

# Florida Department of Education



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

Proposed for 2012-2013

**2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

**PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS**

**School Information**

School Name: Kathleen Elementary	District Name: Polk County
Principal: Lana Tatom	Superintendent: Dr. Sherrie Nickell
SAC Chair: TBA	Date of School Board Approval: TBA

**Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:**

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

**Administrators**

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
----------	------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

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

Principal	Lana Tatom	<p>Educational Specialist, NOVA Southeastern University Curriculum, Instruction, Management, and Administration; Masters of Arts ~ Eastern Michigan University Elementary Education/ Computer Applications in the Classroom; Bachelor of Science ~ Eastern Michigan University Major: Math Minor: Science Group; Florida Certification Educational Leadership All Levels Elementary Education K- 6 Mathematics 5-9 School Principal All Levels; Michigan Certification K-5 all subjects K-8 self contained 6-8 Math and Science</p>	5	8	<p>Principal of KES in 2011-2012: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 48%, Math mastery: 44%, Writing Mastery: 83% Science Mastery: 38%. 81% of the students made learning gains in reading 72% in math. 76% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading 74% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. 2010-2011: Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 60%, Math mastery: 63%, Writing Mastery: 88% Science Mastery: 50%. AYP: 82% of the criteria met. 63% of the students made learning gains in reading 48% in math. 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading 50% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. 2009-2010: Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 59%, Math mastery: 69%, Science Mastery: 41%. AYP: 79% of the criteria met. 60% of the students made learning gains in both reading and math. 42% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading 61% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. 2007-2008: Grade: B, Reading Mastery 68%, Math Mastery 67%, Science Mastery 26%. AYP 92% of the criteria met, Hispanic students did not make AYP in reading or math. Economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in math. 2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 70%, Math mastery: 79%, Science Mastery: 56%. AYP: 95% of the criteria met, this was the first year that there were enough African American students to count as a subgroup and they did not make AYP in reading or math. 2007-2008: Grade: B, Reading Mastery 68%, Math Mastery 67%, Science Mastery 26%. AYP 92% of the criteria met, Hispanic students did not make AYP in reading or math. Economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in math.</p>
-----------	------------	---	---	---	--

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

Assistant Principal	Sara Kocab	Masters of Science Educational Leadership NOVA Southeastern University Bachelor of Arts Elementary Education Michigan State University Florida Certification Educational Leadership All Levels Elementary Education K-6 Social Sciences 5-9	2	3	Assistant Principal of KES in 2011-2012: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 48%, Math mastery: 44%, Writing Mastery: 83% Science Mastery: 38%. 81% of the students made learning gains in reading 72% in math. 76% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading 74% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. Assistant Principal of KES in 2010-2011: Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 60%, Math mastery: 63%, Writing Mastery: 88% Science Mastery: 50%. AYP: 82% of the criteria met. 63% of the students made learning gains in reading 48% in math. 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading 50% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. Dean at KMS in 2009-10: Grade C, Reading Mastery: 55%, Reading Learning Gains: 57%, Lowest 25% Gains: 62%, Math Mastery: 47%, Math Learning Gains: 63%, Lowest 25% Gains: 71%, Science Mastery: 31%, AYP 74%, None of the subgroups made AYP in Reading or Math. 2008-2009: Grade B, Reading Mastery: 63%, Math Mastery: 48%, Science Mastery: 33%, AYP: 87%, Hispanics did not make AYP in Reading and the Black students were the only subgroup that made AYP in Math.
---------------------	------------	---	---	---	---

**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)
--------------	------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	--

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

Writing & Title I Program Facilitator	Renee Howell	Bachelor of Science, Elementary Education University of South Florida	5	1.5	2011-2012:Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 48%, Math mastery: 44%, Writing Mastery: 83% Science Mastery: 38%. 81% of the students made learning gains in reading 72% in math. 76% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading 74% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. 2010-2011:Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 60%, Math mastery: 63%, Writing Mastery: 88% Science Mastery: 50%. AYP: 82% of the criteria met. 63% of the students made learning gains in reading 48% in math. 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading 50% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.
Reading AIF	Joy Hall	Bachelor of Science, Early Childhood Education, Valdosta State University	13	1.75	2011-2012:Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 48%, Math mastery: 44%, Writing Mastery: 83% Science Mastery: 38%. 81% of the students made learning gains in reading 72% in math. 76% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading 74% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. 2010-2011:Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 60%, Math mastery: 63%, Writing Mastery: 88% Science Mastery: 50%. AYP: 82% of the criteria met. 63% of the students made learning gains in reading 48% in math. 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading 50% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.
Math AIF	Tracie Upton	Bachelor of Science, Elementary Education University of North Florida	6	1.5	2011-2012:Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 48%, Math mastery: 44%, Writing Mastery: 83% Science Mastery: 38%. 81% of the students made learning gains in reading 72% in math. 76% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading 74% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. 2010-2011:Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 60%, Math mastery: 63%, Writing Mastery: 88% Science Mastery: 50%. AYP: 82% of the criteria met. 63% of the students made learning gains in reading 48% in math. 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading 50% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

**Highly Effective Teachers**

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

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Recruiting & retaining high quality, highly qualified teachers: applicants are screened to ensure that they meet the HQ CQ criteria and placed on a list of approved candidates for hire	District Office Human Resource Department	Ongoing
2. Selection of staff: administration puts together an interview team representing classroom teachers and support teachers; selects candidates to be interviewed; creates appropriate questions; and facilitates the interview & selection process.	Principal	Ongoing
3. Coaching Support: individual teacher mentoring from experienced, successful teachers; need based classroom modeling and team teaching provided; continuous instructional feedback provided; assistance by experienced teachers in lesson planning & maintaining a positive classroom learning environment; assistance in locating teaching resources, communicating with parents, establishing an organizational system for teacher paperwork, etc.	Support Teachers	Ongoing
4. Monthly reflection meetings with beginning teachers. Teacher coaches will meet with beginning teachers to talk about successes they are having in the classroom with their students and their teaching. Discussions will also take place regarding teacher questions and concerns. Teacher needs will be assessed through these meetings and coaching will be targeted on such needs to address each area of concern.	Support Teachers	June 2012
5. Daily grade level planning meetings: Each grade level team will meet together for 30 minutes daily to plan lessons collaboratively. Each day of the week has a set content focus for planning. Through these consistent team planning sessions, beginning teachers will receive assistance in designing & implementing effective lessons.	Grade Level Chair	June 2012

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

6. Differentiated professional development: teachers will receive small group, intensive professional development throughout the year based upon their instructional needs.	Administration & Support Team	June 2012
---	-------------------------------	-----------

### *Non-Highly Effective Instructors*

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

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

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

### *Staff Demographics*

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
39	3% (1)	51% (20)	28% (11)	18% (7)	23% (9)	100% (39)	N/A	3% (1)	54% (21)

### *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
Joy Hall & Tracie Upton	Reading & Math AIFs	Experience Level	Coaching support, biweekly reflection meetings, daily grade level planning, differentiated professional development

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011



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

### 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, funds school-wide services to Kathleen Elementary. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. Title I, Part A, support provides after-school and summer instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III to ensure that staff development needs are addressed accordingly.
Title I, Part C- Migrant Migrants students enrolled at Kathleen Elementary will be assisted by the school and by the District Migrant Education Program (MEP). Students will be prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status. MEP Teacher Advocates, assigned to schools with high percentages of migrant students, monitor the progress of these high need students and provide or coordinate supplemental academic support. Migrant Home-School Liaisons identify and recruit migrant students and their families for the MEP. They provide support to both students and parents in locating services necessary to ensure the academic success of these students whose education has been interrupted by numerous moves.
Title I, Part D Title I, Part D, provides Transition Facilitators to assist students with transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school. The Transition Facilitators communicate with the Guidance Counselors at schools to facilitate the transfer of records and appropriate placement.
Title II Professional development resources are available to Title I schools through Title II funds. In addition, School Technology Services provide technical support, technology training, and licenses for software programs and web-based access via Title II-D funds. Funds available to Kathleen Elementary are used to purchase training. This past year we used the funds to for common core training and kindergarten teachers attended a conference to further enhance their knowledge of implementing the curriculum .
Title III Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, as well as professional learning opportunities for school staff. Services are provided through the district for one ESOL paraprofessional to support ELL students at our school.
Title X- Homeless The Hearth program, funded through Title X, provides support for identified homeless students. Title I provides support for this program, and many activities implemented by the Hearth program are carried out in cooperation with the Migrant Education Program (MEP) funded through Title I, Part C.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) N/A

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

<p><b>Violence Prevention Programs</b>                  Title IV provides violence and drug prevention programs in schools in order to promote a safe school environment. Examples of violence prevention programs include anti-bullying, gang awareness, gun awareness, etc.</p>
<p><b>Nutrition Programs</b>                  Our school is a location for summer feeding program for the community.</p>
<p><b>Housing Programs</b>                  Students with housing needs are referred to the Homeless Student Advocate.</p>
<p><b>Head Start</b>                  Head Start is not located on our campus. Resources are provided to the program to assist in the transition of students from pre-k to kindergarten. Head Start teachers may participate in professional learning opportunities offered to school staff, and they are involved in Professional Learning Community activities with kindergarten teachers. Parents of Head Start students are invited to participate in parent workshops and activities provided by the school.</p>
<p><b>Adult Education</b>                  N/A</p>
<p><b>Career and Technical Education</b>                  N/A</p>
<p><b>Job Training</b>                  N/A</p>
<p><b>Other</b></p>

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.</p> <p>Principal, Assistant Principal, Grade Chairs, ESE teachers, Reading and Math Resource teachers, School Psychologist, Guidance Counselor, and Technology 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>The team meets monthly to problem-solve using school-wide academic and behavioral data. The focus is on evaluating effectiveness of programs, grade levels, and determining what is working. Representatives from other teams such as PBS are included and report data each month.</p>

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

<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 RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?                  The Leadership Team writes, monitors, and revises the SIP throughout the school year. The SIP is a reflection of the problem-solving process; data analysis; goal setting; areas of weakness are identified; barriers are analyzed; strategies are selected; implemented and monitored across the school year.</p>		
<p><b>MTSS Implementation</b></p>		
<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>Data Sources</p>	<p>Data Management Systems</p>
<p>Tier 1</p>	<p>Discovery, FCAT, SAT-10, attendance, suspensions, office discipline referrals, writing rubrics.</p>	<p>IDEAS, Discovery, GENESIS</p>
<p>Tier 2</p>	<p>Extended reading passages, sight word inventories, oral reading fluency, math fluency probes, Wiley and progress monitoring specific to various curriculums.</p>	<p>IDEAS (special reports on discipline) Moodle, and school-designed systems</p>
<p>Tier 3</p>	<p>Individual progress monitoring which is specific to the student and the problem</p>	<p>OPM is collected in the KES shared folder each month by the resources teachers and classroom teachers.</p>
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.                  During staff development days, Teachers will be given an overview of MTSS. Teachers will discuss monthly Ongoing Progress Monitoring and monthly meetings with resource teachers to review data to determine trends, and effectiveness of interventions.</p>		
<p>Describe the plan to support MTSS.                  Resource teachers will meet with classroom teachers monthly or as needed to review data and determine effectiveness of interventions.</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). Principal, Assistant Principal, Grade Chairs, ESE teachers, Reading and Math Resource teachers, School Psychologist, Guidance Counselor, and Technology Specialist.
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The team meets monthly to problem-solve using school-wide academic and behavioral data. The focus is on evaluating effectiveness of programs, grade levels, and determining what is working. Representatives from other teams such as PBS are included and report data each month.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The major initiatives of the LLT this year are learning gains. The goal is for all students to make learning gains in reading. Whole group, small group, and iii group instruction will be monitored for all classrooms.

### *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.

Kathleen Elementary has several programs to assist preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to elementary programs. Every spring, there is a Kindergarten Round-Up at our school which allows parents and children to register for school, visit kindergarten classrooms, and receive information about things that parents can do to prepare their children for kindergarten. During the Round-Up, children are also assessed in their readiness for kindergarten using school created assessments which include recognizing shapes, colors, and simple objects as well as making a detailed drawing of themselves. This information allows us to determine readiness and appropriate placement. Another program is an informational evening program held every April, where kindergarten teachers invite parents of the students entering kindergarten in the fall. At this time, teachers share their expectations to give the parents an idea of what will be expected of their child and what each child should know prior to enrolling in kindergarten. These two transitional programs precede the August orientation prior to the start of the school year. At the August orientation, parents meet the teacher, tour the school and receive supply lists and other information. Parents are notified about the transitional programs by notices sent home with all elementary school students and flyers are put in all daycares. Additionally, the District Office provides notices to newspapers and radio stations. Kathleen Elementary also has a Pre-Kindergarten program where we are teaching and preparing our students to be ready for Kindergarten. Using data collected and observation made, our Title One Program Facilitator and administration determine the effectiveness and any changes needed to our program.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Reading Goals**

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

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

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

<p><b>1A. FCAT 2.0:</b>  <b>Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b></p>	<p>1A.1. Students reading and writing at or above grade level are not being challenged to maintain or increase grade level proficiency.</p> <p>1A.2. Lack of fidelity of implementation of high yield strategies.</p> <p>1A.3. Students are reading below grade level due in part to lack of rigorous instructional outcomes set by teachers</p>	<p>1A.1. Teacher will use performance data to put students into small flexible groups for differentiated instruction that will improve their achievement.</p> <p>1A.2. Teachers will implement with fidelity; Summarizing, Extended Reading Passages and Extended Thinking/ Writing for Understanding</p> <p>1A.3. SES tutoring, ELP tutoring, iii (Tier 2) for all students, iii (Tier 3) for select students, Fast ForWord, FCAT Explorer, Odyssey</p>	<p>1A. Administration          Leadership Team          Reading Resource</p> <p>District:          1. Principal, AP/C/A, Instructional Facilitators/Teachers          2. Principal, AP/C/A, Instructional Facilitators ,Teachers/PLC’s          3. Academic Instructional Facilitators, Teachers/ bi-weekly PLC’s          4. Principal, AP/C/A, Instructional Facilitators ,Teachers/PLC’s  <b>Simultaneous:</b>          5. Principal, AP/C/A  <b>Optional:</b>          6. School Leadership Team</p>	<p>1A. Data analysis of weekly assessments</p> <p>Data analysis of Discovery Education assessments</p> <p>Data analysis of FCAT scores</p> <p>Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples</p> <p>District:          1. Administer Formative assessments          2. Data Day Chats          3. Data Chats to make curricular/instructional decisions based on review of student data and artifacts          4. Data Chats to make curricular/instructional decisions based on review of student data and artifacts  <b>Simultaneous:</b>          5. a. Daily classroom walk-throughs (3 -5’)          b. Informal observations 10 -25’)          c. Formal Observations (30’ or more)  <b>Optional:</b>          6. Two (2) Live Meetings (First Progress Monitoring and Mid-Year)</p>	<p>1A. Discovery Education Assessments (DEA)</p> <p>SAT 10</p> <p>FCAT</p> <p>Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card data</p> <p>District:          1. Discovery Assessments          2. Initial creation of MTSS Tier matrix of grade level scores by subject (Reading, Math, Science, Writing, EOC’s)          3. Common Assessments (Teacher made by grade level and subject)          4. Adjusted barriers and strategies by MTSS Tier matrix of grade level and subject three (3) x within a school year  <b>Simultaneous:</b>          5. Aggregated data by teacher, grade level, and subject area  <b>Optional:</b>          6. Questions for Progress Monitoring</p>		
---	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

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

<p><u>Reading Goal #1A:</u> <i>Students earning a Level 3 will maintain a 3 or increase their achievement level to a 4 or 5.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>23% of students earned Level 3.</i></p>	<p><i>28% of students should earn Level3.</i></p>					
<p><b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b></p>	<p>1B.1. Our VE teachers need professional development in rigorous and relevant instructional strategies.  Students are reading below grade level.  Lack of rigorous instructional outcomes set by teachers</p>	<p>1B.1. Professional Development/ Modeling: AR, Think Alouds, “What Moves You” LFS, Vocabulary, Summarizing, Extended Passages and Extended Thinking/ Writing for Understanding, Access Points, PD 360</p>	<p>1B.1. Administration Leadership Team Reading Resource</p>	<p>1B.1. Data analysis of weekly assessments  Data analysis of Discovery Education assessments  Florida Alternative Assessments/ FCAT  Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples</p>	<p>1B.1. Discovery Education Assessments (DEA)  SAT 10  FCAT  Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card data</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #1B:</u> <i>100% of the students will maintain a level 4, 5, and 6 on the alternate assessment</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>100% (2)</i></p>	<p><i>100% (1)</i></p>					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b></p>	<p>2A.1. Our third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers need to focus on differentiating instruction with rigor and relevance.</p> <p>Lack of differentiated task in literacy centers/ independent activities</p> <p>Lack of sufficient rigor in instruction</p>	<p>2A.1. Utilization of high yield researched based instructional strategies: Extended thinking, HOT questions, use critical thinking skills, Extended thinking strategies, FCAT 2.0 Reading Item Specifications for 3-5<sup>th</sup> grades, FCAT 2.0 Reading Stem Questions</p> <p>Differentiated assignments within small group time. Teacher forms literacy circles with SSSYR books.</p>	<p>2A.1 Administration Leadership Team Reading Resource</p>	<p>2A.1. Data analysis of weekly assessments</p> <p>Data analysis of Discovery Education assessments</p> <p>Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples</p>	<p>2A.1. Discovery Education Assessments (DEA)</p> <p>SAT 10</p> <p>FCAT</p> <p>Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card data</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #2A:</u></p> <p><i>Students earning a Level 4 or above, will maintain a 4 or increase their achievement level to a 5.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					



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

	<i>21% of our students achieved Level 4 or 5.</i>	<i>We expect 26% of our students to earn Level 4 or 5.</i>					
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>	2B.1. Our ESE teachers continue to need professional development in rigorous and relevant instructional strategies.	2B.1. Differentiated assignments within small group time  Utilization of high yield researched based instructional strategies: Extended thinking, HOT questions, use critical thinking skills, Extended thinking strategies, FCAT 2.0 Reading Item Specifications for 3-5 <sup>th</sup> grades, FCAT 2.0 Reading Stem Questions, Access Points	2B.1. Administration Leadership Team  Reading Resource	2B.1. Data analysis of weekly assessments  Data analysis of Discovery Education assessments  Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples	2B.1. Discovery Education Assessments (DEA)  SAT 10 FCAT  Florida Alternative Assessment/FCAT  Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card data		
<u>Reading Goal #2B:</u> <i>Students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment will score at or above Level 7.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	0	<i>We expect 50% (1) of our students to score at or above Level 7.</i>					

**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		
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>	3A.1. Lack of differentiated task in literacy centers/ independent activities  Inconsistent implementation of rigorous and relevant instructional strategies causing off task behaviors	3A.1. Teachers use data to differentiate assignments in centers  Teachers will complete specific and targeted small group plans that are rigorous	3A.1. Administration  Leadership Team	3A.1. Weekly analysis of lesson plans, assessments and assignments; to include flexible groups  Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples	3A.1. Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card, Discovery Education Assessments.		
<b>Reading Goal #3A:</b>  <i>Students will make learning gains in reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	83	88					
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>	3B.1. Inconsistent implementation of rigorous and relevant instructional strategies causing off task behaviors	3B.1. Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples	3B.1. Administration  Leadership Team	3B.1. Weekly analysis of lesson plans, assessments and assignments; to include flexible groups	3B.1. Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card, Discovery Education Assessments.		

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

<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Students will make learning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment.</i>							
	<i>100% of our students made learning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment.</i>	<i>We expect 100% of our students made learning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment.</i>					
		3B.2. ESE teachers continue to need professional development in rigorous and relevant instructional strategies.	3B.2. Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples	3B.2. Administration Leadership Team	3B.2. Weekly analysis of lesson plans, assessments and assignments; to include flexible groups	3B.2. Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card, Discovery Education Assessments.	
		3B.3. Lack of differentiated task in literacy centers/ independent activities	3B.3. Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples	3B.3. Administration Leadership Team	3B.3. Weekly analysis of lesson plans, assessments and assignments; to include flexible groups	3B.3. Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card, Discovery Education Assessments.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>	4A.1. Students have limited background knowledge, life experiences and vocabulary.	4A.1. Various researched based instructional strategies	4A.1. Administration Leadership Team	4A.1. Weekly analysis of lesson plans, assessments and assignments; to include flexible groups	4A.1. Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card, Discovery Education Assessments.		
<b>Reading Goal #4A:</b>  <i>Students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>80% of our students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.</i>	<i>We expect 85% of our students in the lowest 25% to make learning gains in reading.</i>					
		4A.2. Struggling readers need immediate intensive instruction (iii)	4A.2. Utilize diagnostic assessments to determine specific student needs: ERDA (K-3) DAR (K-5) Fox in a Box (K-3) FAIR (K) Odyssey (3-5) Discovery (K-5)  30 additional minutes on a daily basis outside the literacy block (iii) but within the instructional day Group size 3-5 students	4A.2. Administration Leadership Team	4A.2. Weekly analysis of lesson plans, assessments and assignments; to include flexible groups	4A.2. Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card, Discovery Education Assessments.	

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

		4A.3. Insufficient time on task	4A.3. Differentiated instruction on the student's level Full implementation of PBS Social skills instruction Stop and Think lessons	4A.3. Administration  Leadership Team	4A.3. Weekly analysis of lesson plans, assessments and assignments; to include flexible groups	4A.3. Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card, Discovery Education Assessments.	
<b>4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #4B:</u>  N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b> 46%	51%	55%	60%	64%	69%	73%
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u>  By 2017, 73% of the students tested will receive a level 3 or higher in reading on the PARCC.							
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		
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5B.1. White: Economically disadvantaged, high household mobility rate  Black: High referral rate, economically disadvantaged  Hispanic: Economically disadvantaged, high household mobility rate, attendance  Asian: N/A  American Indian: N/A	5B.1. Framework incorporated in the acquisition lesson (EATS) for guided practice, skill practice spread out across time through Distributed Guided Practice, when learning new information, students periodically summarize what they have learned and work to answer the given Assessment Prompt through the use of Distributed Summarizing.  Gradual Release Process of I Do, We Do, You Do.	5B.1. Administration  Classroom Teachers  Leadership Team	5B.1. Classroom walkthroughs  Lesson Plans	5B.1. Classroom walkthroughs  Lesson Plans		



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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5C.1. Lack of proper accommodations	5C.1. In order to maximize the amount of service time provided, ELL students are assigned to two teachers per grade level.  ELL students will be provided approved accommodations daily during classroom instruction, and during district and statewide assessments	5C.1. Administration  Classroom Teachers  ELL Para  Leadership Team	5C.1. Classroom Walk Throughs  ELL paraprofessional time logs  Lesson Plans  Progress Monitoring	5C.1. Classroom Walk Throughs  ELL paraprofessional time logs  Lesson Plans  Progress Monitoring		
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5C.2. Limited or interrupted schooling experiences	5C.2. Visual aids, consistent academic language used by all staff	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	

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

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

		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		
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5D.1. Students have limited knowledge and background experiences	5D.1. hands-on experiences, project-based learning (extended thinking), realia, immersion in vocabulary instruction and games, Slide Show presentations	5D.1. Administration, Classroom Teachers, Inclusion Teachers	5D.1. Classroom observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples  Lesson plan documentation	5D.1. Classroom Walkthrough reports from Journey  Inclusion Teachers time logs  Progress Monitoring		
<b>Reading Goal #5D:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

		5D.2. Lack of proper accommodations	5D.2. In order to maximize the amount of service time provided by the, the SWD students are assigned to one or two classrooms  SWD students will be provided approved accommodations daily during classroom instruction, and during district and statewide assessments	5D.2. Administration, Classroom Teachers, Inclusion Teachers	5D.2. Inclusion Teachers time logs Classroom Walk Throughs, Progress Monitoring  Lesson plan documentation	5D.2. Classroom Walkthrough reports from Journey  Inclusion Teachers time logs  Progress Monitoring	
		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		
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5E.1. Students have limited knowledge and background experiences	5E.1. Teachers will incorporate hands-on experiences, project-based learning (extended thinking), realia, immersion in vocabulary instruction, vocabulary games, slide show presentations, and other technology resources available throughout their lessons.	5E.1. Administration Classroom Teachers Leadership Team	5E.1. Classroom observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples  Lesson plan documentation	5E.1. Classroom Walkthrough reports from Journey, Progress Monitoring		

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

<b>Reading Goal #5E:</b> <i>Economically disadvantaged students will make learning gains in reading.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5E.2. Students have limited access to reading material and technology at home	5E.2. Increase book checkout, extend media center hours, publicize places with free access to technology: public library, community centers, churches  Classroom and special area teachers will utilize available technology resources during lessons.	5E.2. Administration  Leadership Team  Media Specialist  Program Facilitator	5E.2. Circulation reports weekly  Lesson plan documentation	5E.2. Circulation reports weekly	

**Reading Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b> 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

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

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

AR Think Alouds LFS Vocabulary Summarizing Extended Passages Extended Thinking Writing for Understanding, PD 360 HOT questions critical thinking skills, Extended thinking strategies, FCAT 2.0 Reading FCAT 2.0 Reading Stem Questions Access Points CISM Common Core Centers Text Complexity Rubrics Text Based Questions	All	Reading Resource  Math Resource	School Wide	Weekly PLC's during block time and as scheduled on early release days	Classroom walk-throughs  Lesson plans Progress Monitoring Students Work	Administration  Leadership Team
--	-----	--	-------------	---	---	---------------------------------------

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase Reading Achievement	Weekly Reader	FLEX	\$672.46
Increase Reading Achievement	American Legacy Publishing	FLEX	\$1,152.69
Increase Reading Achievement	National Geographic	FLEX	\$216.84
<b>Subtotal: \$2,041.99</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase Reading Achievement	Accelerated Reader / STAR	OPER	\$1,074.74
<b>Subtotal: \$1,074.74</b>			

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase Reading Achievement	Grade Level Professional Development Days	Title I	\$1,280
Increase Reading Achievement	Reading Resource Teacher	Title I	\$59,459
<b>Subtotal: \$60,739</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase Reading Achievement	Instructional Supplies	Title I	\$476.50
Increase Reading Achievement	Instructional Supplies	OPER	\$2,646.10
Increase Reading Achievement	Extended Reading Passages	FLEX	\$801
<b>Subtotal: \$3,923.60</b>			
<b>Total: \$67,779.33</b>			
Include only school funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			

*End of Reading Goals*

**Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals**

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

<b>CELLA Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition</b>					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>	1.1. Students need time to acquire language skills	1.1. SES Tutoring, ELP Tutoring, Fast Forward, iii, Reading backpacks by level, DVD of high frequency words for K, 1, 2 Common Core	1.1. Leadership Team	1.1. RtI data, OPM data PD in progress monitoring	1.1. Discovery results CELLA RESULTS	

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



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

<b>CELLA Goal #1:</b> <i>Increase proficiency by 5%</i>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u>					
	58%					
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>	2.1. Students are reading below grade level Lack of parental involvement	2.1. SES Tutoring, ELP Tutoring, Fast Forward, iii, Reading backpacks by level, DVD of high frequency words for K, 1, 2 Common Core  Provide a parent workshop outlining the use of the at home DVD's and backpacks.	2.1. Leadership Team	2.1. RtI data, OPM data PD in progress monitoring	2.1. Discovery results CELLA RESULTS	
<b>CELLA Goal #2:</b> <i>Increase proficiency by 5%</i>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u>					
	51%					

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>	3.1. Need for differentiated explicit writing instruction	3.1. Teachers use data to differentiate writing groups and explicitly teach skills that are lacking	3.1. Leadership Team	3.1. Rtl data, OPM data PD in progress monitoring	3.1. Discovery results CELLA RESULTS	
<u>CELLA Goal #3:</u> <i>Increase proficiency by 5%</i>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					
	19%					

**Elementary School Mathematics Goals**

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

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

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

<p><b>1A. FCAT 2.0:</b>  <b>Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>1A.1. Teacher needs to consistently deliver math lessons that include collaborative structures, distributive practice, and distributive summarizing.</p>	<p>1A.1. Student discourse is facilitated through collaborative structures embedded in lessons. Increase the use of projects within the curriculum and de-emphasize lecture.</p>	<p>1A.1. Administration                      Leadership Team                      Math resource teacher                      District:                      1. Principal, AP/C/A, Instructional Facilitators/Teachers                      2. Principal, AP/C/A, Instructional Facilitators, Teachers/PLC's                      3. Academic Instructional Facilitators, Teachers/ bi-weekly PLC's                      4. Principal, AP/C/A, Instructional Facilitator, Teachers/PLC's  <b>Simultaneous:</b>                      5. Principal, AP/C/A  <b>Optional:</b>                      6. School Leadership Team</p>	<p>1A.1. Data analysis of weekly assessments                      Data analysis of Discovery Education assessments                      Data analysis of FCAT scores                      Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples                      District:                      1. Administer Formative assessments                      2. Data Day Chats                      3. Data Chats to make curricular/instructional decisions based on review of student data and artifacts                      4. Data Chats to make curricular/instructional decisions based on review of student data and artifacts  <b>Simultaneous:</b>                      5. a. Daily classroom walk-throughs (3 -5')                      b. Informal observations 10 -25")                      c. Formal Observations (30' or more)  <b>Optional:</b>                      6. Two (2) Live Meetings (First Progress Monitoring and Mid-Year)</p>	<p>1A.1. Discovery Education Assessments (DEA)                      SAT 10                      FCAT                      Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card data                      District:                      1. Discovery Assessments                      2. Initial creation of MTSS Tier matrix of grade level scores by subject (Reading, Math, Science, Writing, EOC's)                      3. Common Assessments (Teacher made by grade level and subject)                      4. Adjusted barriers and strategies by MTSS Tier matrix of grade level and subject three (3) x within a school year  <b>Simultaneous:</b>                      5. Aggregated data by teacher, grade level, and subject area  <b>Optional:</b>                      6. Questions for Progress Monitoring</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u>                      Students that earned a level 3 will maintain their level 3 or increase to a level 4 or 5.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	28% [70]	33%					
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>	1B.1. Our VE teachers need professional development in rigorous and relevant instructional strategies.  Lack of rigorous instructional outcomes set by teachers	1B.1. Professional Development/ Modeling: AR, "What Moves You" LFS, Vocabulary, Summarizing, Extended Passages and Extended Thinking/ Writing for Understanding, Access Points, PD 360	1B.1. Administration  Leadership Team	1B.1.  Data analysis of weekly assessments  Data analysis of Discovery Education assessments  Data analysis of FAA scores  Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples	1B.1.  Discovery Education Assessments (DEA)  Florida Alternative Assessment  Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card data		
<u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u>  Students that earned a level 4, or 5, or 6 will maintain their level or increase to a higher level.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	100% [2]	100%					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>2A. FCAT 2.0:</b>  <b>Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>2A.1.                  Our third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers need to focus on differentiating instruction with rigor and relevance.                   Lack of differentiated task in math centers/ independent activities                   Lack of sufficient rigor in instruction</p>	<p>2A.1.                  Differentiated assignments within small group time                   Utilization of high yield researched based instructional strategies: Extended thinking, HOT questions, use critical thinking skills, Extended thinking strategies, FCAT 2.0 Math Item Specifications for 3-5<sup>th</sup> grades</p>	<p>2A.1.                  Administration                   Leadership Team                   Math resource teacher</p>	<p>2A.1.                  Data analysis of weekly assessments                   Data analysis of Discovery Education assessments                   Data analysis of FCAT scores                   Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples</p>	<p>2A.1.                  Discovery Education Assessments (DEA)                   SAT 10                   FCAT                   Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card data</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u>                   Students that earned a level 4 or 5 will maintain their level 4 or 5 or increase from a level 4 to a level 5.</p>							
	<p>16% [39]</p>	<p>21%</p>					

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

<p><b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>2B.1. Our ESE teachers continue to need professional development in rigorous and relevant instructional strategies.</p>	<p>2B.1. Differentiated assignments within small group time  Utilization of high yield researched based instructional strategies: Extended thinking, HOT questions, use critical thinking skills, Extended thinking strategies, FCAT 2.0 Math Item Specifications for 3-5<sup>th</sup> grades, Access Points</p>	<p>2B.1. Administration  Leadership Team</p>	<p>2B.1. Data analysis of weekly assessments  Data analysis of Discovery Education assessments  Data analysis of FAA scores  Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples</p>	<p>2B.1. Discovery Education Assessments (DEA)  Florida Alternative Assessment  Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card data</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>  Students that earned a level 7 or above will maintain their level or increase from their level.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>0% [0]</p>	<p>50% [1]</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 group:</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>		
--	----------------------------	-----------------	--	--	------------------------	--	--

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

<p><b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>3A.1. Individual classroom teachers continue to need professional development in rigorous and relevant instructional strategies.</p> <p>Lack of differentiated task in literacy centers/ independent activities</p> <p>Inconsistent implementation of rigorous and relevant instructional strategies causing off task behaviors</p>	<p>3A.1. Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples</p>	<p>3A.1. Administration Leadership Team Math resource teacher</p>	<p>3A.1. Weekly analysis of lesson plans, assessments and assignments; to include flexible groups</p>	<p>3A.1. Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, interim reports, report card, Discovery Education Assessments.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u>  Students who made learning gains in math will continue to make learning gains in math. Five percent of students who did not make learning gains in math will make learning gains in 2013.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>75% [185]</p>	<p>80%</p>					

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

<p><b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>3B.1. Inconsistent implementation of rigorous and relevant instructional strategies causing off task behaviors</p>	<p>3B.1. Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples</p>	<p>3B.1. Administration Leadership Team</p>	<p>3B.1. Weekly analysis of lesson plans, assessments and assignments; to include flexible groups</p>	<p>3B.1. Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, interim reports, report card, Discovery Education Assessments.</p>		
<p><b>Mathematics Goal #3B:</b>  Students who made learning gains in math will continue to make learning gains in math. Fifty percent of students who did not make learning gains in math will make learning gains in 2013.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>50% [1]</p>	<p>100%</p>					
		<p>3B.2. ESE teachers continue to need professional development in rigorous and relevant instructional strategies.</p>	<p>3B.2. Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples</p>	<p>3B.2. Administration Leadership Team</p>	<p>3B.2. Weekly analysis of lesson plans, assessments and assignments; to include flexible groups</p>	<p>3B.2. Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card, Discovery Education Assessments.</p>	
		<p>3B.3. Lack of differentiated task in literacy centers/ independent activities</p>	<p>3B.3. Classroom Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples</p>	<p>3B.3. Administration Leadership Team</p>	<p>3B.3. Weekly analysis of lesson plans, assessments and assignments; to include flexible groups</p>	<p>3B.3. Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card, Discovery Education Assessments.</p>	



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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	4A.1. Students have limited background knowledge, life experiences and vocabulary.	4A.1. Various researched based instructional strategies such as build background knowledge with Learn 360 video clips. Explicitly teach vocabulary using Marzano's vocabulary method.	4A.1. Administration Leadership Team Math resource teacher	4A.1. Weekly analysis of lesson plans, assessments and assignments; to include flexible groups	4A.1. Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card, Discovery Education Assessments.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u> Students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains of 80% or higher.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
	76% [188]	77%					
		4A.2. Insufficient time on task	4A.2. Differentiated instruction on the student's level Full implementation of PBS Social skills instruction Stop and Think lessons	4A.2. Administration Leadership Team Math resource teacher	4A.2. Weekly analysis of lesson plans, assessments and assignments; to include flexible groups	4A.2. Classroom Observation reports from Journey, lesson plan rubric, and student work samples, AR reports, interim reports, report card, Discovery Education Assessments.	

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


Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b> 36%	44%	47%	52%	57%	63%	68%
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5A:</u> By 2017, 68% of the students tested will receive a level 3 or higher in math on the PARCC.							

**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 subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>5B.1. White: Economically disadvantaged, high household mobility rate Black: High referral rate, economically disadvantaged Hispanic: Economically disadvantaged, high household mobility rate, attendance Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A</p>	<p>5B.1. Framework incorporated in the acquisition lesson (EATS) for guided practice, skill practice spread out across time through Distributed Guided Practice, when learning new information, students periodically summarize what they have learned and work to answer the given Assessment Prompt through the use of Distributed Summarizing.  Gradual Release Process of I Do, We Do, You Do.</p>	<p>5B.1. Administration Classroom Teachers Leadership Team</p>	<p>5C.1. Classroom Walk Throughs Lesson Plans Progress Monitoring</p>	<p>5C.1. Classroom Walk Throughs Lesson Plans Progress Monitoring</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5C.1. Lack of proper accommodations	5C.1. In order to maximize the amount of service time provided, ELL students are assigned to two teachers per grade level.  ELL students will be provided approved accommodations daily during classroom instruction, and during district and statewide assessments	5C.1. Administration  Classroom Teachers  ELL Para  Leadership Team	5C.1. Classroom Walk Throughs  ELL paraprofessional time logs  Lesson Plans  Progress Monitoring	5C.1. Classroom Walk Throughs  ELL paraprofessional time logs  Lesson Plans  Progress Monitoring		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5D.1. Students have limited knowledge and background experiences	5D.1. hands-on experiences, project-based learning (extended thinking), realia, immersion in vocabulary instruction and games, Slide Show presentations	5D.1. Administration, Classroom Teachers, Inclusion Teachers	5D.1. Classroom observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples  Lesson plan documentation	5D.1. Classroom Walkthrough reports from Journey  Inclusion Teachers time logs  Progress Monitoring		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5D.2. Lack of proper accommodations	5D.2. In order to maximize the amount of service time provided by the, the SWD students are assigned to one or two classrooms  SWD students will be provided approved accommodations daily during classroom instruction, and during district and statewide assessments	5D.2. Administration, Classroom Teachers, Inclusion Teachers	5D.2. Inclusion Teachers time logs Classroom Walk Throughs, Progress Monitoring  Lesson plan documentation	5D.2. Classroom Walkthrough reports from Journey  Inclusion Teachers time logs  Progress Monitoring	
		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	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
--	---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------	--	--

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

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

subgroup:							
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5E.1. Students have limited knowledge and background experiences  Students have limited access to technology at home	5E.1. Teachers will incorporate hands-on experiences, project-based learning (extended thinking), realia, immersion in vocabulary instruction, vocabulary games, slide show presentations, and other technology resources available throughout their lessons.  Classroom and special area teachers will utilize available technology resources during lessons.	5E.1. Administration  Classroom Teachers  Leadership Team	5E.1. Classroom observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and student work samples  Lesson plan documentation	5E.1. Classroom Walkthrough reports from Journey, Progress Monitoring		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

**Mathematics Professional Development**

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

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

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b> 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
LFS Vocabulary Summarizing Extended Passages Extended Thinking PD 360 HOT questions critical thinking skills, Extended thinking strategies, FCAT 2.0 Math Questions Access Points Common Core Centers Text Complexity Mathematical Practices	All	Reading Resource  Math Resource	School Wide	Weekly PLC's during block time and as scheduled on early release days	Classroom walk-throughs  Lesson plans  Progress Monitoring  Students Work	Administration  Leadership Team

**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
Increase Math Achievement	Wylie's	FLEX	\$576.07

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

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

Increase Math Achievement	Penster's	FLEX	\$296.75
<b>Subtotal: \$872.82</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase Math Achievement	Grade Level Professional Development Days	Title I	\$1,280
Increase Math Achievement	Math Resource Teacher	Title I	\$49,909
<b>Subtotal: \$51,189</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase Math Achievement	Instructional Supplies	Title I	\$476.80
Increase Math Achievement	Instructional Supplies	OPER	\$2,646.10
<b>Subtotal: \$3,122.90</b>			
<b>Total: \$55,184.72</b>			



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

**Science Goals**

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

<b>SCIENCE GOALS</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		

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

<p><b>1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science</b></p> <p><u>Science Goal #1:</u></p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Students have misconceptions regarding essential science concepts.</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Utilize activating strategies or formative assessment probes to identify student misconceptions.</p> <p>Adapt instructional strategies to address student learning needs.</p> <p>Provide teachers with PD from Milton on 5E</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Teachers meet in collaborative content area teams to analyze their student's results</p> <p>Determine student's misconceptions to better align instruction.</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Classroom walkthroughs Lesson plans Unit assessments FCAT Discovery FCAT Explorer</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Leadership team</p>		
<p>By Spring of 2013 at least 41% of our total 5<sup>th</sup> grade student population will be at AL 3 or above in science as evidenced by the AYP report.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u></p> <p>*</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u></p> <p>*</p>					

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

	28%	33%					
		1.2. Students fail to recognize the relevance of science to their daily lives leading to disengagement.	1.2. Utilize a variety of media resources, including print, internet, and videos to engage students in discourse relating curriculum to real world issues.	1.2. PLCs  Link to student data  Link to real world experiences	1.2.  Vertical team walkthrough to monitor vertical articulation	1.2.  Leadership team	
		1.3. Students have gaps in their background knowledge of essential science concepts.	1.3. Apply a variety of instructional strategies, such as video clips, online resources, and print materials differentiated for individual student needs.	1.3. Identify a specific set of skills, students should learn at each grade level and in PLCs	1.3. Classroom walkthroughs Lesson plans Unit assessments FCAT Discovery FCAT Explorer	1.3.  Leadership team	
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	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		

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

<p><b>2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science</b></p> <p><u>Science Goal #2:</u></p>	<p>2.1. Students are not provided opportunity to utilize critical thinking skills.</p>	<p>2.1. Incorporate inquiry based lessons with content connected to ethical issues, Comprehensive Instructional Sequence Module (CISM)</p>	<p>2.1. Teachers meet in collaborative content area teams to analyze their students results</p>	<p>2.1. Lesson plans</p>	<p>2.1. Leadership team</p>		
<p>By Spring of 2013 at least 11% of our total 5<sup>th</sup> grade student population will be at AL 4 or 5 in science as evidenced by the AYP report.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *</p>					
	<p>10%</p>	<p>11%</p>					

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

		2.2. Assessments are not authentic or engaging or lack HOT questions for students.	2.2. Utilize a variety of formative and summative assessment strategies including problem solving and project based assessments with clear outcomes. Through rubrics provide students with clear expectations.	2.2. Lesson Plans	2.2. Unit assessments FCAT Discovery FCAT Explorer	2.2. Leadership team	
		2.3 Reading and writing strategies are not utilized to increase learning from science text.	2.3 Integrate science into reading instruction, use writing prompts from science maps in writing instruction.  Comprehensive Instructional Sequence Module (CISM) Professional Development.	2.3 Lesson Plans	2.3 Classroom walkthroughs Lesson plans Unit assessments FCAT Discovery FCAT Explorer	2.3 Comprehensive Instructional Sequence Module (CISM) Professional Development.	

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Learning Focused Strategies including but not limited to summarizing extended thinking skills, guided reading, reading in content areas, graphic organizers in science instructions	K-5	Resource Teachers	School wide	Pre-planning PLC mtgs monthly Title I grade level PD days	Walkthroughs & Lesson plan review	Leadership Team

**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
Increase Science Achievement	National Geographic	FLEX	\$ 216.84
Increase Science Achievement	Weekly Reader	FLEX	\$ 672.46
<b>Subtotal: \$889.30</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase Science Achievement	Grade Level Professional Developmental Days	Title 1	\$1,280
<b>Subtotal: \$1,280</b>			

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

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase Science Achievement	Instructional Supplies	OPER	\$2,646.10
Increase Science Achievement	Instructional Supplies	Title I	\$476.50
<b>Subtotal: \$3,122.60</b>			
<b>Total: \$5,291.90</b>			

**Writing Goals**

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

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

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

<p><b>1A. FCAT:</b>  <b>Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b></p>	<p>1A.1.          Need for explicit writing instruction that is grade level appropriate: prewriting, plan, draft, revise, edit, publish</p>	<p>1A.1.          Teachers will follow the monthly writing plan that was created based upon student work analysis and incorporate Polk Writes lessons.          Daily writing block:          Teachers will continue to improve the use of voice in their student and teacher-modeled writing by implementing the strategies learned from Melissa Forney's writing workshop.          Teachers will continue to use strategies to improve the use of</p>	<p>1A.1.          Renée Howell-Title I Facilitator and leadership team</p>	<p>1A.1.          Administer monthly writing assessment prompts for narrative and expository writing          Portfolios to include Title I Ongoing narrative and expository assessment data. This data will be collected at the beginning, middle and end of the school year to track students' progress</p>	<p>1A.1.          2012 FCAT Writing rubric          Title I Ongoing Assessments as a formative tool to target our struggling students</p>		
--	---	--	--	---	---	--	--



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

	<p>conventions in students' writing using Polk Writes. Teachers will continue to use word walls. Teachers will use SMART Board technology to demonstrate revising and editing of writing. Teachers will plan with a template including all components required. Teachers will provide rubrics for writing assignments.</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

<p><u>Writing Goal #1A:</u>                  The 2011-2012 data analysis indicates we did not meet Adequate Yearly Progress, with 83% of our fourth grade students making 3.0 or above. We must meet or exceed the state requirement of writing proficiency for our students. There is a need to increase the number of students receiving a score of a 4, 5, or 6.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>85%</b></p>	<p><b>90%</b></p>					

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

		1A.2. Increase in rigor with FCAT Writing 2.0 involving mechanics, usage, punctuation, spelling, word choice, specificity, depth, relevance, and thoroughness, and the move to CCSS for grade levels other than current 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> grade.	1A.2. In addition to strategies previously stated, teachers will be made aware expectations for FCAT Writing 2.0 and share strategies in professional learning communities. Teachers will implement Polk Writes lessons. Teachers in all grades will receive PD in CCSS writing including responding to text and K, 1, 2 and 5 will give OPM related to CCSS, 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> OPM will be in narrative and expository FCAT Writes format.	1A.2. Leadership team	1A.2. Leadership team and teachers will participate in vertical team walk-through and observe classroom instruction	1A.2. Classroom walk-through form and student work samples.	
		1A.3. Using scoring rubrics with fidelity	1A.3. Provide rubric training for teachers	1A.3. Leadership team	1A.3. Leadership team and teachers will participate in vertical team walk-through and observe classroom instruction	1A.3. Classroom walk-through form and student work samples.	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b>	1B.1. S	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		

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

<u>Writing Goal #1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

**Writing Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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
Writing expectations, monthly curriculum and testing schedule	K-5	Renée Howell-Title I Facilitator	School wide	PLC meetings monthly Title I grade level PD days	Classroom observations and monthly prompt assessments for narrative and expository writing	Leadership team
CCSS writing	K-5	Leadership team member	School wide	PLC meetings monthly Title I grade level PD days	Classroom observations and monthly prompt assessments for narrative and expository writing	Leadership team

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

Polk Writes Orientation	K-5	Diane Conley Title I Facilitator	School wide	October 1, 2012	Lesson Plans	Leadership team
Rubric Training	4	Diane Conley Title I Facilitator	Grade level	October 15, 2012	Student work samples	Leadership 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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase Writing Achievement	Grade Level Professional Developmental Days	Title I	\$1,280
Increase Writing Achievement	TTI Facilitator	Title I	\$49,375
<b>Subtotal: \$50,655.00</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase Writing Achievement	Instructional Supplies	Title I	\$476.50
Increase Writing Achievement	Instructional Supplies	OPER	\$2,646.10
<b>Subtotal: \$3,122.60</b>			
<b>Total: \$53,777.60</b>			

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

**Attendance Goal(s)**

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

<b>Attendance Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</b>						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>1. Attendance</b></p>	<p>1.1. Parents not bringing students to school.</p>	<p>1.1. - Parent Communication - PST / Intervention Meetings - Attendance Contracts - Automated Letters using GENESIS - Monthly attendance awards - Monitor tardies and early check outs - Offer attendance incentives to include a bike raffle for perfect attendance each semester and perfect attendance certificates each card marking</p>	<p>1.1. PSLT: Administration, Pollock, Sandra Marra, Raquel Vargas</p>	<p>1.1. Weekly meetings / follow-ups with social worker to ensure all student attendance issues are handled in timely manner.</p>	<p>1.1. Elegrade GENESIS Reports</p>		
-----------------------------	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

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

<b>Attendance Goal #1:</b>  <i>Increase student attendance by more than 2% as evidenced by genesis.</i>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
	93.65%	96%					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	245	200					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	87	80					

**Attendance Professional Development**

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



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

professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Student Attendance Monitoring	K-5	Jennifer Rojas	K-5	Oct. 5	Monitor Attendance Reports	Teachers & Office Staff

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase student attendance	Tardy Passes to monitor student attendance	OPER	\$100
<b>Subtotal: \$100</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$100</b>			

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

**Suspension Goal(s)**

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

<b>Suspension Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension</b>						
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		
<b>1. Suspension</b>	1.1. Students not knowing expected behaviors or not being motivated to show appropriate behaviors	1.1. - PBS student training - PBS Monthly Reward Day	1.1. Ms. Tatom, Mrs. Kocab and Mr. Pollock PBS Committee	1.1. - Reward day attendance - Suspension days	1.1. GENESIS reports, attendance reports PBS Benchmarks of quality		
Suspension Goal #1: Decrease number of out of school suspensions by 10%	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
	/	/					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					

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

	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	54	49					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	36	32					

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> 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
PBS	K-5	Mr. Pollock	K-5 Staff	Monthly	PBS Rewards Days	Teachers

**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)).

<b>Parent Involvement Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving</b>						
-----------------------------------	------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

	<b>Process to Parent Involvement</b>						
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		
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>	1.1. Parental transportation and scheduling conflicts	1.1. Implement day time luncheon to cover nightly function.  Planned Core Academic Activities: Back to School Night: Test for Success Title I Annual Meeting & Grade Level Expectations, Math Night, Science Night, Reading Night.	1.1. Leadership team and committees	1.1. Parent attendance, survey, program evaluations	1.1. Sign-in sheets and Parent surveys completed		

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

<u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
Increase parent involvement by 2%							
	<b>96%</b>	<b>98%</b>					
		1.2. Need for increased parent participation in PTO and on SAC	1.2. School wide encouragement of parents to join and serve on the PTO and SAC	1.2. Leadership team and grade chairs	1.2. Parent Membership and participation, volunteer hours as recorded in Genesis	1.2. Sign-in sheets, Genesis reports.	
		1.3. Need for increased parent conferencing	1.3. Student Led Conferences will be scheduled each grading period to discuss student academic achievement.	1.3. Leadership team	1.3. Analysis of data from sign-in sheets and comment cards	1.3. Sign-in sheets, comment cards and Title I Conference report.	

**Parent Involvement Professional Development**

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

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

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

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
Collecting parent involvement data	K-5	Renee Howell	K-5 Staff	Pre-planning	Visit grade level planning meetings	Teachers

**Parent Involvement Budget**

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase Parent Involvement	Student Agendas	Title I	\$2,236
Increase Parent Involvement	Wednesday Folders	XXLOT	\$525
<b>Subtotal: \$2,761</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase Parental Involvement	Postage for Parent Correspondence	Title I	\$300
Increase Parental Involvement	Meals for parent nights	Title I	\$500
Increase Parental Involvement	Supplies: Ink/Toner for Printers (Newsletters), Copier Paper, Flyers, etc.	Title I	\$300
Increase Parental Involvement	TTI Facilitator	Title I	See writing
<b>Subtotal: \$1,000.00</b>			
<b>Total: \$1,000.00</b>			

**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: \$67,779.33	
Mathematics Budget	
Total: \$55,184.72	
Science Budget	
Total: \$5,291.90	
Writing Budget	
Total: \$53,777.60	
Attendance Budget	
Total: \$100	
Suspension Budget	
Total:	
Dropout Prevention Budget	
Total:	
Parent Involvement Budget	
Total: \$1,000.00	
Additional Goals	
Total:	
Grand Total: \$185,994.55	
Please provide the total budget from each section.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$67,779.33</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$55,184.72</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$5,291.90</b>

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

<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$29,090.10</b>
<b>Civics Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>U.S. History Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$100</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$28,548.50</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>CTE Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total:</b>
	<b>Grand Total: \$185,994.55</b>

**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.)

<b>School Differentiated Accountability Status</b>		
--	--	--

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011



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

Priority	Focus	Prevent

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

**School Advisory Council (SAC)**

*SAC Membership Compliance*

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

X 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.
The KES School Advisory Council reviews and determines if the School Improvement Model is being effectively implemented. This group is composed of twenty members consisting of the principal, teachers, support staff, parents, community members, and students. This group represents the population of the students that attend KES. The members determine school improvement priorities as well as support and evaluate the implementation of the plan. In addition this council, assists in the decision making process and approval of expenditures of district lottery funds, school recognition funds when received, and reviews the School Budget. Meetings are held monthly and are posted on our school calendar, school newsletter, and website. During the meetings teachers from each grade share student achievement data, monthly events are discussed and input is given by community members.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Student Agendas & Wednesday folders for parent involvement	2236
Printing costs for newsletters & communication to parents	1000