016-2017 the percentage of non-proficient students in the White subgroup will be reduced by 50% as</i></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="298 1032 438 1114">2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th data-bbox="438 1032 585 1114">2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="298 1114 438 1276">White: 40% (71) Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</td> <td data-bbox="438 1114 585 1276">White: 60% (106) Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	White: 40% (71) Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: 60% (106) Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:						
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*										
White: 40% (71) Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: 60% (106) Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:										
		<p>5B.2. Attendance at staff development opportunities</p>	<p>5B.2. Instructional staff will be given opportunities for staff development targeting needs of subgroups not meeting AYP goals</p>	<p>5B.2. Administrators, SIP Team</p>	<p>5B.2. Instructional IPDP plans will reflect attendance at staff development for AYP goals</p>	<p>5B.2. Instructional IPDP's</p>					

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

<i>reported by the CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment Math Test.</i>							
2012-2013 AMO Goal: 60% of Students with Disabilities will achieve Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Math Test. 2013-2014=64% 2014-2015=68% 2015-2016=72% 2016-2017=76%			5B.3. Time necessary to revise instructional focus calendars based on data analysis	5B.3. Teachers will develop instructional focus calendars based on the Bay District Comprehensive Math Plan and pacing guides to insure students are placed in rigorous course work	5B.3. Administrators, Classroom teachers	5B.3. Monthly data chats Grade group meeting notes	5B.3. FCAT Math Test results DEA data
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>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
N/A			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 mathematics.			5D.1. Instructional knowledge of the Common Core Standards	5D.1. Provide access to mainstream classroom settings for instruction in the state standards	5D.1. ESE Teachers, Math Curriculum Team, SIP Team	5D.1. Progress of SWD will be compared to baseline data (DEA) at mid-term and end of school year	5D.1. FCAT Math Test results DEA data
Mathematics Goal #5D: <i>Baseline data for 2010-2011: 57% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) were proficient on the FCAT Math Test.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 21%(10)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 45% (21)					
6-Year AMO Goal: By the school year 2016-2017 the percentage of non-			5D.2. Adequate time to revise instructional focus calendars based on data analysis	5D.2. Teachers will develop instructional focus calendars and lessons based on the Bay District Comprehensive Math Plan and pacing guides to insure students are placed in	5D.2. Administrators, Classroom teachers	5D.2. Monthly data chats Grade group meeting notes	5D.2. FCAT Math Test results DEA data

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

<p>proficient SWD students will be reduced by 50% as reported by the CCSS-aligned PARCC Summative Assessment Math Test.</p> <p>2012-2013 AMO Goal: 45% of Students with Disabilities will achieve Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Math Test. 2013-2014=51% 2014-2015=56% 2015-2016=62% 2016-2017=67%</p>			rigorous course work			
	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #5E:</p> <p>Baseline data for 2010-2011: 66% of Economically Disadvantaged students were proficient on the FCAT Math Test.</p> <p>6-Year AMO Goal: By the school year 2016-2017 the percentage of non-proficient Economically Disadvantaged students will be reduced by 50%.</p> <p>2012-2013 AMO Goal: 54% of Economically Disadvantaged students will achieve Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Math Test. 2013-2014=59% 2014-2015=63% 2015-2016=68% 2016-2017=73%</p>		5E.1. Time necessary to revise instructional focus calendars based on data analysis	5E.1. Teachers will develop instructional focus calendars and lessons based on the Bay District Comprehensive Math Plan and pacing guides to insure students are placed in rigorous course work	5E.1. Administrators, Classroom teachers	5E.1. Monthly data chats Grade group meeting notes	5E.1. FCAT Math Test results DEA data
<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>34% (44)</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>54% (69)</p>	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals
Mathematics Professional Development

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with 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
Data Analysis	Grades K-5 Mathematics	SIP Team, Administrators	All Instructional Staff Members	August 2012	Instructional staff will have follow-up monitoring during monthly data chats.	Administrators, SIP Team, Guidance Counselor
MTSS Procedures	Grades K-5 Mathematics	MTSS Staff Training Specialist/ Guidance Counselor	Classroom teachers	September 2012 - May 2013	MTSS Staff Training Specialist and Guidance Counselor will be available for follow-up monitoring.	Guidance Counselor, MTSS Staff Training Specialist
Staff Development Opportunities	Grades K-5 Mathematics	Jeremy Centeno	All K-5 Classroom Teachers	Every Tuesday during the first nine weeks of the 2012-2013 school year	Individual review as needed	Administrators, Math Curriculum Team
Discovery Education	Grades K-5	Technology TOSA	All Classroom Teachers	October 2012	Individual review as needed	Media Specialist

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
Provide intervention for K-5 students working below grade level in math	Instructional stipends for after-school tutoring sessions	Title I	\$6,997.00
			Subtotal: \$6,997.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide daily access to computer-assisted instruction such as: FCAT Explorer, SuccessMaker, and Harcourt ThinkCentral	Student incentives	Internal Accounts	\$250.00
Provide daily access to computer-assisted instruction such as: FCAT Explorer, SuccessMaker, and Harcourt ThinkCentral	Student Computer for Lab	Title I	\$859.00
			Subtotal: \$1,109.00
Professional Development			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Continue implementation of the state math standards (NGSS & CCSS)	Stipends for planning for SIP	Title I	\$3,570.00
Implement the use of Kagan Structures with fidelity.	Kagan facilitator and instructional materials for staff development	Title I	\$9,674.00
			Subtotal: \$13,244.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide daily access to computer-assisted instruction such as: FCAT Explorer, SuccessMaker, and Harcourt ThinkCentral	Paraprofessional for lab management and small group tutoring	Title I	\$22,285.00
Instructional staff will be given opportunities for staff development targeting needs of subgroups not meeting AYP goals	Supplemental Instructional materials and supplies	Title I	\$4,977.00
			Subtotal: \$27,262.00
			Total: \$48,612.00

End of Mathematics Goals

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
IA. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			IA.1. Instructional knowledge of the Common Core Standards	IA.1. Continue to align curriculum and assessments with the state standards through vertical and grade-level alignment	IA.1. Science Curriculum Team, SIP Team, Administrators	IA.1. Mid-term and end of the year progress will be compared to baseline data using DEA	IA.1. FCAT Science results DEA data
<u>Science Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
36% of fifth grade students will score a Level 3 on the FCAT Science Test as reported by the School Accountability Report (School Report Card).	33% (22)	36% (21)					
			IA.2. Time necessary to prepare for presentations	IA.2. Continuation of Science Curriculum Team to address science related data and convey information to faculty on a regular basis	IA.2. Science Curriculum Team, SIP Team	IA.2. Review of Science Curriculum Team Minutes	IA.2. Science Curriculum Team minutes
			IA.3. Time necessary to revise instructional focus calendars based on data analysis	IA.3. Teachers will develop instructional focus calendars and lessons based on the Bay District Comprehensive Science Plan and pacing guides to insure students are placed in rigorous course work	IA.3. Administrators, Classroom teachers	IA.3. Monthly data chats Grade group meeting notes	IA.3. FCAT Science Test results DEA data
IB. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.
<u>Science Goal #1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box. N/A	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			IB.2.	IB.2.	IB.2.	IB.2.	IB.2.
			IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.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. Time and materials necessary to prepare for discovery lessons	2A.1. Develop science skills through direct experiences such as: hands-on activities, technology, inclusion of science content in special area classes, field trips (Biophilia Field Trip), parent night, and guest speakers	2A.1. Science Curriculum Team, SIP Team	2A.1. Review of DEA data	2A.1. FCAT Science results DEA data
Science Goal #2A: <i>11% of fifth grade students will achieve Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Science Test as reported by the School Accountability Report (School Report Card).</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 8%(6)	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 11%(6)	Funding for materials and field trips				
			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.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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

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	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g.,	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

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

	PLC Leader	school-wide)	frequency of meetings)		
New Adoption Training	Grades K-2	Textbook Representative	K-2 Grade Teachers	July 2012	Weekly grade level meetings Administrators
Discovery Education	Grades K-5	Media Specialist	All Classroom Teachers	November 2012	Individual review as needed Media Specialist
SMART boards and document cameras for instructional use	Grades K-5	Technology TOSA	All Instructional Staff Members	September 2012 – May 2013	Individual review as needed Technology TOSA
Kagan Structures	Grades K-5	Title I	All Instructional Staff Members	June 2012-May 2013	Kagan facilitator classroom visits Administrator
ThinkCentral	Grades K-5	Technology TOSA	K-2 Grade Teachers	August 2012	Individual review as needed Technology TOSA/Media Specialist

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
Provide intervention for K-5 students working below grade level in science	Instructional stipends for after-school tutoring sessions	Title I	\$1,500.00
			Subtotal: \$1,500.00
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
Develop science skills through direct experiences such as: hands-on activities, technology, inclusion of science content	Field Trips	Title I	\$1,600.00

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

in special area classes, field trips (Bio Field Trip), parent night, and guest speakers			
			Subtotal: \$1,600.00
			Total: \$3,100.00

End of Science Goals

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
----------------------	--

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			IA.1. Use of identical writing terms in the teaching of writing	IA.1. Begin implementation of Rocking Writers including the quarterly analysis and sharing of results by the Writing Curriculum Team each nine weeks “Cold” writes will focus on a writing trait each nine weeks	IA.1. Writing Curriculum Team, SIP Team, Administrators	IA.1. Review Rocking Writers and FCAT Writing scores	IA.1. Rocking Writers results FCAT Writing results
Writing Goal #1A: <i>69% of fourth grade students will score a 3 or higher on the FCAT Writing Test as reported by the School Accountability Report (School Grades).</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 66%(40)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 69%(43)					
			IA.2. Use of identical writing terms in the teaching of writing	IA.2. Continue writing strategies that address learning modalities through direct instruction and inclusion of alternate strategies and reflect the use of FCIM including: quarterly Rocking Writers, cooperative learning, mentoring, inclusion of ESE for writing instruction for general education class, use of Melissa Forney’s S.M.I.L.E./D.O.L. strategies, CRISS, writing centers, Writer’s Conference, Writing Camp, copies of writing rubric sent to parents, Kagan structures, parent writing workshops, and the Six Traits of Writing	IA.2. Writing Curriculum Team, Administrators	IA.2. Review Rocking Writers and FCAT Writing scores	IA.2. Rocking Writers results FCAT Writing results
			IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.
Writing Goal #1B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			IB.2.	IB.2.	IB.2.	IB.2.	IB.2.
			IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.

Writing 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
Rubric Training with FCAT Test Specification guides for the writing test	3 rd and 4th Grade Instructional Staff	Writing Curriculum Team	K-5 Teachers	October-November 2012	Evaluation of Rocking Writers results	Writing Curriculum Team
Data Analysis	Grades K-5	SIP Team, Administrators	All Instructional Staff Members	August 2012	Monthly Data Chats	Administrators SIP Team
Strategies for After-School Tutoring, Parent Workshops, and Student-Peer Training	Grade K-5	Title I Liaison Writing Curriculum Team, 4th grade teachers	School-wide	September 2012 - May 2013	Sign-in sheets	Title I Contact
New technologies for instructional use	Grades K-5	Technology TOSA	All Instructional Staff Members	September 2012-May 2013	Individual review as needed	Technology TOSA
Kagan Structures	Grades K-5	Kagan Representative	All Instructional Staff Members	June 2012 – May 2013	Sign-in sheets	Administrators SIP Team

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
Provide intervention for fourth grade students working below proficiency in writing	Instructional stipends and materials for tutoring sessions	Title I	\$3,915.00
			Subtotal: \$3,915.00
Technology			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Continue writing strategies that address learning modalities through direct instruction and inclusion of alternate strategies and reflect the use of FCIM including: quarterly Rocking Writers, cooperative learning, mentoring, inclusion of ESE for writing instruction for general education class, use of Melissa Forney’s S.M.I.L.E./D.O.L. strategies, CRISS, writing centers, Writer’s Conference, Writing Camp, copies of writing rubric sent to parents, Kagan structures, parent writing workshops, and the Six Traits of Writing	Sue Leonard-Consultant	Title I	\$350.00
Continue writing strategies that address learning modalities through direct instruction and inclusion of alternate strategies and reflect the use of FCIM including: quarterly Rocking Writers, cooperative learning, mentoring, inclusion of ESE for writing instruction for general education class, use of Melissa Forney’s S.M.I.L.E./D.O.L. strategies, CRISS, writing centers, Writer’s Conference, Writing Camp, copies of writing rubric sent to parents, Kagan structures, parent writing workshops, and the Six Traits of Writing	Subs. For Writing Training	Title I	\$4, 384.00
			Subtotal:\$ 4,734.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Continue writing strategies that address learning modalities through direct instruction and inclusion of alternate strategies and reflect the use of FCIM	Writing Center Paraprofessional	Title I	\$22,622.00

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

including: quarterly Rocking Writers, cooperative learning, mentoring, inclusion of ESE for writing instruction for general education class, use of Melissa Forney’s S.M.I.L.E./D.O.L. strategies, CRISS, writing centers, Writer’s Conference, Writing Camp, copies of writing rubric sent to parents, Kagan structures, parent writing workshops, and the Six Traits of Writing			
Continue writing strategies that address learning modalities through direct instruction and inclusion of alternate strategies and reflect the use of FCIM including: quarterly Rocking Writers, cooperative learning, mentoring, inclusion of ESE for writing instruction for general education class, use of Melissa Forney’s S.M.I.L.E./D.O.L. strategies, CRISS, writing centers, Writer’s Conference, Writing Camp, copies of writing rubric sent to parents, Kagan structures, parent writing workshops, and the Six Traits of Writing	Supplemental Instructional Supplies (Writing, folders, paper, pencils, etc.)	Title I	\$500.00
Subtotal:\$ 23,122.00			
Total: \$31,771.00			

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
I. Attendance			1.1. Parents’ attitudes toward attendance for primary age students	1.1. Continue with extended day physical education and take roll on the walking track at 7:55 a.m.	1.1. Administrative Assistant	1.1. Increase average daily attendance to 95% or above	1.1. Attendance records
Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*	Difficulty making improvement to an already acceptable attendance				

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

Increase average daily attendance to 95% or above as measured by FOCUS reports.	95%	95%	rate (95%)				
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	145	130					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	69	62					
		1.2 Parental work schedules	1.2 Stress importance of promptness and regular attendance at the Title I annual meeting night and provide opportunity for parents to view attendance data using parent portal	1.2 Title I Parent Contact	1.2 Review of parent surveys	1.2 Meeting agenda/ handouts Survey results	
		1.3 Availability of working contact phone numbers	1.3 Contact parents of students with an excessive number of unexcused absences or tardies	1.3 Guidance Counselor, Administrators, Parent Liaison	1.3 Decrease the number of students with excessive absences to 150 and excessive tardies to 50	1.3 Attendance records Contact log	

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.						
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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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 Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

Suspension Goal(s)		Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension					
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
I. Suspension		1.1.	1.1	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
Decrease the number of suspensions by 10%		1.1. Analysis of the 2011-2012 school year data to determine if there is a significant sub-group that more frequently resulted in suspensions	1.1. Administrative Assistant	1.1. Referral data	1.1. Referral data	1.1. Referral data	
Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions						2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
	23						20
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School						2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
	18						15
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions						2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
	11	9					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
	11	9					
		1.2.	1.2	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Training on Southport Elementary’s school-wide discipline plan	All Instructional Areas	Administrative Assistant	All instructional staff	October 2012	Individual review as needed	Administrative Assistant

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

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Suspension Goals

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
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.
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>Increase parent involvement at workshops provided to assist parents of students in subgroups not meeting AMO proficiency goals</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>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	Attendance scheduling conflicts	Provide multi-grade level workshops to instruct parents in ways to help their children meet AMO goals in the areas of writing, mathematics, science, and reading	Title I Contact, Administrators	Review responses to parent surveys Attendance records of workshops	Sign-in Sheets Parent Surveys
	517parents	525 parents					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			Parents not attending orientation and other workshops	Provide workshops /opportunities to encourage parents to become partners in the educational process in response to parental survey results, including: workshops/meetings for the purpose of explaining expectations of grade level state standards, strategies for assisting students with homework, student progress reports, explanations of test results, notification to parents of not highly qualified staff, and opportunities to serve on the school advisory council	Title I Contact, Administrators, LLT, Reading Curriculum Team, SIP Team	Review attendance records, agendas, and survey results	FCAT Reading Test results DEA data
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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
Importance of Parent Involvement (review of Title I Modules)	All Instructional Areas	Title I Contact	School-wide	September 2012	Sign-in sheets and meeting agendas	Title I Contact
Communication Strategies	All Instructional Areas	Title I Contact	School-wide	October 2012	Sign-in sheets and meeting agendas	Title I Contact

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
Food for Title I Annual Workshop	Food, supplies, materials, and child care for workshops	Title I Funds/PTO Funds	\$2,347.00
Provide workshops /opportunities to	School personnel will provide mini-	Title I	\$3,202.00

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

encourage parents to become partners in the educational process in response to parental survey results, including: workshops/meetings for the purpose of explaining expectations of grade level State Standards, strategies for assisting students with homework, student progress, explanations of test results, notification to parents of not highly qualified staff, and opportunities to serve on the school advisory council	workshops Parent conferences	Title I	\$1,673.00
Parent Liaison	Parent Liaison	Title I	\$10,789.00
			Subtotal: \$18,011.00
			Total: \$18,011.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: <i>Increase student knowledge of NGSS/CCSS science and math standards and understanding of careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics</i>	1.1. Time and material	1.1. Develop science skills through direct experiences such as: hands-on activities, technology, inclusion of science content in special area classes, field trips (Biophilia Field Trip), parent night, and guest speakers	1.1. Classroom teachers	1.1. Review of DEA data	1.1. FCAT Science Test scores DEA data
	5D.2 Adequate time to revise instructional focus calendars based on data analysis	5D.2 Continued implementation of instructional focus calendars to ensure students are placed in rigorous course work	5D.2 Administrators	5D.2 Review of weekly grade-level meeting notes Classroom walk throughs	5D.2 FCAT Reading Test results DEA data
	1.3. Student attendance	1.3. Develop student awareness of careers in STEM –related fields through student attendance in the Celebration of Learning Event	1.3. Event coordinator-Leslie Abrams	1.3. Students will be given an opportunity to reflect on the Celebration of Learning Event. Review of record daily attendance	1.3. Student survey Attendance records

STEM 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
New Adoption Training	K-2 Grade Teachers	Textbook Representative	K-2 Grade Teachers	July 2012	Monthly grade level meetings	Administrators
Instructional strategies	Instructional grade levels	Paula Weaver	Instructional Faculty	October 2012	Monthly grade level meetings	Media Specialist

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Develop student awareness of careers in STEM –related fields through student attendance in the Celebration of Learning Project	Food for Celebration of Learning guest vendors and dignitaries, decorations, and badges for adults and students.	Fund-raising events (Internal Accounts)	\$600.00
			Subtotal: \$600.00
			Total: \$600.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement									
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool					
1. Additional Goal			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.					
Additional Goal #1: Provide a safe environment for student learning with no more than 9 out of school suspensions as reported by Focus for 2012-2013	<u>2012 Current Level</u> :*	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> :*	None	Continue use of our integrated character education program, Keeping America’s Promise, “Do the Right Thing Program”, Eagle of the Week and Month recognition, Southport Discipline Referral Form, and open communication between staff and parents	Administrators	Review discipline and suspension records	Discipline records Suspension records					
	11	9										
								1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
								1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district 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
Continue use of our integrated character education program, Keeping America's Promise, "Do the Right Thing Program", Eagle of the Week and Month recognition, Southport Discipline Referral Form, and open communication between staff and parents	Incentive for good behavior, i.e., walking feet, Eagle of the Week rewards, Eagle of the Month yard signs	Internal Accounts	\$1,400.00
Subtotal:			\$1,400.00
Total:			\$1,400.00

End of Additional 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: \$52,878.00
CELLA Budget	Total:
Mathematics Budget	Total: \$48,612.00
Science Budget	Total: \$3,100.00
Writing Budget	Total: \$31,771.00
Civics Budget	Total:
U.S. History Budget	Total:
Attendance Budget	Total:
Suspension Budget	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total: \$18,011.00
STEM Budget	Total: \$600.00
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total:\$1,400.00
Grand Total: \$156,372.00	

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.
Southport Elementary School’s Advisory Council is reflective demographically of the student body and is comprised of at least 51% non-school based members. Parents, teachers, and educational support staff are elected by their peers and, if necessary, the school principal may appoint additional members including a business partner to bring the council in compliance with state standards. This council will act as an advisory body to the school administrators; provide community members a vehicle for shared decision-making concerning school affairs; provide community members a means for understanding school, district, and state educational issues; decide expenditures for the School Improvement funds; and provide input, quarterly monitoring of, and approval of the School Improvement Plan. During the 2012-2013 school year, the School Advisory Council will meet a total of six times. At the September meeting, a chairman and secretary will be elected and the council will review curriculum areas of low performance as well as share decision-making responsibility in the development of the school improvement plan. For the remainder of the year, the SAC chairman will plan with the principal meeting times, dates, agendas, and send meeting reminders to the members. The elected secretary will take attendance, record the minutes of each meeting, and file copies of relevant documents in the School Advisory Council handbook that is available for public review. The parents and community members of Southport Elementary School are encouraged to become full partners in the educational process. Serving as a member of the Southport School Advisory Council is an excellent outlet to share thoughts, concerns, and aspirations in our school’s quest to be “anchored in excellence”.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
SAC budget has not been executed at this time	