

Florida Department of Education



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Denham Oaks Elementary School	District Name: Pasco
Principal: Mardee Kay Powers	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Co-Chair: Heather Rulison and Jade Wolfe	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

Administrators

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

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Mardee Kay Powers	Elem. Ed. BS Grades 1-6; Educational Leadership K-12	10	15	2011-2012: School Grade A 2010-2011: School Grade A; Did not make AYP 2009-2010: School Grade A; Did not make AYP 2008-2009: School Grade A; Did not make AYP 2006-2007 at Sanders Memorial Elementary: School Grade A; Did not make AYP
Assistant Principal	Wendy Carswell	Certificate; Educational Leadership, MA, Curriculum & Instruction, BA, Elementary Education, (Grades 1-6)	0	10	2011-2012 – A at Connerton Elementary 2010-2011 – A AYP-No 2009-2010 – C AYP-No 2008-2009 – A AYP-No 2007-2008 – C AYP-No 2006-2007 – A AYP-No

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Literacy Coach	Marisa Williams	Elementary Ed K-6; Masters in Ed. Leadership; ESOL endorsed; Reading Certified	10	10	For the last 10 years, Denham Oaks has received a School Grade of A; Met AYP in 2004, 2005, 2007

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

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. We will make every attempt to hire Highly Effective teachers	Administration	On-going
2. On-going, Job-Embedded Staff Development	Administration, Coaches, Lead Teachers	On-going

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
61	1%(1)	42%(26)	32%(19)	26%(16)	26%(16)	100.0%(62)	3%(2)	11%(7)	53%(33)

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
Achievement Leaders and Coaches	As Needed	Anyone needing assistance will be paired with a mentor having experience in their area of need	Weekly Reading Staff Development, Student Progress Meetings, Weekly Grade Level Problem Solving Meetings, as needed

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Principal, Assistant Principal, School Psychologist, Guidance Counselor, Staffing and Compliance Teacher, Literacy Coach, ESE Achievement Leader, ESE Teacher, Speech Language Pathologist, Basic Teachers from all grade levels</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The team's vision is as follows: "We believe the problem solving process can empower teachers to improve the effectiveness of instruction." The Leadership Team meets at least bi-monthly to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide professional development to broaden the knowledge and build capacity of the problem solving process • Assess the school staff's practices and skill development through the use of surveys • Assess the MTSS implementation progress (SAPSI)
<p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the MTSS problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The Professional Learning Map develop by the SBLT in 2011-2012 school year is the driving document for the development of our School Improvement Plan. The School Based Leadership team involvement may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Analysis of relevant demographic/school profile data for the purpose of problem analysis and hypothesis generation. •Identification of critical MTSS infrastructure already established and/or in need of development and provide plan for building capacity. •Analysis of school-wide and grade-level data in order to identify student achievement trends. •Analysis of disaggregated data in order to identify trends and groups in need of intervention. •Development of data review plans, supports, and calendars. •Review of Progress Monitoring data.
MTSS Implementation
<p>Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Classroom teachers will utilize the MTSS Decision Making Rubric in analyzing their data. This rubric will help them to decide when to reflect on their instructional practices and when to develop small group or individual interventions. Tier 1 Data Sources: Core K-12 Math, District created pre/post unit math assessments, Core K-12 Science, FAIR, MMH Unit Reading Assessments, 6 Point Writing Rubric for grades K-5 Tier 2 and Tier 3 Data Sources: teacher developed assessment in addition to Tier 1 data scores based on problem ID need. (ex. Running Record, Quick Phonic Screener, DAR, DRA2, Curriculum Based Measurement, Spelling Inventory)</p>
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. We have a school wide Professional Learning Map which will drive our professional development to support the Multi Tiered Systems of Support in our building. Concepts include building a deep understanding of the curriculum (unpacking standards), planning collaboratively, aligning instructional best practices to the curriculum, and analyzing student outcomes.</p>

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

- Administration
- Literacy Coach
- Media Specialist
- Technology Specialist
- ESE Support Facilitators
- Basic and special education teachers

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The Lead Literacy Team meets at least once monthly. Each meeting will begin with presentation of relevant data. The Lead Literacy Team will investigate the effective use of differentiated instructional practices to increase student engagement and achievement in small group instruction.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

- Increase the knowledge of cognitive demands that are required for students to meet grade level standards through the “lesson study format.” This includes unpacking the standards and text complexity.
- Increase the student evidence of skill and strategy connections between the main lesson and the small group differentiated instruction.
- Monitoring implementation of professional develop and ensuring that teachers utilize I PICK with students self-selecting texts for independent reading, along with daily conferences between teachers and students.

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.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Reading Goal #1A: By June 2013, there will be at least a 15% increase in our students scoring at a level 3 or higher in reading.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 65% (245)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 80% (281)	Teaching practices are not consistently delivered in an explicit or deliberate format that allows for the level of proficiency we desire.	In order to strengthen Tier 1 instruction, teams will agree upon an area of weakness for their grade level. Lesson Study will be used to increase the deliberate and explicit instruction for that area.	Classroom Teacher Literacy Coach	Reading Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	1.1. FAIR MMH Unit Assessments Formal and Informal Teacher Observations
			The level and type of questioning used during daily instruction does not match the level of complexity required for students to meet standards.	During weekly grade level meetings and/or professional development, teachers will continue to deepen their understanding of questioning strategies and summarization opportunities to improve learning.	Classroom Teachers Literacy Coach	Lesson Study Informal Observations of questioning	MMH Unit Assessments FAIR Formal and Informal Teacher Observations
			Teachers need a better understanding of using standards to plan with the end in mind.	Teachers will continue to work collaboratively to increase knowledge of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, Common Core Standards and the Backwards Planning Model.	Instructional Staff, Administration	Monthly Lead Curriculum Teams Weekly professional development meetings Weekly Grade Level Planning Meetings	Attendance at Professional Development Opportunities Lesson Plans
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: Not assessed at this school.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> NA					

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 or 5 in reading.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Reading Goal #2A: By June 2013, there will be at least a 10% increase in our students scoring at a level 4 or 5 in reading.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 23% (91)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 33% (116)	Students are not required to provide high quality complex reading responses.	Increase the teacher knowledge of text complexity. Use a consistent rubric or scale to measure the quality of the student responses.	Classroom Teacher Literacy Coach Administration	Lead Literacy Meeting Student Progress Reviews Use of Scales and rubrics	FAIR MMH Unit Assessments CORE K-12
			2A.2. Students are not provided the opportunity to read self selected books.	2A.2. Increase the amount of structured and monitored independent reading time designated for reading a variety of self selected good fit books.	2A.2. Classroom Teacher	2A.2. Time built into the master schedule	2A.2. Conferencing notes
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B: Not assessed at this school.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> NA					

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.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
Reading Goal #3A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Teachers have the tier 1 data but may lack the knowledge on how to utilize the information as they plan for differentiated instruction.	Each team will use data to identify a Tier 1 focus that the team collaboratively plan for and commits to implementing using the “lesson study format.”	Instructional Teachers Literacy Coach Administration SBLT Team	Weekly grade level meetings, Collaborative Planning	Data board Lesson Plans
By June 2013, there will be a 32% increase in our reading learning gains.	68% (169)	If we believe all students can learn, we would expect to see 100% of our students making learning gains.					
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:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Not assessed at this school	NA	NA					

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
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1 The targeted interventions for this group of students are not matching the needs of their problem ID in order to close gaps.	4A.1 Teachers will continue to work collaboratively to accurately target the problem ID and find appropriate interventions. Progress Monitoring tools will be used to insure the students are closing gaps.	4A.1 Instructional Teams School Based Leadership Team Administration	4A.1 SBIT, TBIT and Student Progress Reviews	4A.1 Progress Monitoring Portfolios
Reading Goal #4A: By June 2013, there will be at least a 39% increase of reading learning gains for our lowest 25%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 61% (38)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> If we believe all students can learn, we would expect to see 100% of our students making learning gains.					
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1	4B.1	4B.1	4B.1	4B.1
Reading Goal #4B: Not assessed at this school	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> NA					

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%. Reading Goal #5A: By June 2017 we will decrease our non-proficient students by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 78% proficient 22% non proficient		81% proficient	84% proficient	87% proficient	90% proficient	90% proficient	90% proficient	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B: By June 2013, there will be at least a 10% increase in our students scoring at a level 3 or higher in reading for our ethnicity subgroups.	2012 Current Level of Performance: <i>Proficiency</i> White: 62% (154) Hispanic: 64% (63)	2013 Expected Level of Performance: <i>Proficiency</i> White: 72% (156) Hispanic: 74% (69)	5B.1. Teaching practices are not consistently delivered in an explicit or deliberate format that allows for the level of proficiency we desire.	5B.1. In order to strengthen Tier 1 instruction, teams will agree upon an area of weakness for their grade level. Lesson Study will be used to increase the deliberate and explicit instruction for that area.	5B.1. Classroom Teacher Literacy Coach	5B.1. Reading Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	5B.1. FAIR MMH Unit Assessments Formal and Informal Teacher Observations		
	NOTE: Last year we had 248 students in White subgroup and 99 students in Hispanic subgroup. At this time, we have 216 students in White and 93 students in Hispanic subgroups.		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	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 reading.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Reading Goal #5C: This is not a sub-group for our school.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> NA					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1 Our SWD have lower language skills both receptively and expressively.	5D.1 Instructional staff will be trained to assist with imbedding language experience opportunities in the core instruction.	5D.1 Speech Language Pathologists Literacy Coach RtI Teacher	5D.1 Reading Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	5D.1 FAIR MMH Unit Assessments
Reading Goal #5D: By June 2013, there will be at least a 10% increase in our students scoring at a level 3 or higher in reading for our SWD subgroup.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Proficiency 28% (17)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Proficiency 38% (20)					
	NOTE: Last year we had 61 students in this subgroup. At this time, we have 52 students who are identified in the SWD subgroup.		5D.2 Teachers need more knowledge about Executive Functioning and how it impacts student progress in reading.	5D.2 All teachers will develop a common understanding of the importance of executive functioning skills.	5D.2 ESE Teachers	5D.2 Job embedded professional development	5D.2 Informal observations Walkthroughs
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.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
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
<p>Students are not spending the time to read self selected books.</p>			<p>Increase the amount of structured and monitored independent reading time designated for reading a variety of self selected good fit books.</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>Time built into the master schedule. (IPICK Reading Time)</p>	<p>Conferencing notes</p>	
Reading Goal #5E:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<p>By June 2013, there will be at least a 10% increase in our students scoring at a level 3 or higher in reading.</p>	<p>Proficiency Gr.3-39%(22) Gr.4-51%(20) Gr.5-48%(25)</p>	<p>10% gain in all grades.</p>					
	<p>NOTE: Last year we had 148 students in this subgroup. At this time, we have 128 students who are identified in the economically disadvantaged subgroup.</p>						
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

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
Review FAIR and CORE K-12 data to determine Tier 1/CORE area of weakness	All Grades and Subject Areas	Literacy Coach	Instructional Staff	Monthly	Progress Reviews, Grade Level Meetings	Literacy Coach, Achievement Leader Team
Using Standards to plan with the end in mind	All Grades and Subject Areas	Literacy Coach	Instructional Staff	Monthly	Grade Level Meetings, Lesson Study Plans	Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team
Executive Functioning Skills	All Grades and Subject Areas	ESE Ach. Leader	Instructional Staff	Quarterly	Informal observations Student Progress Reviews	ESE Teachers, RtI Teacher, Administration

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
Progress monitoring and developing interventions to match the Problem ID	iReady Diagnostic and Intervention Tool	Lottery Dollars, School Fund Raising Dollars, District Textbook Funds	\$3,000.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase the level of text complexity and student motivation	Mimio and iPads	School fund raiser/technology funds/Lottery Dollars	\$30,000.00
			Subtotal: \$30,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide Time to Collaborate	Substitute Teachers and/or Stipend	Lottery Dollars, Best Practice Funds	Teacher hourly Rate of Pay or Substitute Daily Rate of Pay
			Subtotal: \$6,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase teacher knowledge and build common language of formative assessment and standards-based instruction	Marzano's <u>Formative Assessment & Standards-Based Instruction: Pathways to the Common Core</u>	School Advisory Council Textbook funds Principal Funds	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
			Total: \$40,000.00

End of Reading Goals

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.		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #1:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:	These students may lack background knowledge in content areas and vocabulary.	Teachers will utilize graphic organizers and other best practices to assist students in making personal connections and increasing vocabulary knowledge and usage.	Classroom Teacher	Student Progress Reviews	CELLA
We will increase the percent of students proficient in Listening/Speaking by 10% in 2013	49% (18)					
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.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #2:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:	These students may lack background knowledge in content areas and vocabulary	Teachers will utilize graphic organizers and other best practices to assist students in making personal connections and increasing vocabulary knowledge and usage.	Classroom Teacher	Student Progress Reviews	CELLA
We will increase the percent of students proficient in reading by 10% in 2013	34% (12)					

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.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #3: We will increase the percent of students proficient in writing by 10% in 2013	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :	These students may lack background knowledge in content areas and vocabulary	Teachers will utilize graphic organizers and other best practices to assist students in making personal connections and increasing vocabulary knowledge and usage.	Classroom Teacher	Student Progress Reviews	CELLA
	26% (9).					

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
			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
			None at this time
			Subtotal:
			None at this time 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. Finding a balance between pacing instruction and prioritizing standards so students will be more proficient.	1A.1. Teachers will build a common language around the eight mathematical practices and begin to consistently plan for two of the targeted practices.	1A.1. Classroom Teachers Lead Math Committee	1A.1. Grade Level Meetings Monthly Professional Development	1A.1. Lesson Plans Core K12
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
By June 2013, there will be at least a 21% increase in our students scoring at a level 3 or higher in mathematics.	59% (230)	80% (280)					
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Not assessed at this school.	NA	NA					

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 responses or work do not represent the same level of depth/complexity required of the Common Core Standards or Next Generation SSS.	2A.1. Teachers will analyze the standards and create an instructional plan that matches the complexity and problem solving required in the student work.	2A.1. Classroom Teachers	2A.1. Grade Level Meetings Collaborative Planning Opportunities	2A.1. Student Work Samples Lesson Plans Core K12
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u> By June 2013, there will be at least a 13% increase in our students scoring at a level 4 or 5 in FCAT Mathematics.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 27% (105)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 40% (140)					
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.		2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u> Not assessed at this school.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> NA					

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. Teachers are waiting until summative assessments to identify students who are not meeting the standards taught.	3A.1. Teachers will learn how to use formative assessments in math to identify problem areas in order to inform instruction and/or differentiation on a daily basis.	3A.1. Classroom Teachers	3A.1. Student Progress Monitoring Meetings Grade Level Meetings	3A.1. Unit Assessments Core K12
Mathematics Goal #3A: By June 2013, there will be a 24% increase in our mathematics learning gains.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 76% (189)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> If we believe all students can learn, we would expect to see 100% of our students making learning gains.					
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: Not assessed at this school.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> NA					

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
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Students who are struggling in reading have a more difficult time with math due to their lack of connections between using reading strategies when solving math word problems.	4A.1. Teachers will incorporate a consistent connection of reading strategies for visualization, context clues and vocabulary so students will begin to be able to verbalize and implement these skills during Math.	4A.1. Classroom Teachers Lead Math Team	4A.1. Informal and formal observations Monthly Lead Math Team Meetings	4A.1. Core K12 Math Walk Through Data Student Work Samples
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #4A: By June 2013, there will be at least a 40% increase of mathematics learning gains for our lowest 25%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 60% (38)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> If we believe all students can learn, we would expect to see 100% of our students making learning gains.					
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #4B: <i>Not Assessed at this School.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> NA					

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 66% Proficient 34% Non-Proficient <u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> By June 2017 we will decrease our non-proficient students by 50%.			70% Proficient	74% Proficient	78% Proficient	82% Proficient	83% Proficient	83 % Proficient	
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. <u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> By June 2013, we will increase the proficient students in ethnicity subgroups by at least 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Proficiency White: 59% (146) Hispanic: 60% (59)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Proficiency White: 69% (149) Hispanic: 70% (65)	5B.1. It is difficult to find a balance between pacing instruction and prioritizing standards so students will be more proficient.	5B.1. Teachers will use the Planning with the End in Mind model to create an instructional plan that interweaves and connects the curriculum with student needs.	5B.1. Classroom Teachers Lead Math Committee	5B.1. Teacher Walk Throughs Monthly Lead Math Meetings	5B.1. Lesson Plans Core K12 Math		
	NOTE: Last year we had 248 students in White subgroup and 99 students in Hispanic subgroup. At this time, we have 216 students in White and 93 students in Hispanic subgroups.		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	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.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>This is not a subgroup in our school.</i>	NA	NA					
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. Students with disabilities struggle with the language rich word problems in math.	5D.1. Teachers will learn how to incorporate more learning opportunities that focus on conceptual understanding utilizing best practices in vocabulary building.	5D.1. Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers	5D.1. Student Progress Reviews Writing in the Math Curriculum	5D.1. Student Pre and Post Tests
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By June 2013, we will increase the proficient students in our SWD subgroup by at least 10%.</i>	<i>Proficiency 21% (13)</i>	<i>Proficiency 31% (16)</i>					
	NOTE: Last year we had 61 students in this subgroup. At this time, we have 52 students who are identified in the SWD subgroup.		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

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. Teachers are waiting until summative assessments to identify students who are not meeting the standards taught.	5E.1. Teachers will learn how to use formative assessments in math to identify problem areas in order to inform instruction and/or differentiation on a daily basis.	5E.1. Classroom Teachers	5E.1. Student Progress Monitoring Meetings Grade Level Meetings	5E.1. Unit Assessments Core K12
Mathematics Goal #5E: <i>By June 2013, we will increase the proficient students in our Economically Disadvantaged subgroup by at least 10%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Proficiency 45% (67)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Proficiency 55% (70)					
	NOTE: Last year we had 148 students in this subgroup. At this time, we have 128 students who are identified in the economically disadvantaged subgroup.		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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
Use of Formative Assessments in Math	K-5	Administration, Math Achievement Leader	School-wide	Monthly Grade Level Meetings	Student Progress Reviews	Administration
The eight Mathematical Practices	K-5	Administration	School-wide	Quarterly	Walk Throughs	Lead Math Committee

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

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
Increasing Complexity and Problem Based Learning	Mimios and iPads	School Fundraising	\$20,000.00
			Subtotal: \$20,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$20,000.00

End of Mathematics Goals

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
IA. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			IA.1.	IA.1.	IA.1.	IA.1.	IA.1.
Science Goal #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Students lack the foundational knowledge for vocabulary and may not be exposed to as much non-fiction reading material	Teachers will utilize the Fusion series to integrate using text features and vocabulary building strategies while addressing the standards in science.	Lead Science Team Instructional Staff	Monthly Lead Science Meetings Professional Development opportunities	CORE K-12 Science Teacher observations Classroom science assessments
By June of 2013, there will be at least an 11% increase of students proficient on the Science FCAT for students scoring at a proficient level.	59% (76)	70% (84)					
IB. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.
Science Goal #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
No assessed at this school.	NA	NA					

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.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Science Goal #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Teacher questioning techniques or learning opportunities do not challenge the students to respond to higher level text complexity when using non-fiction text.	Teachers will work collaboratively to plan for inquiry based learning opportunities in science.	Lead Science Team Instructional Staff	Monthly Lead Science Meetings Professional Development opportunities Collaborative planning opportunities	CORE K-12 Science Teacher observations Classroom science assessments
By June of 2013, there will be at least an 8% increase of students proficient on the Science FCAT for our students scoring levels 4 and 5.	17% (22)	25% (30)					
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:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
No assessed at this school.	NA	NA					

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or 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
Technology within the Fusion series.	K-5	Lead Science Team	Teachers learn the value and begin to use the technology within the Fusion series.	9/2012 – 5/2013	PD sign in sheets Informal walkthroughs Student Progress Reveiws	Achievement Coaches Lead Science Team

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			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
Conduct experiments to learn the Scientific Process	Consumable Experiment/lab supplies	District	\$250.00
			Subtotal: \$250.00
			Total: \$250.00

End of Science Goals

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Writing Goal #1A: By June of 2013, there will be at least an 7% increase of students proficient on the FCAT writing assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Teachers and students are not familiar with the Language Arts Standards in grammar, spelling(encoding) and writing.	Teachers will deepen their understanding of what students need to know, understand and do in order to improve their instruction.	Instructional Teachers Literacy Coach Administration	Weekly Professional Development Grade Level Meetings	Evidence of Student work Sign-in sheets for Professional Development
	78% (99)	85% (107)					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			We lack consistency in levels of expectations for evidence in student writing.	In grades K-5 teachers will use the common rubric for assessing writing. Collaborative planning will include discussions of student evidence and consistency in scoring.	Instructional Teachers Literacy Coach Administration	Weekly Professional Development Grade Level Meetings	Evidence of Student Work
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Writing Goal #1B: No assessed at this school.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	NA					

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
“Lesson Study Format” Writing PD for Kindergarten Teachers	Kindergarten	Literacy Coach	Kindergarten Teachers	Monthly	Grade Level Meetings	Literacy Coach Administration
Increasing the consistency and use of the writing rubric	K-5	eraciteracAdmini Administration	K-5	Monthly	Grade Level Meetings	Literacy Coach Administration

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
			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
			None At this time. Subtotal:
			None At this time. Total:

End of Writing Goals

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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Attendance Goal #1: By June 2013 Denham Oaks Elementary, will implement school wide attendance procedures using the MTSS model.	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u> ADA 95% (731)	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u> ADA 97%	It seems to be the same families or students with the attendance and tardies. Students miss instructional time when not in class.	School Social Worker will meet with Data Entry Clerk to identify students with excessive absences (4 or more in a quarter) or excessive tardies/early dismissal (2 or more weekly in a quarter.) A letter will be sent home quarterly reminding parents of the relationship of attendance and academic success.	Data Entry Clerk Administration	Absence and tardy rate will be tracked with our TERMS and RAPTOR systems	TERMS eSembler RAPTOR
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u> 20% (154)	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u> Less than 15% (<115)					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u> 7% (54)	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u> Less than 5% (<38)					

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
NA						

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
NA			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA			
			Subtotal:
			Total: NA

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

End of Attendance Goals

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	There is a disconnect between school language and parent understanding to be able to truly impact student achievement.	Evening Events will be scheduled during a variety of times throughout the year. The first Thursday evening of each month will be an informative parent night.	Administration Select Instructional Staff School Advisory Council	Sign-in sheets to determine attendance.	Parent satisfactory survey
By June of 2013 90% of our parents will have a positive response on feedback surveys from the parent information nights or district satisfaction survey.	On District Survey 79% agree 19% neutral	On District Survey 90% agree					

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 Nights	K-5	Literacy Coach, Select Classroom Teachers, Administration Guidance Counselor	School-wide	9/2012 – 5/2013	Sign-in-sheets and survey results	Administration Literacy Coach Guidance Counselor

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
The first Thursday evening of each month will be an informative parent night.	Instructional staff	Lottery dollars, PTA funds, other internal accounts	Hourly rates (varies)
			Subtotal: \$6,000.00
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: \$6,000.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
STEM Goal #1: <i>By June 2013, 100% of our teachers will increase their knowledge of STEM goals at the elementary level.</i>	1.1. Teachers are not aware of the expectations of the STEM program for the elementary level.	1.1. Professional development time will be dedicated to increasing our knowledge and common vocabulary involving STEM.	1.1 Administration	1.1. Weekly PD Grade Level Meetings	1.1. Survey of teacher knowledge at the beginning and end of the year.

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
Integrated with other Math, Science and Technology PD	K-5	Admin	Instructional Staff	At Least Each Semester		Administration

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
			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: None at this Time

End of STEM Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total:40,000.00

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

CELLA Budget	Total: N/A
Mathematics Budget	Total: \$20,000.00
Science Budget	Total: \$400.00
Writing Budget	Total: N/A
Civics Budget	Total: N/A
U.S. History Budget	Total: NA
Attendance Budget	Total: N/A
Suspension Budget	Total: NA
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total: NA
Parent Involvement Budget	Total: \$6,000.00
STEM Budget	Total: N/A
CTE Budget	Total: NA
Additional Goals	Total: N/A
	Grand Total: \$66,400.00

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

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 meets at least 8 times a year. This group helps to monitor the progress of our School Improvement Plan goals, discusses school wide areas of need in regards to student achievement, informs the parents/community of District and/or State mandates and assists the Staff in deciding how to spend funds from School Recognition and School Lottery dollars.

--

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.

To support after school tutoring or clubs for identified students

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
To support after school tutoring or clubs for identified students	

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