

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



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

Proposed for 2012-2013

## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

### PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

#### School Information

School Name: <b>Sand Lake Elementary</b>	District Name: <b>Orange</b>
Principal: <b>Mary Hool</b>	Superintendent: <b>Dr. Barbara Jenkins</b>
SAC Chair: <b>Sandy Waters</b>	Date of School Board Approval: <b>January 29, 2013</b>

#### 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	Mary Hool	B.A. Education Master of Science/ Early childhood Elementary Education School Principal	6	15	2010-2011 School Grade –A; 92% Proficiency in Reading; 90% Proficiency in Math; 78% Learning Gains in Reading; 70% Learning Gains in Math; 74% Lowest 25% Gains in Reading; 76% Lowest 25% Gains in Math; AYP met for all subgroups except Black in Reading and Math and Hispanics in Math 2011-2012 School Grade – A; 76% Proficiency in Reading; 76% Proficiency in Math; 77% Learning Gains in Reading; 80% Learning Gains in Math; 50% Lowest 25% Gains in Reading; 59% Lowest 25% Gains in Math; AMO Reading Target Met with Asian and Black students in Ready; AMO Reading Target Not Met with All Students, White, Hispanic, English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged Students. AMO Math Target Met with Asian and Hispanic Students; AMO Math Target Not Met with All Students, Black, White, English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged Students.
Assistant Principal	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

### 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)
Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT)	Jennifer Rejim	B.A. Education •Elem Ed K-6 •ESOL •Exceptional Student Elem/Secondary	6	3	2010-2011 School Grade –A; 92% Proficiency in Reading; 90% Proficiency in Math; 78% Learning Gains in Reading; 70% Learning Gains in Math; 74% Lowest 25% Gains in Reading; 76% Lowest 25% Gains in Math; AYP met for all subgroups except Black in Reading and Math and Hispanics in Math 2011-2012 School Grade – A; 76% Proficiency in Reading; 76% Proficiency in Math; 77% Learning Gains in Reading; 80% Learning Gains in Math; 53% Lowest 25% Gains in Reading; 62% Lowest 25% Gains in Math; AMO Reading Target Met with Asian and Black students in Ready; AMO Reading Target Not Met with All Students, White, Hispanic, English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged Students. AMO Math Target Met with Asian and Hispanic Students; AMO Math Target Not Met with All Students, Black, White, English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged Students.
Resource Teacher	Wendy Harmon	B. Music Education M. Music Education S. Educational Leadership	4	0	No prior performance

### Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Only highly qualified applicants will receive interviews	Principal	September 2012
2. New Teacher Mentoring Program	CRT	June 2013
3. Professional Learning Communities	Leadership Team	June 2013
4. Weekly CAIR Meetings (Curriculum, Assessment, Instruction, Response to Intervention)	Administrative Team	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
2 (Jennifer Logan / Karen Smith)	Out of Field – ESOL ESOL Classes

***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
36	0%	28% (10)	30% (11)	42% (15)	42% (15)	100% (36)	19% (7)	8% (3)	86% (31)

**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
Deborah DiPrato	Jason Fetherolf	Highly effective teacher familiar with grade level standards and curriculum.	New teacher meetings Weekly mentor/mentee meetings Ongoing training with curriculum and behavior management Assistance with Beginning Teacher Portfolio
Jennifer Rejim	Joanne Nelson	ACP Program teacher needed a highly effective teacher with a multitude of teacher experiences in a variety of programs.	Monthly mentoring meetings Ongoing training with curriculum, Marzano Assistance with components of ACP program.

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

### Additional Requirements

#### ***Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only***

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

Title I, Part A N/A
Title I, Part C- Migrant N/A
Title I, Part D N/A
Title II N/A
Title III N/A
Title X- Homeless N/A
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) N/A
Violence Prevention Programs N/A
Nutrition Programs N/A
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start N/A
Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
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
<p><b>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.</b> The school based RtI Leadership Team consists of the following staff members: Mary Hool, Principal; Tashia Youmans, Guidance Counselor, Staffing Coordinator, CCT; Wendy Harmon, Resource Teacher; Mary Bartlett, Administrative Dean; Jennifer Rejim, Curriculum Resource Teacher; Heather Wilson, Exceptional Education Teacher; and Donna Seigel, School Psychologist.</p>
<p><b>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?</b> The school based RtI Leadership Team meets with the classroom teacher, focusing on data, pacing of instruction, prior and current interventions that address the needs of their students. The RtI team helps to determine students who are in need of assistance academically, socially and behaviorally. Decisions are data based and the team determines the interventions. In addition, members of the RtI Team meet with grade level teachers and address the specific academic and/or behavioral concerns of students. Struggling students are identified and interventions are put into place. The team also works to identify appropriate professional development and resources for teachers.</p>
<p><b>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?</b> The RtI Leadership team is very instrumental in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. The team provides intervention data and research for areas of deficit. The RtI Leadership team works to ensure the relevance of the SIP for school-wide intervention needs.</p>
MTSS Implementation
<p><b>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.</b> The Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN) is used to summarize tiered data as well as the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). The Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) is administered three times per year. Additionally, teachers administer grade level assessments, Edusoft Benchmark Testing (both administered two times per year) and in grades 3-5 the Florida Comprehensive Assessment</p>
<p><b>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.</b> The school psychologist, Donna Siegel, provided staff members with an initial RtI staff development in the spring of 2009 on how to identify students that may need support. Mary Ann Coleman, RtI District Support Team Member, conducted two comprehensive trainings during the 2010 – 2011 school year. Wendy Harmon, school based RtI staff leader, will provide an additional training during the first quarter of the school year.</p>
<p><b>Describe the plan to support MTSS.</b> RtI leader, Wendy Harmon, will be holding monthly meetings with the grade level to monitor student progress and teacher concerns. Various staff members will be involved in providing multi-tiered support to tier 2 and tier 3 students.</p>

### *Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)*



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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
<p><b>Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Literacy Leadership Team consists of the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Mary Hool, Principal</li><li>o Jennifer Rejim, CRT</li><li>o Alyssa Shaw, Kindergarten Teacher</li><li>o Lori Iiames, 1st Grade Teacher</li><li>o Kathy Pollock, 2nd Grade Teacher</li><li>o Debbie DiPrato, 3rd Grade Teacher</li><li>o Brooke Freiburger, 4th Grade Teacher</li><li>o Jeri Conner, 5th Grade Teacher</li></ul></li></ul>
<p><b>Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).</b></p> <p>The school based Literacy Leadership Team is a collaborative team composed of one teacher from each grade level. The LLT collaborates with the district Reading Leadership Team to support the reading goals and objectives in the School Improvement Plan. The LLT members assist with progress monitoring, interventions/enrichment and ensure consistency in instructional focus.</p>
<p><b>What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Monitor the Accelerated Reader Program and increase student participation.</li><li>• Promote reading through the Sunshine State Books.</li><li>• Promote and model strategies for reading success.</li><li>• Monitor student progress on state and school assessments</li><li>• Analyze student performance data and assist in adjusting instruction</li><li>• Provide professional development for new teachers on using data effectively</li><li>• Provide professional development on the Houghton-Mifflin Reading Program for new teachers</li></ul>

### *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.*

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

***\*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.

N/A

***\*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?

N/A

***\*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?

N/A

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?

N/A

***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](#).

N/A

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	
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	
<p><b>Reading Goal #1A:</b></p> <p><i>Sand Lake Elementary will be using a number of strategies to meet and exceed baseline expectations by the year 2013. For reading, we will be utilizing our 90-minutes, uninterrupted, reading block to teach and reinforce reading strategies. Differentiated instruction will be used to deliver focused, explicit, and systematic instruction with an emphasis on rigor and relevance. Professional development will focus on common assessments and Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework.</i></p>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	The disparity between our highest level readers and lowest level readers requires a great deal of differentiated instruction in the classroom.	Implement intervention/enrichment block utilizing all available special area teachers.  Meet weekly with administrative team members to discuss/plan instructional strategies based on data, RtI, curriculum, and Marzano's Instructional Strategies.	Principal CRT Reading Resource Teacher Classroom teachers	Monitor lesson plans/reading instruction Monitor Progress Monitoring folders for lower performing students Principal observations	SuccessMaker reports FAIR District Benchmark Reading Assessments Classroom Assessments STAR Reading Assessment FCAT Reading level 3+	
	2012 FCAT results showed that 21% (54) taking the FCAT Reading test scored at Level 3.	By 2013 24% of all students taking the FCAT Reading test will score at a Level 3		An increase of lower performing, higher need ESE students require that classroom teachers learn and apply additional strategies to meet their specific needs.	--Professional development with a variety of ESE strategies (Thinking Maps, BrainSmart) --Implement schedule for Varying Exceptionalities teachers that provides students with additional reading instruction through the content areas.	Principal CRT Reading Resource Teacher VE teacher Classroom teachers	Monitor lesson plans/reading instruction Monitor Progress Monitoring folders for lower performing students Principal observations	SuccessMaker reports FAIR District Benchmark Reading Assessments Classroom Assessments STAR Reading Assessment IEP Review meetings
				1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
			K-2 Progress monitoring is implemented inconsistently.	Work with school-based RtI coordinator and grade level teams to implement more effective progress monitoring strategies to identify and provide remediation to students who demonstrate reading deficiencies.	RtI Coordinator Principal	Analyze results of FAIR assessments as well as common assessments as a part of Progress Monitoring in grades K-2.	FAIR Common Assessments	

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

<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b>			1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A
<u>Reading Goal #1B:</u> <i>At this time, Sand Lake Elementary does not have any students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment in reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> N/A	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> N/A					
			1B.2 N/A.	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A
			1B.3 N/A.	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b>			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
<b>Reading Goal #2A:</b>  <i>Sand Lake Elementary will be using a number of strategies to meet and exceed baseline expectations by the year 2013. For reading, we will be utilizing our 90-minutes, uninterrupted, reading block to teach and reinforce reading strategies. Differentiated instruction will be used to deliver focused, explicit, and systematic instruction with an emphasis on rigor and relevance. Professional development will focus on common assessments and Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*  2012 FCAT results showed that 55% (145) taking the FCAT Reading test scored at Level 4	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*  By 2013 60% of all students taking the FCAT Reading test will score at a Level 4 or 5.	Wide range of reading abilities within even the higher level readers.	Utilize Renaissance Accelerated Reader for students to set goals with teachers per quarter.  Continued professional development on higher order thinking in the classroom.	Principal CRT Reading Specialist Classroom teachers	Ongoing observations AR Reports	Weekly AR reports
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<b>Reading Goal #2B:</b>  <i>At this time, Sand Lake Elementary does not have any students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment in reading.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*  N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*  N/A	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
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			3A.1. Lack of alignment of common assessment data to interventional programs	3A.1. Implement use of Florida Ready in conjunction with other intervention programs to ensure that students have proficiency with all FCAT 2.0 content standards	3A.1. Principal CRT Reading Specialist Classroom teachers	3A.1. Progress Monitoring	3A.1. Florida Ready common assessments Progress monitoring student data
<b>Reading Goal #3A:</b>  <i>Sand Lake Elementary will be using a number of strategies to meet and exceed baseline expectations by the year 2013. For reading, we will be utilizing our 90-minutes, uninterrupted, reading block to teach and reinforce reading strategies. Differentiated instruction will be used to deliver focused, explicit, and systematic instruction with an emphasis on rigor and relevance. Professional development will focus on common assessments and Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <b>2012 FCAT results showed that 77% (201 ) taking the FCAT Reading test made learning gains.</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <b>80% of all students taking the FCAT Reading test will make learning gains.</b>	3A.2. Inconsistent use of computer interventional programs	3A.2. Continue use of SuccessMaker for all students with monitoring of student performance and use.	3A.2. Principal CRT Reading Specialist	3A.2. Monthly SuccessMaker reports to monitor student growth and program use	3A.2. SuccessMaker Student Performance Report
			3A.3. Lack of time for sufficient instruction and purposeful practice of benchmark skills	3A.3. Continue reinforcement of reading benchmarks in content areas of social studies and science	3A.3. Principal CRT Reading Specialist	3A.3. Student growth on District Benchmark assessments and grade level common assessments.  Monitoring of lesson plans	3A.3. District Reading Benchmark Assessments Common Assessments Theme Skills Test
			3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A
<b>Reading Goal #3B:</b>  <i>At this time, Sand Lake Elementary does not have any students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment in reading.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <b>N/A</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <b>N/A</b>	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A

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

		3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A
--	--	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>			4A.1. Many of these students do not read for pleasure.	4A.1. Implement Accelerated Star incentive board  Incorporate daily DEAR time in the classroom	4A.1. Classroom teachers Principal CRT Reading Specialist Media Specialist	4A.1. Track the number of students in our bottom 25% making progress on the AR Star board  Classroom observations	4A.1. AR Star board
<p><b>Reading Goal #4:</b></p> <p><i>Sand Lake Elementary will be using a number of strategies to meet and exceed baseline expectations by the year 2013. For reading, we will be utilizing our 90-minutes, uninterrupted, reading block to teach and reinforce reading strategies. Differentiated instruction will be used to deliver focused, explicit, and systematic instruction with an emphasis on rigor and relevance. Professional development will focus on common assessments and Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework.</i></p>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	2012 data indicates that 53% (34) of students in the bottom 25% made learning gains as indicated by the 2011 Reading FCAT 2.0.	By Spring 2013 58% of all students in the Bottom 25% will make learning gains on the Reading FCAT 2.0.					
			4A.2. Students in grades 3-5 continue to struggle with their fluency and speed when reading	4A.2. Utilize weekly timed reading passages for students to self-monitor their growth as well as the teacher monitoring.	4A.2. CRT Reading Specialist Classroom Teachers	4A.2. Analysis of weekly timed reading passages data	4A.2. Ongoing Progress Monitoring Students tracking individual progress
		4A.3. Student needs are not always accurately determined and addressed	4A.3. RTI team will carefully assess student needs and determine effective strategies for intervention  Meet monthly to monitor student progress and analyze student Progress Monitoring data in order to adapt intervention as needed.	4A.3. RTI Team Principal CRT Reading Specialist Classroom Teachers	4A.3. Review data with RtI team and during monthly data meetings to monitor the success of the interventions	4A.3. FAIR Common assessments Reading Benchmark Testing Ongoing Progress Monitoring	



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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>  <b>All Students: 82%</b> <b>Asian: 86%</b> <b>Black: 50%</b> <b>Hispanic: 73%</b> <b>White: 93%</b> <b>ELL: 73%</b> <b>ESE: 57%</b> <b>FRL: 61%</b>		All Students: 84% Asian: 87% Black: 54% Hispanic: 75% White: 94% ELL: 75% ESE: 61% FRL: 64%	All Students: 85% Asian: 88% Black: 58% Hispanic: 78% White: 94% ELL: 78% ESE: 64% FRL: 68%	All Students: 87% Asian: 90% Black: 63% Hispanic: 80% White: 95% ELL: 80% ESE: 68% FRL: 71%	All Students: 88% Asian: 91% Black: 67% Hispanic: 82% White: 95% ELL: 82% ESE: 71% FRL: 74%	All Students: 90% Asian: 92% Black: 71% Hispanic: 84% White: 96% ELL: 84% ESE: 75% FRL: 77%	All Students: 91% Asian: 93% Black: 75% Hispanic: 87% White: 97% ELL: 87% ESE: 79% FRL: 81%
	<b>Reading Goal #5A:</b>  <i>Sand Lake Elementary will be using a number of strategies to meet and exceed baseline expectations by the year 2013. For reading, we will be utilizing our 90-minutes, uninterrupted, reading block to teach and reinforce reading strategies. Differentiated instruction will be used to deliver focused, explicit, and systematic instruction with an emphasis on rigor and relevance. Professional development will focus on common assessments and Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	<b>Reading Goal #5B:</b>		5B.1.  <u>Black:</u> Many students in this subgroup lack sufficient parental support at home with homework and nightly reading.	5B.1.  Develop and implement a support program that involves teachers from grades K-2 and administrative positions to work with students in these subgroups in the area of reading and with general homework support.	5B.1.  Principal	5B.1.  Student survey Teacher survey Evaluate student data	5B.1.  Surveys EDUSOFT FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring	
	<i>Sand Lake Elementary will be using a number of strategies to meet and exceed baseline expectations by the year 2013. For reading, we will be utilizing our 90-minutes, uninterrupted, reading block to teach and reinforce reading strategies.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance: * 2012 data indicates that 56.5% of Black students and 60% of Hispanic students made learning gains as indicated by the	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * By 2013 60% of our Black students and 63% of our Hispanic students will demonstrate learning gains as indicated by the 2012					

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

<p><i>Differentiated instruction will be used to deliver focused, explicit, and systematic instruction with an emphasis on rigor and relevance. Professional development will focus on common assessments and Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework.</i></p>	2011 Reading FCAT 2.0.	Reading FCAT 2.0.					
			<p>5B.2. Hispanic students are also in need of vocabulary development in English as many of them speak Spanish at home.</p>	<p>5B.2. Train in the use of thinking maps and other graphic organizers in order to develop better understanding of words introduced in reading materials and content areas.</p>	<p>5B.2. Thinking Maps Trainer at School CRT Reading Specialist</p>	<p>5B.2. Review student performance data on classroom assessments and district benchmark assessments to measure success of implementation of Thinking Maps</p>	<p>5B.2. Classroom assessments District Reading Benchmark Assessments</p>
			<p>5B.3. Lack of exposure to non-fiction text with this group gives these students a weak level of background knowledge necessary for inferencing and making connections when reading.</p>	<p>5B.3. Utilize social studies and science materials for reading instruction in order to maximize exposure to a variety of topics.  Use Think.Central login for students to access science readers.</p>	<p>5B.3. Principal CRT Reading Specialist</p>	<p>5B.3. Monitor lesson plans Monitor implementation at monthly curriculum meetings.</p>	<p>5B.3. Common benchmark assessments District Reading Benchmark Assessments</p>

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<b>Reading Goal #5C:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>	Language/cultural barriers make it difficult for students to achieve necessary learning gains	Address specific strategies for ELL learners in bi-weekly curriculum and instruction team meetings.	Principal Reading Specialist Classroom Teachers CRT	Analyze progress monitoring data, including FAIR and benchmark assessments. Monitor progress through RTI meetings.	Progress Monitoring Data FAIR District Reading Benchmark Assessments FLKRS
<i>Sand Lake Elementary will be using a number of strategies to meet and exceed baseline expectations by the year 2013. For reading, we will be utilizing our 90-minutes, uninterrupted, reading block to teach and reinforce reading strategies.</i>	<i>2012 data indicates that 53% (47) of all ELL students made learning gains as indicated by the 2011 Reading FCAT 2.0.</i>	<i>By 2013, 56% of all ELL students will make learning gains as indicated by the 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0.</i>					
<i>Differentiated instruction will be used to deliver focused, explicit, and systematic instruction with an emphasis on rigor and relevance. Professional development will focus on common assessments and Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework.</i>							
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			Determining the specific needs of individual students in this subgroup.	Implement RtI at all grade levels to ensure that the needs of all ELL students are being addressed	Principal RtI Coordinator Classroom Teachers CRT	RtI team data review Monthly RtI meetings with RtI Coordinator to monitor the success of the interventions	Progress Monitoring Data FAIR District Reading Benchmark Assessments
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
<b>Reading Goal #5D:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>	Significant disabilities impede development of phonics skills necessary for reading grade level text.	In addition to the instruction given by VE teacher, special area teachers will provide tutoring in multimodal phonics instruction to remediate deficits.	Principal Reading Specialist	Progress monitoring by VE teacher. Evaluate feedback by classroom teachers as to classroom performance.	FAIR Annual IEP assessment results Edusoft Benchmark Assessments FLKRS
<i>Sand Lake Elementary will be using a number of strategies to meet and exceed baseline expectations by the year 2013. For reading, we will be utilizing our 90-minutes, uninterrupted, reading block to teach and reinforce reading strategies.</i>	<i>2012 data indicates that 17% (3) of all ESE students made learning gains as indicated by the 2011 Reading FCAT 2.0.</i>	<i>By 2013, 25% of all ESE students will make learning gains as indicated by the 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0.</i>					

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

<i>reading strategies. Differentiated instruction will be used to deliver focused, explicit, and systematic instruction with an emphasis on rigor and relevance. Professional development will focus on common assessments and Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework</i>		5D.2. Students do not have sufficient skills for reading and understanding non-fiction text material.	5D.2. VE teacher will use science and social studies content material to address deficit reading skills.	5D.2. Principal	5D.2. Progress monitoring by VE teacher. Evaluate feedback by classroom teachers as to classroom performance.	5D.2. District Reading Benchmark tests Annual IEP assessment results
		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
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5E.1. Many students in this subgroup lack sufficient parental support at home with homework and nightly reading.	5E.1. Develop and implement a support program that involves teachers from grades K-2 and administrative positions to work with students in these subgroups in the area of reading and with general homework support. Teachers will work with students multiple times weekly.	5E.1. Principal	5E.1. Conduct surveys to monitor student and teacher impressions of effectiveness  Analyze progress monitoring assessments	5E.1. Student survey Teacher survey FAIR District Reading Benchmark Assessments FLKRS
<b>Reading Goal #5E:</b>  <i>Sand Lake Elementary will be using a number of strategies to meet and exceed baseline expectations by the year 2013. For reading, we will be utilizing our 90-minutes, uninterrupted, reading block to teach and reinforce reading strategies. Differentiated instruction will be used to deliver focused, explicit, and systematic instruction with an emphasis on rigor and relevance. Professional development will focus on common assessments and Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>2012 data indicates that 66% (55) of all ESE students made learning gains as indicated by the 2011 Reading FCAT 2.0.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>By 2013, 69% of all Economically Disadvantaged students will make learning gains as indicated by the 2012 Reading FCAT 2.0.</i>	5E.2. Students have limited exposure to reading outside of school.	5E.2. Promote reading through Sunshine State Reader motivational program.  Promote reading through Accelerated Reader star board.	5E.2. Principal CRT Media specialist	5E.2. Monitor reading motivational programs.  Review data in monthly data meetings to identify effective strategies.	5E.2. FAIR reports Ongoing Progress Monitoring District Reading Benchmark Assessments
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

## Reading Professional Development

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b>						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Marzano's Instructional Design Questions	Higher Level Thinking/ Background Knowledge	Principal, CRT, Reading Specialist	School-wide	Monthly throughout school year	Classroom Observations	Principal
Developing Standards Based Lessons	NGSSS Reading & Common Core	Principal, CRT, Reading Specialist	School-wide	Monthly throughout school year	Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans, Student Performance on Benchmark Assessments	Principal

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

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

Thinking Maps	Using Thinking Maps in Reading	School-Based Trainer	School-wide	October 2012, December 2012	Classroom Observations	Principal
---------------	--------------------------------	----------------------	-------------	-----------------------------	------------------------	-----------

**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
Florida Ready	Supplemental Reading Materials	School Budget	\$2,000.00
Florida Studies Weekly	Supplemental Reading Materials	School Budget	\$1,400.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$3,400.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reading A-Z	Online subscription for supplemental leveled reading materials	School Budget	\$500.00
Mimio	Interactive instructional tool	PTA Budget	\$15,000.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$15,500.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*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
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>  <b>CELLA Goal #1:</b>  <i>Sand Lake Elementary will be using a number of strategies to meet and exceed baseline expectations by the year 2013. For English Language Learners, we will be utilizing our 90-minutes, uninterrupted, reading block to teach and reinforce reading strategies including opportunities for listening and speaking. Differentiated instruction will be used to deliver focused, explicit, and systematic instruction with an emphasis on rigor and relevance utilizing ELL strategies. Professional development will focus on common assessments and Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework.</i>	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	<i>2012 data indicates that 60%(59) of all ELL students taking the CELLA test were proficient in Listening and Speaking.</i>	There is insufficient time for practice in speaking in English.	Teachers will model proper listening and speaking and allow opportunities for student practice and peer interactions.	Classroom Teachers ELL Paraprofessionals CRT	Evaluation of student level of performance based on teacher assessments and observations.	Teacher checklists Common assessments CELLA
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		Many LY1 & LY2 students do not have someone at home to assist in acquisition of spoken English.	Teachers and ELL paraprofessionals will use visual cues to assist students in understanding spoken English.	Classroom Teachers ELL Paraprofessionals CRT	Evaluation of student level of performance based on teacher assessments and observations	CELLA
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.



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

Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<b>CELLA Goal #2:</b>	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</b>	Development of academic language takes 5-7 years which impedes progress in reading as well.	Classroom teachers implement use of ELL strategies and word lists to develop vocabulary	Classroom teachers ELL Paraprofessionals CRT	Analyze data from FAIR, Edusoft Benchmark tests, and common assessments to develop additional lists of necessary vocabulary and monitor the progress towards these goals.	CELLA
<i>Sand Lake Elementary will be using a number of strategies to meet and exceed baseline expectations by the year 2013. For English Language Learners in the area of reading, we will be utilizing our 90-minutes, uninterrupted, reading block to teach and reinforce reading strategies. Differentiated instruction will be used to deliver focused, explicit, and systematic instruction with an emphasis on rigor and relevance. Professional development will focus on common assessments and Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework.</i>	2012 data indicates that 43% (42) of all ELL students taking the CELLA test were proficient in the area of Reading.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		Students do not spend ample time reading appropriate leveled books.	Implement DEAR time in the classrooms in order to increase independent reading time.	Classroom Teachers Media Specialist	Monitor student Accelerated Reader points	CELLA
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>		2.1. Parents also struggle with written English and cannot provide additional support at home with grammar, spelling and writing rules.	2.1. Classroom teachers and ELL paraprofessionals work with small groups of students to provide additional support with writing.	2.1. Classroom Teachers ELL Paraprofessionals CRT	2.1. Monitor student progress with monthly writing assessments.	2.1. CELLA
<b>CELLA Goal #3:</b>  <i>Sand Lake Elementary will be using a number of strategies to meet and exceed baseline expectations by the year 2013. For writing, we will be utilizing ELL strategies to teach and reinforce writing skills. Differentiated instruction will be used to deliver focused, explicit, and systematic instruction with an emphasis on rigor and relevance. Professional development will focus on common assessments and Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework.</i>	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</b>  2012 data indicates that 49% (50) of all ELL students taking the CELLA test were proficient in the area of Writing.	2.2. Lack of vocabulary to apply to writing that effectively communicates an idea.	2.2. Classroom teachers implement use of ELL strategies and word lists to develop vocabulary and provide a print rich environment to help ELL students with writing.	2.2. Classroom Teachers ELL Paraprofessionals CRT	2.2. Monitor student progress with monthly writing assessments.	2.2. CELLA
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

**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
Morning tutoring program	Student materials for Sidewalks	School Budget	\$300.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$300.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Rosetta Stone	Online English language instructional program	District ESOL Department	\$0
			<b>Subtotal: \$0</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			<b>Subtotal: N/A</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			<b>Subtotal: N/A</b>
			<b>Total: \$300.00</b>

*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]).

<b>Elementary Mathematics Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Increasing the number of students demonstrating proficiency in mathematics.	Provide training for teachers in the Common Core and OCPS Math Order of Instruction to support the NGSSS in the classroom.	Principal	Classroom observations Monitoring lesson plans Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment team meetings	District Benchmark Math Assessments Benchmark Mini-Assessments
<i>Sand Lake Elementary will teach the NGSSS in mathematics to all kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade students. The key focus in mathematics instruction will be to increase learner engagement through hands on learning opportunities. Ongoing formal and informal assessments of student achievement will be conducted in all grades. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with emphasis on the use of benchmark testing.</i>	<i>In June 2012, 19% (50) of students at Sand Lake Elementary taking the FCAT Math 2.0 scored at a Level 3.</i>	<i>By June 2013, 22% of all students at Sand Lake Elementary taking the FCAT Math 2.0 will score a Level 3.</i>					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			Gaps in learning still exist in intermediate grades due to changes in state standards.	Identify gaps at each grade level and provide curricular material and professional development in order to bridge the learning gaps.	Principal CRT Classroom teachers	Unit assessments Monitoring lesson plans Classroom observations District assessments	Edusoft EnVision Unit & District Benchmarks Assessments FOCUS Assessments
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
			Lack of scheduled time to analyze data	Schedule weekly data, curriculum, and instruction meetings for the sole purpose of analyzing student data and developing instructional	Principal	Meeting agendas	Edusoft EnVision Unit & District Benchmarks Assessments FOCUS Assessments
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>			1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>At this time, Sand Lake Elementary does not have</i>	N/A	N/A					

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

any students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment in math.		1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A
		1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>  <b>Mathematics Goal #2A:</b>  <i>Sand Lake Elementary will teach the NGSSS in mathematics to all kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade students. The key focus in mathematics instruction will be to increase learner engagement through hands on learning opportunities. Ongoing formal and informal assessments of student achievement will be conducted in all grades. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with emphasis on the use of benchmark testing.</i>			2A.1.  Inconsistent use of differentiated instruction and program enrichment	2A.1.  Provide training for teachers in the effective use of enrichment component of EnVision math	2A.1.  Principal CRT Classroom teachers	2A.1.  Classroom observations Monitoring lesson plans	2A.1.  Edusoft EnVision Unit & District Benchmarks Assessments FOCUS Assessments
			2A.2.  Supplemental materials and activities do not meet the needs of high performing students.	2A.2.  Research and secure materials used to enrich student instruction and increase student achievement related to the NGSSS.  Develop system for recording and checking out resource room materials to better track enrichment materials.	2A.2.  Principal CRT Team Leaders	2A.2.  Evaluate FCAT and Benchmark assessment data  Monitor resource room materials	2A.2.  Math FCAT 2.0 District Math Benchmark Assessments Resource room inventory
			2A.3.  Not all of our highest learners are fully prepared for an accelerated or advanced placement in middle school.	2A.3.  Establish differentiated math classes for 5 <sup>th</sup> grade students in order to prepare them for expectations of accelerated math and to maintain high achievement levels on Math FCAT 2.0.  Collaborate with middle school counselors to monitor former SLE student placement and performance in accelerated math programs in middle school.	2A.3.  Principal CRT 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math Teachers	2A.3.  Classroom observations  Evaluate middle school math placement data	2A.3.  EnVision Step-Up to 6 <sup>th</sup> grade assesment
			2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A

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

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

Mathematics Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<p><i>At this time, Sand Lake Elementary does not have any students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment in mathematics.</i></p>	N/A	N/A					
		2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	
		2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #3A:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>	Inconsistent implementation of rigor and relevance within and across grade levels.	Promote grade level discussions in curriculum, instruction, and assessments through weekly meetings with principal or CRT.	Principal CRT	Monitor lesson plans Weekly team meeting agendas in CIA	Edusoft EnVision Unit & District Benchmarks Assessments FOCUS Assessments
<i>Sand Lake Elementary will teach the NGSSS in mathematics to all kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade students. The key focus in mathematics instruction will be to increase learner engagement through hands on learning opportunities. Ongoing formal and informal assessments of student achievement will be conducted in all grades. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with emphasis on the use of benchmark testing.</i>	<i>In June 2012, 81% (211) of students at Sand Lake Elementary taking the FCAT Math 2.0 made learning gains</i>	<i>By June 2013, 84% of all students at Sand Lake Elementary taking the FCAT Math 2.0 will make learning gains.</i>					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			Students who are at a level 3 or higher do not make sufficient gains to maintain their high level of achievement.	Establish weekly team meetings to evaluate data, discuss curriculum and instruction, and to develop grade level plans to challenge proficient learners to continue to make progress.  Monitor individual level of understanding of benchmarks to ensure mastery at prior year FCAT level.	Principal CRT Grade Level Teams	Monitor student performance on school and district assessments.  Monitor lesson plans	Edusoft EnVision Unit & District Benchmarks Assessments FOCUS Assessments.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
			Lack of automaticity with math facts	Research and utilize online resources to reinforce math facts that are effective and motivational for students	Principal Classroom teachers Media Specialist	Analyze progress monitoring data and district assessments	Edusoft EnVision Unit & District Benchmarks Assessments FOCUS Assessments
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #3B:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A



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

<i>At this time, Sand Lake Elementary does not have any students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment in mathematics.</i>	N/A	N/A					
		3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	
		3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			4A.1. Finding time to provide adequate support to the lowest 25% not making learning gains.	4A.1. Secure a certified math teacher to provide tutoring in 4 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> grades in small groups to address gaps in student learning that inhibit their making learning gains.	4A.1. Principal CRT	4A.1. Administer and analyze benchmark assessments.	4A.1. Edusoft EnVision Unit & District Benchmarks Assessments FOCUS Assessments.
<b>Mathematics Goal #4:</b>  <i>Sand Lake Elementary will teach the NGSSS in mathematics to all kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade students. The key focus in mathematics instruction will be to increase learner engagement through hands on learning opportunities. Ongoing formal and informal assessments of student achievement will be conducted in all grades. OCPs district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with emphasis on the use of benchmark testing.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>In June 2012, 62% (40 )of students at Sand Lake Elementary in the lowest 25% taking the FCAT Math 2.0 made learning gains</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>By June 2013, 65% of all students at Sand Lake Elementary in the lowest 25% taking the FCAT Math 2.0 will make learning gains.</i>	4A.2. Lack of automaticity with math facts	4A.2. Research and utilize online resources to reinforce math facts that are effective and motivational for students	4A.2. Principal Classroom teachers Media Specialist	4A.2. Analyze progress monitoring data and district assessments	4A.2. Edusoft EnVision Unit & District Benchmarks Assessments FOCUS Assessments
			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											
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>																	
	<b>All Students: 81%</b> <b>Asian: 93%</b> <b>Black: 56%</b> <b>Hispanic: 59%</b> <b>White: 91%</b> <b>ELL: 64%</b> <b>ESE: 71%</b> <b>FRL: 57%</b>	All Students: 76% Asian: 94% Black: 60% Hispanic: 62% White: 92% ELL: 67% ESE: 73% FRL: 61%	All Students: 84% Asian: 95% Black: 63% Hispanic: 66% White: 93% ELL: 70% ESE: 76% FRL: 64%	All Students: 86% Asian: 95% Black: 67% Hispanic: 69% White: 93% ELL: 73% ESE: 78% FRL: 68%	All Students: 87% Asian: 95% Black: 71% Hispanic: 73% White: 94% ELL: 76% ESE: 81% FRL: 71%	All Students: 89% Asian: 96% Black: 74% Hispanic: 76% White: 95% ELL: 79% ESE: 83% FRL: 75%	All Students: 91% Asian: 97% Black: 78% Hispanic: 80% White: 96% ELL: 82% ESE: 86% FRL: 79%											
<b>Mathematics Goal #5A:</b>																		
<p><i>Sand Lake Elementary will teach the NGSSS in mathematics to all kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade students. The key focus in mathematics instruction will be to increase learner engagement through hands on learning opportunities. Ongoing formal and informal assessments of student achievement will be conducted in all grades. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with emphasis on the use of benchmark testing.</i></p>																		
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool											
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.											
<p><b>Mathematics Goal #5B:</b></p> <p><i>Sand Lake Elementary will teach the NGSSS in mathematics to all kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade students. The key focus in mathematics instruction will be to increase learner engagement through hands</i></p>		Student lack of prior knowledge is not clearly identified and addressed.	Collect and analyze data from Edusoft, EnVision beginning of the year assessments, and unit assessments.  Provide professional development in data analysis and designing instructional activities to meet the needs of different subgroups.	Principal CRT	Assess data and notes from data meetings	FCAT 2.0 math data Edusoft math data												
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>In June 2012, White: 86% (128)</td> <td>By June 2013, White: 89%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black: 51% (45)</td> <td>Black: 54%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic: 62% (39)</td> <td>Hispanic: 65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian: 92% (37)</td> <td>Asian: 95%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>American</td> <td>Will make learning gains as indicated by the Mathematics FCAT 2.0.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	In June 2012, White: 86% (128)	By June 2013, White: 89%	Black: 51% (45)	Black: 54%	Hispanic: 62% (39)	Hispanic: 65%	Asian: 92% (37)	Asian: 95%	American	Will make learning gains as indicated by the Mathematics FCAT 2.0.					
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*																	
In June 2012, White: 86% (128)	By June 2013, White: 89%																	
Black: 51% (45)	Black: 54%																	
Hispanic: 62% (39)	Hispanic: 65%																	
Asian: 92% (37)	Asian: 95%																	
American	Will make learning gains as indicated by the Mathematics FCAT 2.0.																	

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

<p><i>on learning opportunities. Ongoing formal and informal assessments of student achievement will be conducted in all grades. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with emphasis on the use of benchmark testing.</i></p>	<p>Indian: NA Made learning gains as indicated by the Mathematics FCAT 2.0.</p>					
		<p>5B.2. Students lack support at home with more complex topics in math.</p>	<p>5B.2. Improve teacher/parent communication as it pertains to online textbook and benchmark resources that will facilitate working with their children at home.</p>	<p>5B.2. Principal CRT</p>	<p>5B.2. Create and distribute parent survey about effectiveness of online mathematics resources.</p>	<p>5B.2. Parent survey</p>
		<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5C.1. Weak mastery of grade level mathematics vocabulary.	5C.1. Teachers employ use of ELL strategies in the instruction of mathematics vocabulary.	5C.1. Principal CRT	5C.1. Analyze Benchmark assessments and EnVision Topic assessments during team data meetings.	5C.1. Benchmark assessments EnVision Topic assessments
<b>Mathematics Goal #5C:</b>  <i>Sand Lake Elementary will teach the NGSSS in mathematics to all kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade students. The key focus in mathematics instruction will be to increase learner engagement through hands on learning opportunities. Ongoing formal and informal assessments of student achievement will be conducted in all grades. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with emphasis on the use of benchmark testing.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>In June 2012, 65% (39) of ELL students at Sand Lake Elementary taking the FCAT Math 2.0 made learning gains.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>In June 2013, 68% of ELL students at Sand Lake Elementary taking the FCAT Math 2.0 will make learning gains</i>	5C.2. Language barriers preclude parents from assisting students with homework.	5C.2. Train students in use of EnVision math at home textbook resources including animated learning lessons.	5C.2. Classroom teachers Principal	5C.2. Teachers monitor student use of online resources at home.	5C.2. Benchmark assessments EnVision Topic assessments
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5D.1. Weak mastery of grade level mathematics vocabulary.	5D.1. Teachers employ use of ESE strategies in the instruction of mathematics vocabulary including thinking maps and other visual representations.	5D.1. Principal CRT	5D.1. Analyze Benchmark assessments and EnVision Topic assessments during team data meetings.	5D.1. Benchmark assessments EnVision Topic assessments
<b>Mathematics Goal #5D:</b>  <i>Sand Lake Elementary will teach the NGSSS in mathematics to all kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade students. The key focus in mathematics instruction will be to</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>In June 2012, 22% (4) of ESE students at Sand Lake Elementary taking the FCAT Math</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>In June 2013, 25% of ESE students at Sand Lake Elementary taking the FCAT Math</i>					

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

<i>increase learner engagement through hands on learning opportunities. Ongoing formal and informal assessments of student achievement will be conducted in all grades. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with emphasis on the use of benchmark testing.</i>	<i>2.0 made learning gains.</i>	<i>2.0 will make learning gains.</i>									
		5D.2.	Lack of mastery of basic facts.	5D.2.	Research and utilize engaging online math activities and programs for building mastery of facts.	5D.2.	Classroom teachers Principal	5D.2.	Analyze Benchmark assessments and EnVision Topic assessments during team data meetings.	5D.2.	Benchmark assessments EnVision Topic assessments
		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
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5E.1. Additional time needed to process and master newly introduced skills.	5E.1. Provide in-school tutoring by a certified teacher.	5E.1. Principal CRT	5E.1. Pretest/Posttest of individual standards	5E.1. Benchmark assessments EnVision Topic assessments
<b>Mathematics Goal</b> #5E:	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
<i>Sand Lake Elementary will teach the NGSSS in mathematics to all kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade students. The key focus in mathematics instruction will be to increase learner engagement through hands on learning opportunities. Ongoing formal and informal assessments of student achievement will be conducted in all grades. OCPS district assessment tools will be used for measuring, monitoring and forecasting student progress with emphasis on the use of benchmark testing.</i>	<i>In June 2012, 56% (60) of economically disadvantaged students at Sand Lake Elementary taking the FCAT Math 2.0 made learning gains.</i>	<i>In June 2013, 59% of ESE students at Sand Lake Elementary taking the FCAT Math 2.0 will make learning gains</i>					
			5E.2. Lack of mastery of basic facts.	5E.2. Research and utilize engaging online math activities and programs for building mastery of facts.	5E.2. Classroom teachers Principal	5E.2. Analyze Benchmark assessments and EnVision Topic assessments during team data meetings.	5E.2. Benchmark assessments EnVision Topic assessments
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

**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]).

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> 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	
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	5B.1. N/A	5B.1. N/A	5B.1. N/A	5B.1. N/A	5B.1. N/A	
		<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>						
			5B.2. N/A	5B.2. N/A	5B.2. N/A	5B.2. N/A	5B.2. N/A	
			5B.3. N/A	5B.3. N/A	5B.3. N/A	5B.3. N/A	5B.3. N/A	

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

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

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

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

*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]).

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #3:  N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			3.2. N/A	3.2. N/A	3.2. N/A	3.2. N/A	3.2. N/A
			3.3. N/A	3.3. N/A	3.3. N/A	3.3. N/A	3.3. N/A

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals*



**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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.</b>			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Algebra 1 Goal #1:  N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A
			1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. 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 group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.</b>			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Algebra Goal #2:  N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A
			2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	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	
<b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>	Algebra 1 Goal #3B:		3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	
	N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		N/A	N/A					
				3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A
		3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	

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

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

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

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

*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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.</b>			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Geometry Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A
			1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. 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 group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.</b>			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Geometry Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A
			2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A

**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
<b>3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2011-2012</b>		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	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
<b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>	Geometry Goal #3B:		3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A
	N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
		N/A	N/A				
				3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A
		3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	

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

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

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

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

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

**Mathematics Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b>						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Enrichment work in the Mathematics Classroom	K-5	CRT	School-wide	Ongoing	Classroom observations	Principal



**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
Florida Ready	Supplemental FCAT math Resource	School Budget	\$1,200.00
In-school math tutor	EnVision Diagnosis and Intervention System	School Budget	\$2,000.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$3,200.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Strategies for Challenging High Performing Math students	Using resources from the resource room and the Internet effectively	N/A	0
Transitioning to the Common Core	Black Belt Trainers training teammates	N/A	0
Utilizing the EnVision Enrichment Component	EnVision Enrichment component	N/A	0
			<b>Subtotal: \$0</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Higher level thinking math resources/ remedial math resources	Resource Room Materials	School Budget	\$2,000.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$2,000.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$5,200.00</b>

*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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b>			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
<b>Science Goal #1A:</b> In order for Sand lake to maintain high performance in science, we will continue to implement ample opportunities for inquiry science providing growth in analyzing and critical thinking thought processes. A focus on hands-on experimental activities coupled with vocabulary based instruction will lead to further gains in the science area.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> <i>In June 2012 29% (23) of all students at Sand Lake taking the Science FCAT scored at level 3</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> <i>By June 2013 32% if students at Sand Lake taking the Science FCAT will score at level 3.</i>	Teachers do not feel comfortable with their existing knowledge of science to enthusiastically teach it.	Train teachers to use the new Science Fusion series, OCPS Order of Instruction, and the CIA blueprints.	Principal CRT Science Fusion On-Site Trainer	Analyze Science Fusion end of the year benchmark test data.	End of the year Science Fusion Assessment
			1A.2. Students lack exposure and background knowledge to science concepts prior to in class learning	1A.2. Provide common planning time for grades K-4 to develop plans that incorporate an increased amount of non-fiction science books and articles into their reading instruction to provide students with adequate background knowledge.	Principal CRT Science Fusion On-Site Trainer	Analyze Science Fusion end of the year benchmark test data.	End of the year Science Fusion Assessment
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<b>Science Goal #1B:</b> At this time, Sand Lake does not have any students taking the Florida Alternative Assessment.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> N/A	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A

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

		1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A
--	--	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b>			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
<b>Science Goal #2A:</b> In order for Sand lake to maintain high performance in science, we will continue to implement ample opportunities for inquiry science providing growth in analyzing and critical thinking thought processes. A focus on hands-on experimental activities coupled with vocabulary based instruction will lead to further gains in the science area.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>In June 2012 41% (32) of all students at Sand Lake taking the Science FCAT scored at level 4 or 5.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>By June 2013 44% if students at Sand Lake taking the Science FCAT will score at level 4 or 5.</i>	High achieving students in grades 1-4 are not exposed to complex scientific thinking and concepts.	Provide gifted services through the gifted resource teacher in the science content area, aligned to the NGSSS Science benchmarks	Gifted Resource Teacher Principal	Ongoing formative observations Teacher observation Parental feedback Student feedback	Parent survey Student survey Science Notebook
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<b>Science Goal #2B:</b> At this time, Sand Lake Elementary does not have any students taking the Florida Alternative Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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

*End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals*

**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
<b>1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Science Goal #1:  N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A
			1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. 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 group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Science Goal #2:  N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A
			2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals*

**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]).

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

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

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

*End of Biology 1 EOC Goals*

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

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Think Central Use	K-5	Science Lead	School-wide	On-going	Classroom observations	Principal

**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	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
N/A				
Technology				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
N/A				
Professional Development				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
N/A				
Other				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
N/A				
N/A				

*End of Science Goals*

**August 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	
<b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	
<b>Writing Goal #1A:</b> Sand Lake Elementary utilizes a school wide writing plan for all students in Kindergarten through 5 <sup>th</sup> grade based on the OCPS curriculum. Writing instruction begins in Kindergarten and includes the use of Thinking maps. At third grade and beyond, teachers implement strategies from a variety of writing programs. Student writing includes authentic, purposeful writing format, using specific strategies of effective writing elements. An analysis of differentiated instruction and disparities among writing performance in targeted groups is on-going.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> <i>2012 data indicates that 95% (76) of all students at Sand Lake taking the FCAT Writes were at a level 3.0 or higher</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> <i>By June 2012, 100% of all students taking the FCAT Writes will score at a level 3.5 or higher.</i>	Continuing to provide instruction in classrooms of teachers new to 4 <sup>th</sup> grade that will maintain the high level of students meeting proficiency in writing.	Provide training within the team in the writing program developed by SLE's 4 <sup>th</sup> grade team.	Principal CRT	Review quarterly writing prompt scores and data.	Quarterly school-wide writing prompt	
				1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
				1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
			Students do not effectively use prewriting strategies to plan their essay.	Continue building capacity of Thinking Maps classroom implementation.	Principal CRT	Teacher records and observation	Quarterly writing prompt Teacher observation	
			Students entering 4 <sup>th</sup> grade do not have the endurance necessary nor the prior knowledge to write lengthier essays.	Implement use of school-wide scored writing prompts and build a program to initiate more conversations amongst students about writing in grades K-3.  Secure resources and distribute writing binders to teachers in grades K-3 to ensure more purposeful, direct writing instruction in primary grades.	Principal CRT Writing Lead Teacher	Evaluation of evidence in the hallways indicating that purposeful writing is occurring in the primary grades.	Quarterly writing prompt	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b>			1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	

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

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

Writing Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
At this time, Sand Lake Elementary does not have any students taking the Florida Alternative Assessment.	N/A	N/A					
			1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A
			1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A

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

**Writing Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Thinking Maps	K-5	Thinking Maps onsite trainer	School-wide	On-going	Classroom observations	Principal
PDA Writing	4	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Team Leader	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade new team members	On-going	Classroom observations Monthly writing prompts	Principal

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Write Source	Grammar/Writing Resource Book and e-resources	School budget	\$6,000.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$6,000.00</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$6,000.00</b>

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

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

**Total: \$6,000.00**

*End of Writing Goals*

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

**Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(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
			<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.</b>			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Civics Goal #1:  N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A
			1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. 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 group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
			<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.</b>			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Civics Goal #2:  N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A
			2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A

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

**Civics Professional Development**

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

**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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
N/A			

*End of Civics Goals*

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

**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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.</b>			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
U.S. History Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2.
		1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.</b>			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
U.S. History Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2.
		2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3.	

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

**U.S. History Professional Development**

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

**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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
N/A			

*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]).

<b>Attendance Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</b>				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Attendance</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Attendance Goal #1:</b>			Excessive absences; excessive tardiness	Social worker available to assist parents in getting child/children to school in a timely manner.  Perfect Attendance Awards.	Guidance Counselor Registrar Administrative Dean	Monitor attendance records	Attendance records
<i>Sand Lake Elementary's attendance record remained the same for the 2011-2012 school year. We project an increase in attendance for the 2012-2013 school year.</i>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
	<i>The attendance rate for the 2011-2012 school year was 96%</i>	<i>The expected attendance rate for the 2012-2013 School year is 97.5%</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	<i>In the 2011-2012 School year there were 119(24%) students with excessive absences.</i>	<i>In the 2012-2013 school year, no more than 43 (10%) students are expected to have excessive absences.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	<i>In the 2011-2012 School Year, there were 2 (&lt;1%) students with excessive tardiness.</i>	<i>In the 2012-2013 school year, zero students will have excessive tardiness.</i>					

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

		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**

**Attendance Professional Development**

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

**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	N/A	N/A	N/A	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
				<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
				<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
				<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
				<b>Subtotal:</b>
				<b>Total:</b>

*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
<b>1. Suspension</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Suspension Goal #1:</b>  <i>Sand Lake Elementary had an increase in the number of students serving in-school suspensions. This number will be reduced by 10% this year.</i>	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions	Inconsistent use of classroom management techniques to alleviate more persistent or severe behaviors within the classroom.	Provide teachers with adequate training in classroom management techniques to reduce more severe behaviors.  Continue and refine the RtI process to include a behavioral component.	School-based RtI Coach Guidance Counselor	Review and analyze RtI team meeting notes and data	Review SMSS and EDW suspension data.
	3	1					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	3	1					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	24	20					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
19	15						
			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**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Classroom management techniques	K-5	Academic Dean	School-wide	On-going	RtI Leadership Team Meetings	Principal/ Guidance Counselor

**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	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
N/A			

*End of Suspension Goals*

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

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

**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)).

<b>Dropout Prevention Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention</b>				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Dropout Prevention</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</b>  <i>As an elementary school, Sand Lake Elementary does not have a drop-out rate. However, we will identify students at risk for dropping out of school based on attendance and retention data.</i>	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	N/A	N/A					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A
			1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A

**Dropout Prevention Professional Development**

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

**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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
N/A			

*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
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</b>  <i>Sand Lake will increase parent membership in the PTA. Sand Lake is a family-friendly school that encourages parents to be active participants in their child's education. PTA serves as a link between parents and the school by offering family fun activities both on and off campus. In addition, Sand Lake's PTA has implemented programs to provide assistance to families in need.</i>	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*	Lack of parent knowledge of the PTA and its various events.	Increase Parent Communications- • Connect Orange messages • Quarterly PTA Newsletters • Classroom Newsletters • Marquee • Event Flyers • Student Planners	Principal CRT Classroom Teachers PTA President	Review of the results of parent survey	Parent Survey
	<i>During the 2011-2012 school year, 28% (112) of families joined the PTA)</i>						
	<i>In the 2012-2013 School Year 35% of families will join the PTA.</i>						
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			Lack of understanding of the function of the PTA and how becoming a member benefits the children at Sand Lake.	Include results of PTA activities and impacts on student learning in newsletters to inform parents the importance of PTA membership.	Principal PTA President	Review results of parent survey.	Parent Survey
			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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

**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	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
N/A			

*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				
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
<p><b>STEM Goal #1:</b></p> <p><i>At Sand Lake Elementary, students an increasingly higher number of students each year have been demonstrating proficiency on the FCAT Science. 2011-2012 data indicates that 70% (55) of students in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade taking the FCAT Science were proficient. In order to continue to improve additional STEM activities are needed at all grade levels.</i></p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Lack of knowledge of STEM by teachers</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Provide professional development on STEM and its use within the classroom.</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Gifted Resource Teacher Principal CRT</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Analyze FCAT 2.0 Science results in June 2013 and district benchmark Science assessments.</p> <p>Conduct teacher survey related to the use of STEM in the classroom.</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Teacher survey Science FCAT 2.0 District Science Benchmark assessments</p>
	<p>1.2.</p> <p>Students lack exposure to the understanding of the engineering and design process.</p>	<p>1.2.</p> <p>Model engineering and design process for students and provide ample opportunities for them to practice with guidance.</p> <p>Group 5<sup>th</sup> grade gifted students in one science class for instruction in order to increase rigor of instruction in STEM.</p> <p>Provide 1-5 Gifted Services through science.</p>	<p>1.2.</p> <p>Principal Gifted teachers CRT</p>	<p>1.2.</p> <p>Analyze FCAT 2.0 Science results in June 2013 and district benchmark Science assessments.</p> <p>Conduct student survey related to the use of STEM in the classroom</p>	<p>1.2.</p> <p>Student survey Science FCAT 2.0 District Science Benchmark assessments</p>
	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>

**STEM Professional Development**

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
STEM Activities	K-5	Gifted Resource Teacher	School-wide	On-going	Conduct teacher survey related to the use of STEM in the classroom	CRT

**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	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
N/A			

*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				
	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:					
CTE Goal #1:  N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A
	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A

**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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	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	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
N/A			

*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
<b>1. Additional Goal</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Additional Goal #1:</b>  Sand Lake Elementary will Decrease the Achievement Gap for Each Identified Subgroup by 10% by June 30, 2016	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*	Lack of support at home.	In-school tutoring.  K-3 teachers participate in providing mentorship to students in need in grades 4-5 in order to better address their needs and close the achievement gap.	Principal	Team meetings with administration to discuss and analyze:  FAIR Edusoft Benchmark Assessments FCAT 2.0 Results	FAIR Edusoft Benchmark Assessments FCAT 2.0 Results Common Assessments
	<i>In June 2012, achievement gaps for identified subgroups (Reading/Math) were:</i> ELL 26%/24% FRL 33%/35% Black 29%/31% Hispanic 22%/24%	By June 2012, Sand Lake Elementary will decrease its achievement gaps by 3%.					
			1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**Additional Goals Professional Development**

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

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

**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	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A			
N/A			

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

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

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$23,400.00</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$300.00</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$5,200.00</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$6,000.00</b>
<b>Civics Budget</b>	<b>Total: N/A</b>
<b>U.S. History Budget</b>	<b>Total: N/A</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total: N/A</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0</b>
<b>CTE Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$0</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total:</b>
	<b>Grand Total: \$ 34,900.00</b>

**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 type="checkbox"/> Prevent

Are you reward school?  Yes       No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

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

**School Advisory Council (SAC)**

*SAC Membership Compliance*

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

Yes       No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Acquiring Substitutes for Staff Development/ planning	\$2,000.00
Additional Instructional Resources to effectively implement the School Improvement Plan	\$500.00