FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

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

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name:	Oakshire Elementary School	District Name:	Orange County Public Schools
Principal:	William A. Bohn	Superintendent:	Barbara M. Jenkins
SAC Chair:	Gloria Castro	Date of School Board Approval:	January 29, 2013

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	William A. Bohn	Master of Science Elementary Education, Nova University 2001; Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership, Nova University 2002; Bachelor of Liberal Arts, University of Florida 1997	5	9	2011-2012; Grade A, Oakshire Elementary School (Meeting High Standards 62% Reading, 60% Math, 80% Writing, 50% Science, Learning Gains – 81% Reading and 75% Math, Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains - Reading 83% and Math 74%) 2010-2011; Grade A, Oakshire Elementary School (Did not meet AYP, Meeting High Standards 73% Reading, 78% Math, 90% Writing, 55% Science, Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains - Reading 62% and Math 72%) 2009-2010; Grade A, Oakshire Elementary School (Did not meet AYP, Meeting High Standards 77% Reading, 78% Math, 84% Writing, 60% Science, Lowest 25% Making Learning Gaines - Reading 57% and Math 73%) 2005-2009; District Level Administrator in ESOL

		Certified Elementary Education and ESOL Endorsement			2004-2005; Grade A, Oakshire Elementary School (Did not meet AYP, Meeting High Standards 72% Reading, 71% Math, 73% Writing, n/a Science, Lowest 25% Making Learning Gaines - Reading 65% and Math n/a)
Assistant Principal	Raquel Flores	Master of Science Educational Leadership, Nova University 2011; Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education, University of Central Florida Certified in Early childhood PreK-3, ESOL, Reading.	11	1	2011-2012; Grade A, Oakshire Elementary School (Meeting High Standards 62% Reading, 60% Math, 80% Writing, 50% Science, Learning Gains – 81% Reading and 75% Math, Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains - Reading 83% and Math 74%) 2010-2011; Grade A, Oakshire Elementary School (Did not meet AYP, Meeting High Standards 73% Reading, 78% Math, 90% Writing, 55% Science, Lowest 25% Making Learning Gaines - Reading 62% and Math 72%) 2009-10; Grade A, Oakshire Elementary School (Did not meet AYP, Meeting High Standards 77% Reading, 78% Math, 84% Writing, 60% Science, Lowest 25% Making Learning Gaines - Reading 57% and Math 73%)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
<u>Instructional Coaches</u>

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading Coach	Jennifer Duvall	Elementary Education Certification ESOL Certification Media Center K-12 Certification Masters in Reading	10	6	2011-2012; Grade A, Oakshire Elementary School (Meeting High Standards 62% Reading, 60% Math, 80% Writing, 50% Science, Learning Gains – 81% Reading and 75% Math, Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains - Reading 83% and Math 74%) 2010-2011; Grade A, Oakshire Elementary School (Did not meet AYP, Meeting High Standards 73% Reading, 78% Math, 90% Writing, 55% Science, Lowest 25% Making Learning Gaines - Reading 62% and Math 72%) 2009-10; Grade A Oakshire Elementary School (Did not meet AYP, Meeting High Standards 77% Reading, 78% Math, 84% Writing, 60% Science, Lowest 25% Making Learning Gaines - Reading 57% and Math 73%)
Reading Coach	Ilia Adorno	Elementary Education Certification Reading & ESOL Endorsements Secondary Education certification Spanish	12	9	2011-2012; Grade A, Oakshire Elementary School (Meeting High Standards 62% Reading, 60% Math, 80% Writing, 50% Science, Learning Gains – 81% Reading and 75% Math, Lowest 25% Making Learning Gaines - Reading 83% and Math 74%) 2010-2011; Grade A, Oakshire Elementary School (Did not meet AYP, Meeting High Standards 73% Reading, 78% Math, 90% Writing, 55% Science, Lowest 25% Making Learning Gaines - Reading 62% and Math 72%) 2009-10; Grade A Oakshire Elementary School (Did not meet AYP, Meeting High Standards 77% Reading, 78% Math, 84% Writing, 60% Science, Lowest 25% Making Learning Gaines - Reading 57% and Math 73%)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
<u>**Effective and Highly Effective Teachers**</u>

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Regular meetings of all teachers, with Instructional Coach, Principal, and Assistant Principal	Instructional Coach	On-going
2. Completion of New Teacher Program	Instructional Coach	On-going
3. Mentoring Program	Instructional Coach and Mentor	On-going
4. Professional Development Training specific to Teacher Needs	Instructional Coach	June 2013

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0% [0]	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
46	0 [0%]	35% [16]	46% [21]	19% [9]	43% [20]	100% [46]	1% [4]	0% [0]	100% [46]

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
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
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Additional Requirements

*Coordination and Integration-*Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A – Services are provide through Title I to ensure that students requiring additional interventions are assisted through push in and pull out intervention support. Also, Title I pays for the salaries of 2 reading coaches and the instructional coach, and LEA as well as funding family curriculum nights for Reading and Math.
Title I, Part C- Migrant Not Applicable
Title I, Part D – Currently have not have concerns of problems or neglect. However, if an issue does arise, Oakshire's LEA would make the necessary contacts with parent and local agencies that specialize in neglect.
Title II funding will be utilized to provided additional training to teacher on the new Common Core State Standards. Teachers will learn best practices for implementation of the lessons as they relate to the new Common Core State Standards. The trainer will spend 6 hours working with teachers on best practices and then a follow-up session will provide an additional opportunity for teachers to observe "model lessons".
Title III – Services are provided through the district for educational materials and ELL support of English as a Second Language Students.
Title X- Homeless – The school LEA Representative/Parent Involvement Coordinator, School Social Worker, Homeroom teacher and School Administrator meet individually with the families that answered Yes to the first 2 questions of the Student Residency Questionnaire. The purpose of the meeting is to inform the parents about their child's rights under the Mc Kinney Vento Act. A folder is given to the parents with resource guides to the parents, information and assistance brochure, and their child's rights under the program. During this meetings parents usually express their immediate needs to the committee (such as food, clothing, school supplies, etc.) and support is provided with the help of the school social worker.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) -SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school and before/after school tutoring for Level 1 readers.
Violence Prevention Programs – School Resource Officer visits classrooms, works with individual students as needed, and supervises the M.A.G.I.C Program.

Nutrition Programs – Students that qualify are able to receive free or reduced breakfast and lunch.
Housing Programs – Not Applicable
Head Start – Currently have 1 morning session of PreK students to provide early learning opportunities on a first come first serve basis. Priority is given to those members of the community that are in the Oakshire Attendance Zone prior to opening to other qualifying students.
Adult Education – We partner with the community college and local high school to provide ESOL Classes for adults in the neighborhood. Classes are provided on campus and offer the neighborhood the opportunity to learn English as a Second Language as a community service.
Career and Technical Education – Not Applicable
Job Training – Not Applicable
Other

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. The MTSS Leadership team consists of William Bohn (Principal), Sandy Sauma (AP), Joseph Guarino (CRT), Jennifer Duvall (Reading Coach), Ilia Adorno (Reading Coach), Carmen Rivera (CT, LEA Representative), and Rebecca Milay (Psychologist).
Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The MTSS team oversees the implementation of the systematic intervention plan. Students are identified based on prior year data and beginning of the year base-line assessments. The teacher works with the identified high risk students. The reading coaches and reading paraprofessionals work with the moderate risk students. All student monitoring is recorded on a graph with an aim line. If students are not making progress, an instructional change line is made and adjustments are put in place to differentiate the instruction for the students' needs. The assistant principal meets with the reading coaches and CRT every Tuesday to discuss the current state of interventions and individual student progress. The reading team meets with the grade levels once a month to discuss student progress. The CRT ensures that all necessary resources are purchased for the school.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the MTSS problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The MTSS leadership team assists in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan by working with SAC to determine an action plan for continued academic progress in all areas. At the end of the school year the SAC and MTSS Team meet to review the end of the year data by grade level and by SIP area (Reading, Math, etc.) and determine what worked and what needed to be modified.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. A grade level data-base is managed by the reading coaches. This data-base includes all assessments for the students and is color coded to monitor who is and is not on grade level after each assessment. The chutes and ladders instrument is used with K-3 to analyze reading progress and a school based instrument is used to analyze FCAT data. There is a notebook kept for each grade level with the graphs for all students in interventions. This notebook is managed by the reading team and classroom teachers.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The leadership team works with the grade level teams to determine who needs interventions. During the Shark Tracking Data Analysis Meetings, teachers will continue to be trained on how to use the intervention program, how to chart student progress with an aim line, and the purpose of an instructional change line and when to use it. Additionally, the school psychologist will train teachers during Pre-Planning and will continue to train and retrain staff on MTSS as a follow up to the process. For the PBS portion of MTSS, the psychologist did an ongoing training with the MTSS leadership team during Pre-Planning in 11-12 school year. She used the powerpoints provided by the district to lead us through the process. Teachers will implement the SHARK Rules (modified version of CHAMPS). Trainings will also be completed on PDS Online.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. The leadership team will meet with grade level teams bi-weekly along with those providing intervention services to discuss student progress and placement within MTSS. Students not meeting goals will be discuss to determine if placement or program changes would be appropriate.

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).
William Bohn, Sandy Sauma,, Jennifer Duvall, Carmen Rivera, Ilia Adorno, Joseph Guarino
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
Weekly Tuesday Meeting, were we discussing the professional developments, students' achievement, and overall classroom environments.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
To provide students more opportunities to read independently in order to foster a love of reading. We have increase the goal for the amount of Accelerated Reader points for this year to 27,000 to encourage more reading and are rewarding students with "Oakie" dollars to purchase rewards in the Media Center when seen reading independently or achieving reading goals.

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.

School based Pre-K programs conduct Kindergarten classroom visitation in the 4th grading period of the school year. PreSchool teacher will work with students throughout the year developing reading, social, and independency skills. At Oakshire Elementary School, all incoming Kindergarten students are assessed prior to or upon entering Kindergarten in order to ascertain individual and group intervention needs programs. The Developmental Skills Checklist (DSC) will be used to determine students' print/letter knowledge and level of phonological awareness/processing. In addition to academic/school readiness assessments, all incoming Kindergarten students will be assessed in the area of social/emotional development. Data will be used to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students and for groups of students or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Core Kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice and independent practice of all academic and/or social emotional skills identified by screening data. Social skills instruction will occur daily for 20 minutes using the Skills Streaming Curriculum and will be reinforced throughout the day through the use of a common language, re-teaching, and positive reinforcement of pro-social behavior. Screening tools will be re-administered mid-year and at the end of the year in order to determine student learning gains in order to determine the need for changes to the instructional/intervention programs.

*Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S
For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

Not Applicable

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

Not Applicable

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

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Not Applicable

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

Not Applicable

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. Student difficulties in reading varies among students.	1A.1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Students will be given opportunities to use the i-Ready Reading program and read stories on the MyOn Capstone program.	1A.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	1A.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments, fall and winter benchmark, and FAIR results. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. i-Ready progress will be discussed monthly.	1A.1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark, FAIR Testing, i-Ready and MyOn Capstone.
Reading Goal #1A: Increase the number of students scoring level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 59% (220) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test at Oakshire Elementary scored a level 3.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 62% (180) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test at Oakshire Elementary will score a level 3.					
			1A.2. Students having difficulty with comprehending reading instruction.	1A.2. Identify effective strategies for improving reading instruction (according to CAAP)	1A.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	1A.2. Literacy Leadership Meetings to discuss CWTs.	1A.2. Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms
			1A.3. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in reading.	1A.3. Host a family reading nights and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	1A.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	1A.3. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	1A.3. Parent Surveys
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Student difficulties in reading varies among students.	2A.1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Students will be given opportunities to use the i-Ready Reading program and read stories on the MyOn Capstone program.	2A.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	2A.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments, fall and winter benchmark, and FAIR results. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. i-Ready progress will be discussed monthly.	2A.1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark, FAIR Testing, i-Ready and MyOn Capstone.
Reading Goal #2A: Increase the number of students scoring level 4 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 27% (99) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test at Oakshire Elementary scored a level 4 or above.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 30% (87) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test at Oakshire Elementary will score a level 4 or above.					
			2A.2. Students having difficulty with comprehending reading instruction.	2A.2. Identify effective strategies for improving reading instruction (according to CAAP)	2A.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	2A.2. Literacy Leadership Meetings to discuss CWTs.	2A.2. Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms
			2A.3. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in reading.	2A.3. Host a family reading nights and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	2A.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	2A.3. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	2A.3. Parent Surveys
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Student difficulties in reading varies among students.	3A.1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Students will be given opportunities to use the i-Ready Reading program and read stories on the MyOn Capstone program.	3A.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	3A.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments, fall and winter benchmark, and FAIR results. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. i-Ready progress will be discussed monthly.	3A.1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark, FAIR Testing, i-Ready and MyOn Capstone.
Reading Goal #3A: Increase the number of students making learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Reading by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 88% (326) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test at Oakshire Elementary made learning gains.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 91% (264) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test at Oakshire Elementary will make learning gains.					
			3A.2. Students having difficulty with comprehending reading instruction.	3A.2. Identify effective strategies for improving reading instruction (according to CAAP)	3A.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	3A.2. Literacy Leadership Meetings to discuss CWTs.	3A.2. Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms
			3A.3. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in reading.	3A.3. Host a family reading nights and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	3A.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	3A.3. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	3A.3. Parent Surveys
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Student difficulties in reading varies among students.	4A.1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Students will be given opportunities to use the i-Ready Reading program and read stories on the MyOn Capstone program.	4A.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	4A.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments, fall and winter benchmark, and FAIR results. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. i-Ready progress will be discussed monthly.	4A.1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark, FAIR Testing, i-Ready and MyOn Capstone.
Reading Goal #4: Increase the number of students in lowest 25% making learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Reading by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 91% (83) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test at Oakshire Elementary in the lowest 25% made learning gains.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 94% (46) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test at Oakshire Elementary in the lowest 25% will make learning gains.					
			4A.2. Students having difficulty with comprehending reading instruction.	4A.2. Identify effective strategies for improving reading instruction (according to CAAP)	4A.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	4A.2. Literacy Leadership Meetings to discuss CWTs.	4A.2. Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms
			4A.3. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in reading.	4A.3. Host a family reading nights and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	4A.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	4A.3. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	4A.3. Parent Surveys

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	In April 2012, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test was 62%.	In April 2013, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test will be 67%.	In April 2014, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test will be 72%.	In April 2015, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test will be 77%.	In April 2016, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test will be 82%.	In April 2017, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test will be 86%.
Reading Goal #5A: In April 2010-2011, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test was 73%.							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**		5B.1. Student difficulties in reading varies among students.	5B.1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Students will be given opportunities to use the i-Ready Reading program and read stories on the MyOn Capstone program.	5B.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5B.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments, fall and winter benchmark, and FAIR results. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. i-Ready progress will be discussed monthly.	5B.1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark, FAIR Testing, i-Ready and MyOn Capstone.	
Reading Goal #5B: Increase the number of students in each subgroup making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Reading by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, the percent of students in each subgroup made satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading listed below: White: 72% [21] Black: 44% [12] Hispanic: 56% [169] Asian: 91% [11] American Indian: 100% [2]	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, the percent of students in each subgroup will make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading will be: White: 75% [13] Black: 47% [11] Hispanic: 59% [139] Asian: 94% [4] American Indian: 100% [3]						
		5B.2. Students having difficulty with comprehending reading instruction.	5B.2. Identify effective strategies for improving reading instruction (according to CAAP)	5B.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5B.2. Literacy Leadership Meetings to discuss CWTs.	5B.2. Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms	
		5B.3. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in reading.	5B.3. Host a family reading nights and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	5B.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5B.3. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	5B.3. Parent Surveys	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Student difficulties in reading varies among students.	5C.1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Students will be given opportunities to use the i-Ready Reading program and read stories on the MyOn Capstone program.	5C.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5C.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments, fall and winter benchmark, and FAIR results. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. i-Ready progress will be discussed monthly.	5C.1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark, FAIR Testing, i-Ready and MyOn Capstone.
Reading Goal #5C: Increase the number of ELL students making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Reading by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 47% (104) percent of ELL students made satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 50% (72) percent of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.					
			5C.2. Students having difficulty with comprehending reading instruction.	5C.2. Identify effective strategies for improving reading instruction (according to CAAP)	5C.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5C.2. Literacy Leadership Meetings to discuss CWTs.	5C.2. Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms
			5C.3. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in reading.	5C.3. Host a family reading nights and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	5C.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5C.3. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	5C.3. Parent Surveys
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. Student difficulties in reading varies among students.	5D.1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Students will be given opportunities to use the i-Ready Reading program and read stories on the MyOn Capstone program.	5D.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5D.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments, fall and winter benchmark, and FAIR results. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. i-Ready progress will be discussed monthly.	5D.1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark, FAIR Testing, i-Ready and MyOn Capstone.
Reading Goal #5D: Increase the number of SWD students making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Reading by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 58% (220) percent of ELL students made satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 61% (175) percent of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.					
			5D.2. Students having difficulty with comprehending reading instruction.	5D.2. Identify effective strategies for improving reading instruction (according to CAAP)	5D.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5D.2. Literacy Leadership Meetings to discuss CWTs.	5D.2. Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms

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

		5D.3. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in reading.	5D.3. Host a family reading nights and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	5D.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5D.3. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	5D.3. Parent Surveys

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1.Student difficulties in reading varies among students.	5E.1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Students will be given opportunities to use the i-Ready Reading program and read stories on the MyOn Capstone program.	5E.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5E.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments, fall and winter benchmark, and FAIR results. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. i-Ready progress will be discussed monthly.	5E.1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark, FAIR Testing, i-Ready and MyOn Capstone.
Reading Goal #5E: Increase the number of ED students making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Reading by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 54% (168) percent of ED students made satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 57% (141) percent of ED students will make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.					
			5E.2. Students having difficulty with comprehending reading instruction.	5E.2. Identify effective strategies for improving reading instruction (according to CAAP)	5E.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5E.2. Literacy Leadership Meetings to discuss CWTs.	5E.2. Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms
			5E.3. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in reading.	5E.3. Host a family reading nights and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	5E.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5E.3. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	5E.3. Parent Surveys

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
<u>**Reading Professional Development**</u>

						
Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Training on Implementation of Intervention programs	K-5	Jennifer Duvall and Ilia Adorno	School-wide	August to September 2012	Classroom Walkthrough & Coaching	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading coaches
Literature Circles	3-5	Jennifer Duvall and Ilia Adorno	1-5	September 2012-March 2013	Classroom Walkthrough & Coaching	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading coaches
Reader's Theatre	K-5	Jennifer Duvall and Ilia Adorno	School-wide	September 2012-March 2013	Classroom Walkthrough & Coaching	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading coaches
Common Core State Standards	K-2	Jennifer Duvall and Ilia Adorno	School-wide	September 2012-March 2013	Classroom Walkthrough & Coaching	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading coaches
Text Complexity	K-5	Jennifer Duvall and Ilia Adorno	School-wide	September 2012-March 2013	Classroom Walkthrough & Coaching	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading coaches
Reading Data (FCAT, Benchmark, FAIR, i-Ready, MyOn Capstone)	K-5	Jennifer Duvall, Ilia Adorno, Joseph Guarino	School-Wide	September 2012-June 2013	Classroom Walkthrough & Coaching	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading coaches and CRT
Common Core Strategies	K-5	Dr. Kathy Oropallo	School-Wide	October 8th & 9th, 2012	Classroom Walkthrough & Coaching	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading coaches and CRT

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
MyOn Capstone Library	Online Books	Paid by County	$0.00
I-Ready	Online Reading Program	Title I	$6,000
			Subtotal: $6,000
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Common Core Strategies	Dr. Kathy Oropallo	Title II and Title I	$1,500
			Subtotal: $1,500
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $7,500

End of Reading Goals

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

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: Increase the number of students scoring proficient in listening/speaking on CELLA by 3%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: In 2012, 74% (52) percent of students scored proficient in listening/speaking on CELLA.	1.1 Student difficulties in reading varies among students due to level of English acquisition.	1.1 Analyze CELLA data to determine strategies for improving listening/speaking instruction within various strands. Students will use Rosetta Stone program to acquire higher level of English proficiency.	1.1 Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, CT, coaches	1.1 Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments, fall and winter benchmark, and FAIR results. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. Rosetta Stone progress will be discussed monthly.	1.1 CELLA, FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark, FAIR Testing and Rosetta Stone.
		1.2 Students having difficulty with comprehending reading instruction due to language issues.	1.2 Identify effective strategies for improving reading instruction (according to CAAP)	1.2 Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	1.2 Literacy Leadership Meetings	1.2 Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms
		1.3. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in English acquisition.	1.3. Host Parent Leadership Council meetings to inform parents of strategies for helping their child in language acquisition.	1.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	1.3. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	1.3. Parent Surveys
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
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2: Increase the number of students scoring proficient in reading on CELLA by 3%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: In 2012, 71% (50) percent of students scored proficient in reading on CELLA.	2.1 Student difficulties in reading varies among students due to level of English acquisition.	2.1 Analyze CELLA data to determine strategies for improving reading instruction within various strands. Students will use Rosetta Stone program to acquire higher level of English proficiency.	2.1 Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, CT, coaches	2.1 Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments, fall and winter benchmark, and FAIR results. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. Rosetta Stone progress will be discussed monthly.	2.1 CELLA, FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark, FAIR Testing and Rosetta Stone.
		2.2 Students having difficulty with comprehending reading instruction due to language issues.	2.2 Identify effective strategies for improving reading instruction (according to CAAP)	2.2 Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	2.2 Literacy Leadership Meetings	2.2 Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms
		2.3. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in English acquisition.	2.3. Host Parent Leadership Council meetings to inform parents of strategies for helping their child in language acquisition.	2.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	2.3. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	2.3. Parent Surveys

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

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: Increase the number of students scoring proficient in writing on CELLA by 3%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : In 2012, 60% (42) percent of students scored proficient in writing on CELLA.	3.1 Difficulties of students with reading in class vary among students due to level of English acquisition.	3.1 Analyze CELLA data to determine strategies for improving writing instruction within various strands. Students will use Rosetta Stone program to acquire higher level of English proficiency.	3.1 Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, CT, coaches	3.1 Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments, fall and winter benchmark, and FAIR results. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. Rosetta Stone progress will be discussed monthly.	3.1 CELLA, FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark, FAIR Testing and Rosetta Stone.
		3.2 Students having difficulty with comprehending reading instruction due to language issues.	3.2 Identify effective strategies for improving reading instruction (according to CAAP)	3.2 Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	3.2 Literacy Leadership Meetings	3.2 Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms
		3.3. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in English acquisition.	3.3. Host Parent Leadership Council meetings to inform parents of strategies for helping their child in language acquisition.	3.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	3.3. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	3.3. Parent Surveys

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. Student difficulties in math vary among students. Different aspects of Operations are an issue across grade levels.	1A.1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Teachers will provide students opportunities to use Moby Math at school and home to review basic operations of math. i-Ready Math will be used to continue progress of students who are making satisfactory progress.	1A.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	1A.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. Progress on Moby Math and i-Ready will be discussed monthly.	1A1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark Testing, Moby Math and i-Ready.
Mathematics Goal #1A: Increase the number of students scoring level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Math by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 57% (212) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Math Test at Oakshire Elementary scored a level 3.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 60% (174) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Math Test at Oakshire Elementary will score a level 3.					
			1A.2. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in math.	1A.2. Host a family math night (hosted with Orlando Science Center) and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	1A.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	1A.2. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	1A.2. Parent Surveys
			1A.3. Students having difficulty with comprehending math instruction.	1A.3. Identify effective strategies for improving math instruction (according to CAAP)	1A.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	1A.3. Leadership Meetings with Principal to discuss CWTs.	1A.3 Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Student difficulties in math vary among students. Different aspects of Operations are an issue across grade levels.	2A.1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Teachers will provide students opportunities to use Moby Math at school and home to review basic operations of math. i-Ready Math will be used to continue progress of students who are making satisfactory progress.	2A.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	2A.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. Progress on Moby Math and i-Ready will be discussed monthly.	2A1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark Testing, Moby Math and i-Ready.
Mathematics Goal #2A: Increase the number of students scoring level 4 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Math by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 27% (98) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Math Test at Oakshire Elementary scored a level 4 or above.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 30% (87) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Math Test at Oakshire Elementary will score a level 4 or above.					
			2A.2. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in math.	2A.2. Host a family math night (hosted with Orlando Science Center) and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	2A.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	2A.2. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	2A.2. Parent Surveys
			2A.3. Students having difficulty with comprehending math instruction.	2A.3. Identify effective strategies for improving math instruction (according to CAAP)	2A.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	2A.3. Leadership Meetings with Principal to discuss CWTs.	2A.3 Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Student difficulties in math vary among students. Different aspects of Operations are an issue across grade levels.	3A.1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Teachers will provide students opportunities to use Moby Math at school and home to review basic operations of math. i-Ready Math will be used to continue progress of students who are making satisfactory progress.	3A.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	3A.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. Progress on Moby Math and i-Ready will be discussed monthly.	3A1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark Testing, Moby Math and i-Ready.
Mathematics Goal #3A: Increase the number of students making learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Math by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 80% (296) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Math Test at Oakshire Elementary made learning gains.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 83% (241) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Math Test at Oakshire Elementary will make learning gains.					
			3A.2. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in math.	3A.2. Host a family math night (hosted with Orlando Science Center) and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	3A.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	3A.2. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	3A.2. Parent Surveys
			3A.3. Students having difficulty with comprehending math instruction.	3A.3. Identify effective strategies for improving math instruction (according to CAAP)	3A.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	3A.3. Leadership Meetings with Principal to discuss CWTs.	3A.3 Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Student difficulties in math vary among students. Different aspects of Operations are an issue across grade levels.	4A.1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Teachers will provide students opportunities to use Moby Math at school and home to review basic operations of math. i-Ready Math will be used to continue progress of students who are making satisfactory progress.	4A.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	4A.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. Progress on Moby Math and i-Ready will be discussed monthly.	4A1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark Testing, Moby Math and i-Ready.
Mathematics Goal #4: Increase the number of students in lowest 25% making learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Math by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 77% (286) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Math Test at Oakshire Elementary in the lowest 25% made learning gains.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 80% (232) of all students taking the FCAT 2.0 Math Test at Oakshire Elementary in the lowest 25% will make learning gains.					
			4A.2. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in math.	4A.2. Host a family math night (hosted with Orlando Science Center) and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	4A.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	4A.2. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	4A.2. Parent Surveys
			4A.3. Students having difficulty with comprehending math instruction.	4A.3. Identify effective strategies for improving math instruction (according to CAAP)	4A.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	4A.3. Leadership Meetings with Principal to discuss CWTs.	4A.3 Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: In April 2010-2011, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test was 77%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	In April 2012, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test was 60%.	In April 2013, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test will be 68%.	In April 2014, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test will be 74%.	In April 2015, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test will be 80%.	In April 2016, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test will be 84%.	In April 2017, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test will be 89%.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** Mathematics Goal #5B: Increase the number of students in each subgroup making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Math by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, the percent of students in each subgroup made satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math listed below: White: 72% [21] Black: 56% [15] Hispanic: 53% [159] Asian: 91% [11] American Indian: 100% [2] / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, the percent of students in each subgroup will make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math will be: White: 75% [13] Black: 59% [13] Hispanic: 56% [130] Asian: 94% [4] American Indian: 100% [3]	5B.1. Student difficulties in math vary among students. Different aspects of Operations are an issue across grade levels.	5B .1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Teachers will provide students opportunities to use Moby Math at school and home to review basic operations of math. i-Ready Math will be used to continue progress of students who are making satisfactory progress.	5B.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5B.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. Progress on Moby Math and i-Ready will be discussed monthly.	5B 1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark Testing, Moby Math and i-Ready.	
		5B.2. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in math.	5B.2. Host a family math night (hosted with Orlando Science Center) and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	5B.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5B.2. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	5B.2. Parent Surveys	

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

		5B.3. Students having difficulty with comprehending math instruction.	5B.3. Identify effective strategies for improving math instruction (according to CAAP)	5B.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5B.3. Leadership Meetings with Principal to discuss CWTs.	5B.3 Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Student difficulties in math vary among students. Different aspects of Operations are an issue across grade levels.	5C .1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Teachers will provide students opportunities to use Moby Math at school and home to review basic operations of math. i-Ready Math will be used to continue progress of students who are making satisfactory progress.	5C.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5C.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. Progress on Moby Math and i-Ready will be discussed monthly.	5C 1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark Testing, Moby Math and i-Ready.
Mathematics Goal #5C: Increase the number of ELL students making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Math by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 46% (101) percent of ELL students made satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 49% (70) percent of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.					
			5C.2. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in math.	5C.2. Host a family math night (hosted with Orlando Science Center) and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	5C.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5C.2. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	5C.2. Parent Surveys
			5C.3. Students having difficulty with comprehending math instruction.	5C.3. Identify effective strategies for improving math instruction (according to CAAP)	5C.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5C.3. Leadership Meetings with Principal to discuss CWTs.	5C.3 Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. Student difficulties in math vary among students. Different aspects of Operations are an issue across grade levels.	5D .1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Teachers will provide students opportunities to use Moby Math at school and home to review basic operations of math. i-Ready Math will be used to continue progress of students who are making satisfactory progress.	5D.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5D.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. Progress on Moby Math and i-Ready will be discussed monthly.	5D 1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark Testing, Moby Math and i-Ready.
Mathematics Goal #5D: Increase the number of SWD students making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Math by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 56% (210) percent of SWD students made satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 59% (169) percent of SWD students will make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.					

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

| | | 5D.2. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in math. | 5D.2. Host a family math night (hosted with Orlando Science Center) and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child. | 5D.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches | 5D.2. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results. | 5D.2. Parent Surveys |
| | | 5D.3. Students having difficulty with comprehending math instruction. | 5D.3. Identify effective strategies for improving math instruction (according to CAAP) | 5D.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches | 5D.3. Leadership Meetings with Principal to discuss CWTs. | 5D.3 Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms |

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Student difficulties in math vary among students. Different aspects of Operations are an issue across grade levels.	5E .1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark and FAIR data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Teachers will provide students opportunities to use Moby Math at school and home to review basic operations of math. i-Ready Math will be used to continue progress of students who are making satisfactory progress.	5E.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5E.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. Progress on Moby Math and i-Ready will be discussed monthly.	5E 1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark Testing, Moby Math and i-Ready.
Mathematics Goal #5E: Increase the number of ED students making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Math by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 56% (210) percent of ED students made satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 59% (159) percent of ED students will make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.					
			5E.2. Parents not aware of strategies to assist child in math.	5E.2. Host a family math night (hosted with Orlando Science Center) and parent training sessions to provide parents of intermediate grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	5E.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5E.2. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	5E.2. Parent Surveys
			5E.3. Students having difficulty with comprehending math instruction.	5E.3. Identify effective strategies for improving math instruction (according to CAAP)	5E.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	5E.3. Leadership Meetings with Principal to discuss CWTs.	5E.3 Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Mathematics Goal #2A: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
Mathematics Goal #3A: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Mathematics Goal #5A: *N/A*							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**			5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
Mathematics Goal #5B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:						
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

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

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Mathematics Goal #1: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A		*N/A*					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #1: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra Goal #2: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: *N/A*							

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	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.** Algebra 1 Goal #3B: *N/A*	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** / **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** — *N/A* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: / *N/A* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.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
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal #1: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal #2: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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		2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012**					
Geometry Goal #3A: *N/A*						

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
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**			3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Geometry Goal #3B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Geometry Goal #3C: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.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
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Geometry Goal #3D: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.		3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Geometry Goal #3E: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

Mathematics Professional Development

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
Common Core State Standards	K-2	Jennifer Duvall, Ilia Adorno, Joseph Guarino	School-wide	September 2012-March 2013	Classroom Walkthrough & Coaching	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading coaches
Math Data (FCAT, Benchmark, Moby Math, i-Ready)	K-5	Jennifer Duvall, Ilia Adorno, Joseph Guarino	School-Wide	September 2012-June 2013	Classroom Walkthrough & Coaching	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading coaches and CRT
Common Core Strategies	K-5	Dr. Kathy Oropallo	School-Wide	October 8th & 9th, 2012	Classroom Walkthrough & Coaching	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading coaches and CRT

(Header note: Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities — Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.)

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Moby Math	Online Math Program	Paid by County	$0.00
I-Ready	Online Math Program	Title 1	$6,000
			Subtotal: $6,000
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Common Core Strategies	Dr. Kathy Oropallo	Title II and Title I	$1,500
			Subtotal: $1,500
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Family Math Night	Orlando Science Center Family Event	Extended Day	$400
			Subtotal: $400
			Total: $7,900

End of Mathematics Goals

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1. Students having difficulty with science concepts due to vocabulary.	1A.1.Teachers will use *Science Boot Camp* series to increase student vocabulary to increase student comprehension of science concepts.	1.A.1 Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRA, CT, coaches, staffing specialist.	1A.1 Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments created by Science Lab Teacher and 5th Grade Team. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill.	1A.1. Mini-Science Benchmarks, Benchmark Assessments, FCAT, *Science Boot Camp* lessons.
Science Goal #1A: Increase the number of students scoring level 3 on the FCAT Science by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 33% (43) of all students taking the FCAT Science Test at Oakshire Elementary scored a level 3.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 36% (32) of all students taking the FCAT Science Test at Oakshire Elementary will score a level 3.					
			1A.2. Lack of materials for Science Lab	1A.2. Teachers will provide any materials from Science Fusion series and supplies provided by the school.	1A.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRA, coaches, Science lab teacher	1A.2 Science Lab Teacher will have enough supplies for every student to participate in experiments and activities.	1A.2 Students have experiments and activities completed.
			1A.3 Lack of computer activities relating to Science	1A.3.Time will be blocked for Science Lab Teacher to take students to computer lab to use *Science Fusion* lessons.	1A.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRA, coaches	1A.3 Students will be able to access *Science Fusion* lessons on the computers in lab.	1A.3 Students complete *Science Fusion* lessons online.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Science Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Students having difficulty with science concepts due to vocabulary.	2A.1.Teachers will use *Science Boot Camp* series to increase student vocabulary to increase student comprehension of science concepts.	2.A.1 Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRA, CT, coaches, staffing specialist.	2A.1 Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments created by Science Lab Teacher and 5th Grade Team. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill.	2A.1. Mini-Science Benchmarks, Benchmark Assessments, FCAT, *Science Boot Camp* lessons.
Science Goal #2A: Increase the number of students scoring level 4 and 5 on the FCAT Science by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 12% (16) of all students taking the FCAT Science Test at Oakshire Elementary scored a level 4 and 5.	2013Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 15% (13) of all students taking the FCAT Science Test at Oakshire Elementary will score a level 4 and 5.					
			2A.2. Lack of materials for Science Lab	2A.2. Teachers will provide any materials from Science Fusion series and supplies provided by the school.	2A.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRA, coaches, Science lab teacher	2A.2 Science Lab Teacher will have enough supplies for every student to participate in experiments and activities.	2A.2 Students have experiments and activities completed.
			3A.3 Lack of computer activities relating to Science	3A.3.Time will be blocked for Science Lab Teacher to take students to computer lab to use *Science Fusion* lessons.	3A.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRA, coaches	3A.3 Students will be able to access *Science Fusion* lessons on the computers in lab.	3A.3 Students complete *Science Fusion* lessons online.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science Goal #1: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)*

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology 1 Goal #1: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology 1 Goal #2: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Science Professional Development

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6">Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</td></tr>
<tr><td>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</td><td>Grade Level/Subject</td><td>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</td><td>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</td><td>Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</td><td>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

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
Science Boot Camp	Science Supplemental Materials	n/a (Previously Purchased)	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science Fusion	Science Series	n/a (Purchased by County)	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science Lab Materials	Materials needed for Experiments	Title I	$1,000
			Subtotal:
			Total: $1,000.00

End of Science Goals

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

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 4.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. County does not provide a routine assessment of writing.	1A.1. School will provide monthly writing prompts for all grade levels as well as purchase WriteScore writing assessments for 4th Grade.	1A.1 Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Reading Coaches, staffing specialist	1A.1. Writing Tracking meetings will be held monthly based on writing assessments given by school and WriteScore.	1A.1. Monthly Writing assessments, WriteScore and FCAT Writes.
Writing Goal #1A: Increase the number of students scoring Achievement Level 4.0 and higher on the FCAT Writing by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In April 2012, 21% (25) of all students taking the FCAT Writing Test at Oakshire Elementary scored a 4.0 or higher.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In April 2013, 24% (23) of all students taking the FCAT Writing Test at Oakshire Elementary will score a level 4.0 or higher.					
			1A.2. Student difficulties in writing vary among students.	1A.2 Students in 3rd Grade will be given a writing assessment to see what areas they are having difficulty before coming to 4th Grade.	1.A.2 Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers, CRT, and Reading Coaches	1A.2 Writing Tracking meetings will be held monthly based on writing assessments given by school and WriteScore.	1A.2 Monthly Writing assessments, WriteScore and FCAT Writes.
			1A.3. Conventions has been given greater emphasis in writing.	1A.3 Teachers will use the WriteSource series to increase student knowledge of writing conventions.	1A.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers, CRT, and Reading Coaches.	1A.3. Use of conventions will be monitored closely in students' monthly essays.	1A.3. Students' use of conventions will improve monthly.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
New County Rubric	K-5	K-2	Jennifer Duvall, Ilia Adorno, Joseph Guarino	School-wide	September 2012-March 2013	Classroom Walkthrough & Coaching

Principal, Assis

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
Monthly Writing Prompt	Monthly Writing Assessment	n/a (School Created)	$0.00
WriteSource	Writing Textbook Series	n/a (Previously purchased)	$0.00
WriteScore	Writing Assessment Company	Title I	$1,950.00
			Subtotal: $1,950.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $1,950.00

End of Writing Goals

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
<u>Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals</u> *(required in year 2014-2015)*

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

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics Goal #2: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Civics Professional Development

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6">Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</td></tr>
<tr><td>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</td><td>Grade Level/Subject</td><td>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</td><td>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</td><td>Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</td><td>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Civics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

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

U.S. History EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
U.S. History Goal #1: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
U.S. History Goal #2: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
U.S. History Professional Development

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

U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of U.S. History Goals

August 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]).

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Majority of students arriving to school tardy are walking or riding bicycles.	1.1 Teacher and staff will send notices and contact guardians encouraging either other methods of transportation or having students leave earlier to arrive on time.	1.1 Classroom Teacher, Assistant Principal, CRT, Registrar	1.1 Attendance will be monitored monthly to note tardiness of walking or biking students.	1.1. Attendance Records
Attendance Goal #1: Based on the attendance data available Oakshire Elementary will decrease tardiness and excessive absences by at least 3%	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	95% (727)	98% (611)					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	29% (248)	26% (162)					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	10% (83)	7% (44)					
			1.2. Instructional time lost due to student tardiness.	1.2. Conduct meetings with parents to encourage timely arrival to school to increase classroom instruction time.	1.2. Classroom Teacher, Assistant Principal, CRT, Registrar	1.2. Specific students' tardiness rate will be monitored.	1.2. Attendance Records
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Teacher training of new attendance policies and enforcement procedures.	all	School Register	Classroom teachers and support personnel	August 2012 and ongoing	Monthly review of TERMS report on tardiness	Principal and Assistant Principal

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

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)).

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1. Students are new to school and are unaware of school rules.	1.1 Teachers and school staff will post and enforce SHARK Rules throughout the school.	1.1 Principal and Assistant Principal	1.1 Suspension rates will be monitored monthly.	1.1 Discipline Reports
Suspension Goal #1: Through the use of SHARK Rules, suspension rates will decrease by 0.2%.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	0.3% (2)	0.1% (1)					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	0.3% (2)	0.1% (1)					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	1.3% (10)	1.1% (7)					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	1% (8)	0.8 (5)					
			1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
			1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3

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

Suspension Professional Development

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

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
SHARK Rules Posters	Display of School Rules	n/a (Made at school)	$0.00
			Subtotal:
			Total: $0.00

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *N/A* *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* *N/A* 2012 Current Graduation Rate:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* *N/A* 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* *N/A*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: Increase the number of parents that participate and volunteer at Oakshire Elementary School by 10%	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* In School Year 2011-2012, 81% (585) of parents participated in school based activities	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* In School Year 2012-13, 91% (567) of parents will participate in school based activities	1.1 Parent work various hours and are not available during the day	1.1 Continue to provide activities and opportunities (Reading Night, FCAT Night, Mother Son Diner) for parents to participate in school activities with that student that encourage a commitment to the school and their child's educations.	1.1 Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Reading Coach, LEA	1.1 Parent Surveys and Sign-In Sheets will be collected after each event to determine participation.	1.1. Parent Surveys and Sign-In Sheets.
			1.2 Majority of parents speak Spanish.	1.2 Utilize staff members to translate handouts and outgoing messages for parents in Spanish.	1.2 ELL, LEA, and CRT	1.2 Parent Surveys and Sign-In Sheets will be collected after each event to determine participation of Spanish speaking parents.	1.2. Parent Surveys and Sign-In Sheets.
			1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Parent Title 1 and family involvement programs	All	ADDitions Coordinator	Parents	On-going throughout the school year.	Monthly review of ADDitions Hours logged and sign in logs.	Principal, Assistant Principal, ADDitions Coordinator, and CRT
Training on ADDitions requirements/utilization.	All	ADDitions Coordinator	Teachers	October 2012	Ongoing review of ADDtions Log in	Principal, Assistant Principal, ADDitions Coordinator, and CRT.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
<u>Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)</u>

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<u>STEM Goal #1:</u> To increase the use of problem-based learning in more than two subjects/grade levels, providing some learning experiences that have high potential for student engagement.	1.1. Students are not implementing problem based learning on a regular basis.	1.1. Students will be brought weekly to the computer lab to perform problem-based learning across intermediate grade levels using the Science Fusion series.	1.1. Science Lab Teacher	1.1. Students will be evaluated on assessments in the computer lab using the Science Fusion series and will be monitored monthly.	1.1. Science Fusion Series
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
STEM 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
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of STEM Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

CTE 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
n\a			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n\a			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n\a			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n\a			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal Additional Goal #1: Increase the percent of VPK Students who will enter elementary school ready based on Florida Voluntary Prekindergarten Assessment Data (score 70% or above) by 3%.	2012 Current Level :* In April 2012, 83% (13) of VPK students entered elementary school ready based on the Florida VPK Assessment.	2013 Expected Level :* In April 2013, 86% (12) of VPK students will enter elementary school ready based on the Florida VPK Assessment.	1.1. Students come to VPK at various levels of prior knowledge.	1.1. Analyze VPK checklist and Florida VPK Assessments data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement	1.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, VPK Teacher, CRT/LRT, Coaches	1.1. Data Tracking Meetings based on VPK checklist and assessments throughout the year.	1.1. VPK Checklist and Florida VPK Assessment
			1.2. Students are having difficulties with reading comprehension.	1.2. Identify effective strategies for improving reading instruction.	1.2. Assistant Principal, Principal, VPK Teacher, CRT/LRT, Coaches	1.2. Literacy Leadership Meetings to discuss CWTs.	1.2. Classroom Walkthrough (CWT) Forms
			1.3. Parents are not aware of standards required of Pre-Kindergarten students.	1.3. Host a family reading night and parent training sessions to provide parents of VPK grade level students with expectations and strategies for the development of appropriate grade level skills for their child.	1.3. Assistant Principal, Principal, VPK Teacher, CRT/LRT, Coaches	1.3. Provide Parent Survey and analyze results.	1.3. Parent Surveys
Additional Goal(s)			**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Additional Goal Additional Goal #2: Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup by 10% by June 30th, 2016.	2012 Current Level :* In April 2012, the achievement gap between White student from other subgroups was as follows:	2013 Expected Level :* In April 2013, the achievement gap between White student from other subgroups will decrease as	2.1. Student difficulties in reading and math vary among non-White students.	2.1. Analyze FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark, FAIR, i-Ready and Moby Math data to identify specific strands that require strategies for improvement among non-White students. Increase instructional time. Teachers watch videos from iObservation and *Teach Like a Champion* series. Marzano strategies will be deconstructed at monthly meetings. Students will be given opportunities to use	2.1. Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, Coaches	2.1. Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments, fall and winter benchmark, and FAIR results. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. i-Ready and Moby Math progress will be discussed monthly.	2.1. FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark, FAIR Testing, i-Ready, Moby Math and MyOn Capstone.

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

				the i-Ready Reading and Math program.			
Black: 28% Hispanic: 16%	follows: Black: 18% Hispanic: 6%						
		2.2 Student difficulties in reading among Hispanics varies due to level of English acquisition.	2.2 Analyze CELLA data to determine strategies for improving reading instruction within various strands. Students will use Rosetta Stone program to acquire higher level of English proficiency.	2.2 Assistant Principal, Principal, Teachers, CRT/LRT, CT, coaches	2.2 Data Tracking Meetings using bi-weekly mini-benchmark assessments, fall and winter benchmark, and FAIR results. Determine if re-teaching and reassessment is needed of skill. Rosetta Stone progress will be discussed monthly.	2.2 CELLA, FCAT, Benchmark, Mini-Benchmark, FAIR Testing and Rosetta Stone.
		2.3	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Additional Goal(s)		**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Additional Goal		3.1. Majority of students arriving to school tardy are walking or riding bicycles.	3.1 Teacher and staff will send notices and contact guardians encouraging either other methods of transportation or having students leave earlier to arrive on time.	3.1 Classroom Teacher, Assistant Principal, CRT, Registrar	3.1 Attendance will be monitored monthly to note tardiness of walking or biking students.	3.1. Attendance Records.
Additional Goal #3: Maintain high fine arts enrollment percentage.	**2012 Current Level :*** In April 2012, the attendance of our students was 95% (727)					
	2013 Expected Level :* In April 2013, the attendance of our students will be 96% (600)					
		3.2 Based on survey, parents are unaware of Choir and Strings groups at school.	3.2 Notices will be sent home with all 4th and 5th grade level students twice in English and Spanish to sign up for Choir and/or Strings.	3.2. Music and Strings Teacher	3.2 Music and Strings teacher will fill all available placements for Choir and Strings groups.	3.2. Number of students in Choir and Strings groups.
		3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3

Additional Goal(s)		**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Additional Goal		4.1. Students do not have access to research materials (such as internet) at home.	4.1. Media Center will set aside materials for student research. Students will use computers in lab.	4.1. CRT, Computer Lab Monitor	4.1. Students will turn in Career Goal sheet.	4.1. Career Goal Sheet
Additional Goal #4: Increase college and career awareness throughout school.	**2012 Current Level :*** In 2012, the percentage of students who participated in the Career Goals board was 0% (0).					
	2013 Expected Level :* In 2013, the percentage of students who will participate in the Career Goals board will be 20%					

			(125).				

		4.2. Based on student verbal responses, many students are not sure about attending college.	4.2. Different colleges will be displayed in the Front Office and mentioned on the morning news.	4.2. CRT, Morning News Manager	4.2. Students will volunteer to discuss colleges they are interested in attending on the morning news.	4.2. Student broadcasts and board display.
		4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

Additional Goal(s)		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5. Additional Goal		5.1 Black students are not referred for Gifted Testing.	5.1. School psychologist and LEA will communicate characteristics to look for when referring students to Gifted. Administration will not Black students who may qualify for testing.	5.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, School Psychologist and LEA.	5.1. Number of black students identified as Gifted will increase.	5.1. SMS data.
Additional Goal #5: Decrease disproportionate classification in Special Education.	2012 Current Level :* In the 2011-12 school year 1 black student(s) were identified as Gifted.	2013 Expected Level :* In 2012-13 school year 2 black student(s) will be identified as Gifted.				
		5.2.	5.2.	5.2.	5.2.	5.2.
		5.3.	5.3.	5.3.	5.3.	5.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

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: $7,500
CELLA Budget
Total: $0
Mathematics Budget
Total: $7,900
Science Budget
Total: $1,000
Writing Budget
Total: $1,950
Civics Budget
Total: $0
U.S. History Budget
Total: $0
Attendance Budget
Total: $0
Suspension Budget
Total: $0
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total: $0
Parent Involvement Budget
Total: $0
STEM Budget
Total: $0
CTE Budget
Total: $0
Additional Goals
Total: $0
Grand Total: $18,350

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
<u>**Differentiated Accountability**</u>

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance
Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2.When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK,* this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

Are you reward school? ☒Yes   ☐No
(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

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

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

☒ Yes   ☐ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The School Advisory Council of Oakshire Elementary this coming year will once again hold a minimum of eight meetings which follow a prepared agenda each month in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order. The school SAC discusses and votes on all pertinent issues pertaining to school business including SAC Funds, A+ Funds, and reviewing the Budget. The SAC will monthly thoroughly review the SIP to ensure that all objectives and strategies are being addressed, and reviewed if they are not. The SAC helps in the planning and writing of the School Improvement Plan yearly.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
To be determined when funds are distributed for FY12.	