

Florida Department of Education



DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Hudson Elementary	District Name: Pasco
Principal: Linda McCarthy	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair:	Date of School Board Approval: October 16, 2012

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:

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

List your school's highly effective administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Linda McCarthy	BA Elem Masters in Science and Education 18 credit hours in Supervision/Administration FL Certification in Elem (K-6), Educational Leadership	12	16	2011-2012 School Grade: D 2010-2011 School Grade: D (Earned 468 points/C but dropped a letter grade due to the lowest 25% not making learning gains in reading due to the increase not reaching the 50% requirement. AYP: No 90% 2009-2010 School Grade: C 470 points AYP: No 79% 2008-2009 School Grade: C 492 points AYP: No 90%
Assistant Principal	Sharon Sacco	BA Psychology BA in Elem Masters in VE Masters in Educational Leadership FL Certification in Elem (1-6), VE (K-12), Educational Leadership ESOL Endorsed	4	4	2011-2012 School Grade: D 2010-2011 School Grade: D (Earned 468 points/C but dropped a letter grade due to the lowest 25% not making learning gains in reading due to the increase not reaching the 50% requirement. AYP: No 90% 2009-2010 School Grade: C 470 points AYP: No 79% 2008-2009 School Grade: C 492 points AYP: No 90%

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

Instructional Coaches

List your school's highly effective 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 AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Literacy Coach	Theresa Laurino	Elem K-6, Reading Endorsement, K-12 MS K-12 Reading	3	3	HES 2011-2012 school Grade: D HES 2010-2011 School Grade: D (Earned 468 points/C but dropped a letter grade due to the lowest 25% not making learning gains in reading due to the increase not reaching the 5% requirement. AYP: No 90% HES 2009-2010 School Grade: C 470 points AYP: No 79% HES 2008-2009 School Grade: C 492 points AYP: No 90%
Science Coach	Alondra Beatty-Woodall	Elementary K-6 Ed Leadership	0	0	N/A

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

Math Resource Teacher	Kerrie Cuffe	Elementary K-6 Ed Leadership	4	4	<p>2011-2012 School Grade: D</p> <p>HES 2010-2011 School Grade: D (Earned 468 points/C but dropped a letter grade due to the lowest 25% not making learning gains in reading due to the increase not reaching the 5% requirement. AYP: No 90%</p> <p>HES 2009-2010 School Grade: C 470 points AYP: No 79%</p> <p>HES 2008-2009 School Grade: C 492 points AYP: No 90%</p>
-----------------------	--------------	------------------------------	---	---	---

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Recruit: Applicants go through an extensive screening process to ensure that they are the most highly qualified teacher for the position	Administration District	08/12
2. Retain: Continue providing support to faculty members through job embedded training and learning communities (PLCs). In addition, provide support through coaching cycle. Also, first year teachers are assigned a mentor where they engage in regularly scheduled meetings and professional dialogue.	Administration, Literacy Coach, Math Resource Teacher, Science Coach, Media/Technology Specialist, Mentors	6/13

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Currently all teachers at HES are currently teaching in-field.	Job imbedded professional development and coaching will be offered to support the differentiated needs of staff members that have not met the criteria of performing at highly effective. Data has also been collected to determine the overall needs of the staff and professional development outlined in the SIP has targeted those areas.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
61	5 % (3)	59% (36)	25% (15)	11% (7)	36% (22)	100%	4% (3)	1% (1)	61% (37)

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program 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
Kelly Kolman (Basic)	Kimberly Febus	Grade Level Mentor and student achievement performance	Additional Teacher Evaluations to allow for additional feedback and coaching opportunities. In addition the mentor will provide on going support through weekly PLCs and grade level planning.

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

Allison Campos (Basic)	Allison Witt	Grade Level Mentor and student achievement performance	Additional Teacher Evaluations to allow for additional feedback and coaching opportunities. In addition the mentor will provide on going support through weekly PLCs and grade level planning.
Helen Geisler (ESE: EBD unit)	Sandra Sanchez	Grade Level Mentor/ESE EBD Experience and student achievement performance	Additional Teacher Evaluations to allow for additional feedback and coaching opportunities. In addition the mentor will provide on going support through weekly PLCs and grade level planning.

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 Professional development, additional personnel and instructional materials and Extended School Year
Title I, Part C- Migrant N/A
Title I, Part D N/A
Title II Professional Development opportunities to teachers and administrators to address the specific academic achievement needs for our school
Title III N/A
Title X- Homeless Parent Involvement Coordinator and Social Worker provides resources for students identified as homeless.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) N/A
Violence Prevention Programs Second Step Core Social Skills training for Students School-Wide
Nutrition Programs School implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Plan All students receive free breakfast throughout the school year. During ESY students received breakfast and lunch.

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Housing Programs
N/A
Head Start
Pre-K provided to students age 3-5
Adult Education
N/A
Career and Technical Education
N/A
Job Training
N/A
Other
N/A

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

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

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Our school is currently beginning the fifth year of implementation of Behavior (continued emphasis on improving our Tier 2 level of supports) and beginning the 4th year of Academic MTSS with an emphasis on Tier 1 level (CORE Curriculum) of supports K-5 and Tier 2 supplemental supports. Currently piloting for the district behavior and academic tier 3 level of supports.

Administration: Supports the school-wide MTSS implementation plan by ensuring that the school based team receives professional development, communicates plan with parents and ensures there is adequate intervention support and documentation.

School Psychologist: Main focus is to assist with the collection, interpretation and analysis of data. In addition, provides support to the team by providing interventions and necessary professional development.

Student Services Personnel (Social Worker, Guidance Counselors, School Nurse, Behavior Specialist): Provides the team with information/trends in regards to attendance and programs available to support families and students (academic, emotional and behavioral needs) through community based and school programs. In addition, analyzes student data academically and behaviorally in order to provide interventions based on the needs of the students and families.

General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate): Participates in data collection, delivers core instruction and interventions to students (tier 1, 2 and 3), dialogues and collaborates with other staff members on delivery of the core instruction and interventions throughout the leveled tiers and stays abreast on research based best practices.

Literacy Coach: Assists in the implementation of the K-12 reading plan and keeping the staff up to date with research based interventions and supplemental services available to students at the different tier levels. In addition, facilitates and supports data collection activities.

ESE Teacher: Participates in student data collection, collaborates with general education teachers and integrates core instructional activities and interventions at tier 1, 2 and 3.

Basic Intervention Teachers (2 dually certified teachers): Participates in student data collection, collaborates with general education teachers and integrates core instructional activities and interventions at tier 1, 2 and 3. Primary focus will be working with students K-5 requiring tier 2 and 3 supports.

Tech Specialist: Assists the team with managing data collection and providing professional development and technical Support.

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

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The MTSS Leadership team (see roles above) meets a minimum 1x per month to review and reflect on current plan and school-wide data (adjusts plan as needed), problem solve students needs based on data, survey teachers to determine instructional needs and best practices for job embedded training and plan parent awareness workshops. In addition, the team works with staff members to problem solve through the four different stages, discuss how to use resources more efficiently by organizing instruction and interventions available to students through the three tiers of support. Currently an emphasis is placed on tier 1 and tier 2 level of supports for academics (fidelity of the CORE programs and supplemental programs) and tier 2 level of supports for behavior (CI/CO, small groups and mentoring).

MTSS efforts are built in to weekly grade level planning and vertical committee meetings. Our weekly K-12 PLCs focus on the new CCSS. Weekly grade level planning and vertical committee meetings focuses on grade level and school-wide data and the data is used to problem solve areas of need and plan for instruction. In addition, grade levels will focus on overall learning gains and an emphasis on the lowest 25% quartile in the area of reading math.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The SIP functions as a working document as the staff works through the PS process and adjustments will be reflected on the SIP. The SIP also builds on the level of student need/support at each of the tiered levels. The MTSS Leadership team reviews and reflects on current goals and the implementation process. Data is reviewed to determine if gains are being made toward the SIP goal(s) and whether or not adjustments are needed to meet the goals. The MTSS leadership team also reflects on the school-wide plan to determine next steps.

MTSS Implementation

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

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.

Data Charts:

Reading: 1-5 based on MMH unit assessments

Math: K-5 Pre and post data

Lowest Quartile Charts K-5 (3-5 based on FCAT, K-2 based on FAIR data)

Note: Lowest quartile charts include attendance and behavior concerns

On-Track System:

System tracks students who are on-track and/or at risk for behavior and attendance (according to guidelines created by MTSS): File Maker Pro Data Base

Data Management Systems:

Reading Progress Monitoring System:

Tier 1: (Grades K-5) PMRN/FAIR (BOY, MOY, EOY), Unit Assessments (Core K-12 grades 2-5), Weekly planning/data meetings, (Grades K-2) Running Records

Tier 2: In addition to Tier 1 system- (Grades K-5) More frequent Running Records, Weekly Assessments (ELL/Approaching), Students setting goals and monitoring progress (graphs), progress monitoring of interventions/supplemental programs effectiveness, (Grades 3-5) Running Records, (Grades K-2) Paper/pencil OPM FAIR

Tier 3: In addition to Tier 1 and 2 data system, with an increase on frequency of collection- Alternative Reading CORE data collection weekly on progress (Kaleidoscope)

Math Progress Monitoring System:

Tier 1: (K-5) Pre and Post Tests, Go Math BOY, MOY, EOY Test, (Grades 2-5) CORE K-12 (BOY, MOY, EOY)

Tier 2: In addition to Tier 1 system- (Grades K-5) Go Math Strategic Intervention and increase in mini assessments to progress monitor growth, Students set goals and progress monitor growth (graphs), Think Central

Tier 3: In addition to Tier 1 and 2 data system- Go Math Intensive Interventions and On-line Soar to Success

Science Progress Monitoring System:

Tier 1: (Grades K-5) District provided pre and post tests for Bodies of Knowledge, (Grades 2-5) CORE K-12 (BOY, MOY, EOY)

Tier 2/3: In addition to Tier 1 system- (Grades K-5) more frequent assessments that allow for progress monitoring (mini benchmark assessments)

Writing Progress Monitoring System:

Tier 1: (Grades K-5) Quarterly prompts scored through MMH Holistic Rubric (Spreadsheets/Graphing), Published piece per unit, Student/Teacher Conferencing, (Grade 4) Monthly prompts

Tier 2: In addition to Tier 1 system- (Grades K-5) additional teacher/student conferencing and students setting goals and progress monitoring growth (Spreadsheets/Graphing)

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Trainings (MTSS Behavior) for the 2012-2013 school year will continue to build on the previous years training and an emphasis on building capacity on developing BIPs/FBAs. Training with all staff members will begin during preplanning week and will be scheduled throughout the school year based on needs and additional information from district.

Trainings (MTSS) for the 2012-2013 school year will be provided by district (TBD). Staff will continue to receive training in the problem solving process and disaggregating data and what to do with the data in weekly meetings. In addition instructional staff will be trained on how to graph their own academic and behavior data.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

Hired a F/T School Psychologist in order to continue to support school-wide efforts.

Currently piloting for the district tier 3 supports for academics and behavior (ESE department will provide support for academics and district/USF will provide support for behavior).

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Administration, Literacy Coach, ESE teacher, Primary and Intermediate Basic Ed Teachers, Special Area Teacher and Media Specialist
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Literacy Coach facilitates monthly meetings and all participants work together to: generate and agree on questions about important elements and next steps for our school in regards to literacy, collect data to answer pressing questions, review and summarize data to determine student and staff needs to continue to move forward, make recommendations based on collected data and share out to staff and community members and request feedback from stakeholders.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? To generate change, the literacy team must actively use a literacy action plan to guide decision making around instruction, programming, and resource allocation. In order to do so the LLT major initiatives include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support common core (all instructional teachers)• Data by analyzing areas of weakness across the grades to support grade level meetings• School-wide focus calendar implementation toward FCAT 2.0 standards• School-wide Read (modeling for students, conferencing, journaling, literature circles)

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.

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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.

At Hudson Elementary School, all incoming Kindergarten students are assessed prior to or upon entering Kindergarten in order to determine individual and group needs and to assist in the development of effective, rigorous instructional and intervention programs. All students are assessed within the areas of Basic Skills/School Readiness, Oral Language/Syntax, Print/Letter knowledge, and Phonological Awareness/Processing. Screening data will be collected and aggregated by the middle of September 2012. Data will be used to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students and for groups or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Core Kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice and independent practice of all academic and/or social emotional skills identified by screening data. In addition kindergarten teachers will provide Kindergarten Camp prior to the start of the 2012-2013 school year.

****Grades 6-12 Only*** Sec. 1003.413 (b) F.S

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

N/A

****High Schools Only***

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(g)(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](#).

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

N/A

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		

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1a.1. Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing grade level benchmarks and Common Core State Standards (CCSS).	1a.1. Align and guide instructional planning to benchmark/CCSS standards. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	1a.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	1a.1. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, lesson plans, feedback from teachers	1a.1. FAIR data, Unit Assessments, Administration walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #1a: <i>The percentage of students scoring a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 18 % (63 students in grades 3-5) to 25%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>18 % (63 students) decrease from last year 38%.</i>	<i>25% (7% increase)</i>					
		1a.2. Students not having enough opportunity to engage in higher order thinking skills.	1a.2. Through instructional planning increase higher order questioning opportunities.	1a.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	1a.2. Observations, coaching cycle, lesson plans, feedback from teachers and students.	1a.2. Administration walkthroughs, Unit Assessments, FAIR data	

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

		1a.3. Instructional staff accepting responses from students that fall within the lower cognitive complexity level.	1a.3. Determine and monitor student responses based on desired level of test complexity.	1a.3. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	1a.3. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data and feedback from teachers	1a.3. Administration walkthroughs, student products and rubrics, FAIR data	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.	2.a.1. Focus on lower quartile students Time to develop enrichment activities and provide student conferencing	2.a.1. Provide additional opportunities that allow for depth, application and mastery of the Inquiry Based Learning Process.	2.a.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Gifted Teacher, Media Specialist, Technology Specialist, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	2.a.1. Observations, Coaching Cycle, and Feedback from Teachers and Students	2.a.1. Administration walkthroughs, Student Products and Rubrics		

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

Reading Goal #2a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>The percentage of students scoring a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 20 % (72 students grades 3-5) to 27%.</i>							
	20% (72 students) decrease from last year 26%.	27% (7 % increase)					
		2.a.2. Time spent focused on lower quartile students	2.a.2. Provide differentiated instruction throughout the structures within the reading and enrichment blocks.	2.a.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Gifted Teacher, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	2.a.2. Observations, Coaching Cycle, lesson plans and Feedback from Teachers and Students	2.a.2. Unit Assessments, Administration walkthroughs	
		2.a.3.	2.a.3.	2.a.3.	2.a.3.	2.a.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		

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	3a.1. Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing grade level and CCSS.	3a.1. Align and guide instructional planning to benchmark standards. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	3a.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	3a.1. Observations, Coaching Cycle, Analyzing Student Data, Lesson Plans and Feedback from Teachers	3a.1. FAIR Data, Unit Assessments, Administration walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #3a: <i>The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 58 % to 66%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	58% (201 students) decrease from last years 61%.	66% (8 % increase)					
		3a.2. Students not having enough opportunity to engage in higher order thinking skills.	3a.2. Through instructional planning increase higher order questioning opportunities.	3a.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	3a.2. Observation, coaching cycle, lesson plans, feedback from teachers and students	3a.2. Administration walkthroughs, Unit Assessments, FAIR data	

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

		3a.3. Instructional staff accepting responses from students that fall within the lower cognitive complexity level.	3a.3. Determine and monitor student responses based on desired level of test complexity.	3a.3. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	3a.3. Observation, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, feedback from teachers	3a.3. Administration walkthroughs, student products and rubrics, FAIR data	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4a.1. Fidelity of the MTSS process.	4a.1. Monitor the fidelity of the prescribed interventions and increase progress monitoring to determine if interventions are effective.	4a.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher, School Psychologist and Teachers	4a.1. Observations, Analyzing student data, fidelity form	4a.1. Administration walkthroughs, data chats, fidelity forms, progress monitoring tools determined at each grade level		

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

Reading Goal #4a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will maintain at 57%.</i>							
	57% increase from last years 38%.	Maintain at/ above 50%					
		4a.2. Students not at the expected reading levels.	4a.2. Targeted students (2-5) will use district approved (K-12 plan) alternate reading core program.	4a.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	4a.2. Observations, coaching cycle, lesson plans, feedback from teachers	4a.2. Administration walkthroughs, more frequent/ ongoing assessments (weekly/ unit assessments), FAIR	
		4a.3. Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing grade level and CCSS.	4a.3. Guide instructional planning to ensure grade level benchmark standards are aligned with the alternative-core. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	4a.3. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	4a.3. Observations, Coaching Cycle, Analyzing Student Data, Lesson Plans and Feedback from Teachers	4a.3. FAIR, Weekly/Unit Assessments, Administration walkthroughs	

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

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 71%	73.5%	76.0%	78.5%	81.0%	83.5%	85.4% to 86%
Reading Goal							
#5A: <i>By the 2016-2017 school year we will decrease the percentage of nonproficient students from 29 % to 14.5%. Baseline 71% proficient (29% nonproficient) and increase to 85.4%.</i>							

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1. Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing grade level and CCSS.	5B.1. Align and guide instructional planning to benchmark standards. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	5B.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	5B.1. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, lesson plans and feedback from teachers	5B.1. FAIR data, Unit Assessments, Administration walkthroughs		

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

Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>The percent of white students reading proficiency will increase to %.</i>							
	White: % increase/decrease from last year 63%	White: %					
		5B.2.Students not having enough opportunity to engage in higher order thinking skills.	5B.2. Through instructional planning increase higher order questioning opportunities.	5B.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	5B.2. Observation, coaching cycle, lesson plans, feedback from teachers and students	5B.2. Administration walkthroughs, Unit Assessments, FAIR data	
		5B.3. Instructional staff accepting responses from students that fall within the lower cognitive complexity level.	5B.3. Determine and monitor student responses based on desired level of test complexity.	5B.3. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	5B.3. Observation, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, feedback from teachers	5B.3. Administration walkthroughs, student products and rubrics, FAIR data	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
<u>Reading Goal</u> <u>#5C:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	N/A	N/A					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.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		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. Fidelity of the MTSS process.	5D.1. Monitor the fidelity of the prescribed interventions and increase progress monitoring to determine if interventions are effective.	5D.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher, School Psychologist and Teachers	5D 1. Observations, Analyzing student data, fidelity form	5D 1. Administration walkthroughs, data chats, fidelity forms, progress monitoring tools determined at each grade level		
Reading Goal #5D: <i>The percent of students with disabilities reading proficiency will increase to %.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>% increase/decrease from last years 26%.</i>	<i>%</i>					

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

		5D.2. Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing grade level and CCSS.	5D.2. Align and guide instructional planning to benchmark standards. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	5D.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	5D.2. Observations, coaching cycle, lesson plans, analyzing student data and feedback from teachers	5D.2. FAIR data, Unit Assessments, Administration walkthroughs	
		5D.3. Students not having enough opportunity to engage in higher order thinking skills.	5D.3. Through instructional planning increase higher order questioning opportunities.	5D.3. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	5D.3. Observation, coaching cycle, lesson plans, feedback from teachers and students	5D.3. Administration walkthroughs, Weekly/Unit Assessments, FAIR data	
		5D.4. Instructional staff accepting responses from students that fall within the lower cognitive complexity level.	5D.4. Determine and monitor student responses based on desired level of test complexity.	5D.4. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	5D.4. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data and feedback from teachers.	5D.4. Administration walkthroughs, student products and rubrics, FAIR data	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier						

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

5E. Economically Disadvanta ged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing the grade level and CCSS.	5E.1. Align and guide instructional planning to benchmark standards. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	5E.1 Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	5E.1. Observations, coaching cycle, lesson plans, analyzing student data, feedback from teachers	5E.1. FAIR data, Unit Assessments, Administration walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #5E: <i>The percent of economically disadvantaged students reading proficiency will increase to %.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	% increase/decrease from last years 59%.	%					
			5E.2.Students not having enough opportunity to engage in higher order thinking skills.	5E.2. Through instructional planning increase higher order questioning opportunities.	5E.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	5E.2. Observations, coaching cycle, lesson plans, feedback from teachers and students	5E.2. Administration walkthroughs, Unit Assessments, FAIR data
		5E.3. Instructional staff accepting responses from students that fall within the lower cognitive complexity level.	5E.3. Determine and monitor student responses based on desired level of test complexity.	5E.3. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	5E.3. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data and feedback from teachers.	5E.3. Administration walkthroughs, student products and rubrics, FAIR data	

Reading Professional Development

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity <div>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</div>						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
K-12 Reading Plan PLC Building understanding of the CCSS for ELA	K-5	Literacy Coach	School-wide Instructional Staff	August 2012-May 2013 (4 modules: 1 per quarter)	Coaching Cycle, Implementation Log/ Reflection and K-1 Lesson Plans, Weekly Agendas and Follow-up	Administration and Literacy Coach
Reading Conferencing and Journaling with Students	K-5	Literacy Coach and District Support	School-wide Instructional Staff	Pre-planning Week: August 2012 (district) On-going through June 2013	Observation of implementation in classrooms	Administration and Literacy Coach
Close Reading and Text Dependency	K-5	Literacy Coach	School-wide Instructional Staff	August 2012-June 2013	Observations of implementation in classrooms	Administration and Literacy Coach
Lesson Study	TBD	Literacy Coach and Administration	TBD	Semester 2 cycle	Observation of implementation classroom, lesson plans	Administration and Literacy Coach

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

Differentiated professional development provided through the Coaches Learning Cycle	K-5	Literacy Coach	School-wide Instructional Staff	August 2012-June 2013	Coaching Cycle documentation	Administration and Literacy Coach
---	-----	----------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Support Tier 1, 2 and 3 efforts	Supplemental materials and resources to support tier level of services (K-12 supplemental materials approved).	Title 1	1,850.77
Subtotal: 1,850.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

Provide additional support during the reading and intervention block for Tier 2 and Tier 3 targeted student needs in order to increase learning gains and/or proficiency levels.	2 Basic Intervention Teacher	Title 1	\$86,354.00
Provide additional support during the reading block for Tier 1 and Tier 2 targeted student needs in order to increase learning gains and/or proficiency levels.	3 Instructional Assistants	Title 1	\$60,000.00
Implementation of an additional 30 minutes to the reading block for targeted students requiring additional support (built into the school-wide K-5 schedule).	1 ILST: Instructional Learning Systems Technician	Title 1	9,400.00
Subtotal: \$155,754.00			
Total: \$157,604.00			

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.	1.1. Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing grade level benchmarks and Common Core State Standards (CCSS).	1.1. Align and guide instructional planning to benchmark/CCSS standards. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	1.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, ESOL Resource Teacher, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	1.1. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, lesson plans, feedback from teachers	1.1. FAIR data, Unit Assessments, Administration walkthroughs	

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

CELLA Goal #1: <i>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 CELLA, in grades K-5, will increase from 46% to 55%.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	46% (17 students) are proficient in grades K-5.					
		2.2. Students not having enough opportunity to engage in higher order thinking skills.	2.2. Through instructional planning increase higher order questioning opportunities.	2.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, ESOL Resource Teacher, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	2.2. Observations, coaching cycle, lesson plans, feedback from teachers and students.	2.2. Administration walkthroughs, Unit Assessments, FAIR data
		2.3. Instructional staff accepting responses from students that fall within the lower cognitive complexity level.	2.3. Determine and monitor student responses based on desired level of test complexity.	2.3. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, ESOL Resource Teacher, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	2.3. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data and feedback from teachers	2.3. Administration walkthroughs, student products and rubrics, FAIR data
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1. Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing grade level benchmarks and Common Core State Standards (CCSS).	2.1. Align and guide instructional planning to benchmark/CCSS standards. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	2.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, ESOL Resource Teacher, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	2.1. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, lesson plans, feedback from teachers	2.1. FAIR data, Unit Assessments, Administration walkthroughs	

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

CELLA Goal #2: <i>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 CELLA, in grades K-5, will increase from 24% to 33%.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :					
	<i>24% (9 students) are proficient in grades K-5.</i>					
		2.2. Students not having enough opportunity to engage in higher order thinking skills.	2.2. Through instructional planning increase higher order questioning opportunities.	2.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, ESOL Resource Teacher, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	2.2. Observations, coaching cycle, lesson plans, feedback from teachers and students.	2.2. Administration walkthroughs, Unit Assessments, FAIR data
		2.3. Instructional staff accepting responses from students that fall within the lower cognitive complexity level.	2.3. Determine and monitor student responses based on desired level of test complexity.	2.3. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, ESOL Resource Teacher, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher and Teachers	2.3. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data and feedback from teachers	2.3. Administration walkthroughs, student products and rubrics, FAIR data
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1. Students not engaged in writing to respond to reading. Students have difficulty writing to show evidence.	2.1. Students will write to show evidence across content areas.	2.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Teacher, ESOL Resource Teacher, Math Resource Teacher, Science Coach and Teachers	2.1. Teacher, Administration Observations and analyzing student data.	2.1. rubrics and student products	

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

CELLA Goal #3: <i>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 CELLA, in grades K-5, will increase from 35% to 44%.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	35% (13 students) are proficient grades K-5.					
		2.2. Students are taught the writing skills and processes in isolation.	2.2. Integrate the process of writing, text structures for writing, paragraph or sentence construction skills and grade level expectations for conventions across content areas.	2.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, ESOL Resource Teacher, Math Resource Teacher, Science Coach and Teachers	2.2. Teacher, Administration Observations and analyzing student data.	2.2. Student self monitoring progress tool and goal setting, rubrics
		2.3. Students have difficulty showing what they know/ learned through writing.	2.3. Teachers will explicitly model how students will write routinely over extended and short time frames for a range of disciplines.	2.3. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, ESOL Resource Teacher, Math Resource, Science Coach and Teachers	2.3. Teacher and Administration Observations and analyzing student data.	2.3. Journals, rubrics, student self monitoring

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Support Tier level of Supports	Brain Pop Jr. and Brain Pop Espanol	Title 1	1,275.00
Subtotal: \$1,275.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: \$1,275.00			

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1a.1. Students struggle with multi-step word problems (moving from concrete to abstract).	1a.1. Provide additional opportunities for students to engage in real world problem solving, with multiple steps (with an emphasis on fractions, fact recall and making numbers).	1a.1. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	1a.1. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	1a.1. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling.		
Mathematics Goal #1a: <i>The percentage of students scoring a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 20% (72 students grades 3-5) to 27 %.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	20 % (72 students) decrease from last years 33%	27% (7% increase)					
		1a.2 Students struggle with math text.	1a.2. Through instructional planning increase opportunities that allow students to apply vocabulary in context.	1a.2. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	1a.2. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	1a.2. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling	
		1a.3. Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing grade level benchmarks and Common Core State Standards (K-1 CCSS).	1a.3. Align and guide instructional planning to benchmark/CCSS standards. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	1a.3. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	1a.3. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	1a.3. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2a.1. Students have limited opportunities to engage in enrichment activities/ projects (K-5).	2a.1. Provide additional opportunities that allow for depth, application and mastery of inquiry based learning.	2a.1. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee, Gifted Teacher and Teacher	2a.1. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	2a.1. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling		
Mathematics Goal #2a: <i>The percentage of students scoring a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 13% (48 students grades 3-5) to 19%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	13 % (48 students) decrease from last years 22%	19% (6% increase)					
		2a.2. Students struggle with multi-step word problems (moving from concrete to abstract).	2a.2. Provide additional opportunities for students to engage in real world problem solving, with multiple steps (with an emphasis on fractions, fact recall and making numbers).	2a.2. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee, Gifted Teacher and Teacher	2a.2. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	2a.2. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling	

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

		2.a.3 Time spent focused on lowest quartile	2.a.3 Provide differentiated instruction throughout the structure of the math block.	2a.3 Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee, Gifted teacher and Teacher	2a.3. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	2a.3. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	3a.1. Students struggle with multi-step word problems (moving from concrete to abstract).	3a.1. Provide additional opportunities for students to engage in real world problem solving, with multiple steps (with an emphasis on fractions, fact recall and making numbers).	3a.1. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	3a.1. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	3a.1. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3a:</u> <i>The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will maintain at 52%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	52%	60%					

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

		3a.2. Students struggle with math text.	3a.2. Through instructional planning increase opportunities that allow students to apply vocabulary in context.	3a.2. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	3a.2. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	3a.2. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling	
		3a.3. Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing grade level benchmarks and Common Core State Standards (K-1 CCSS).	3a.3. Align and guide instructional planning to benchmark/CCSS standards. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	3a.3. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	3a.3. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	3a.3. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4a.1. Students struggle with multi-step word problems (moving from concrete to abstract).	4a.1. Provide additional opportunities for students to engage in real world problem solving, with multiple steps (with an emphasis on fractions, fact recall and making numbers).	4a.1. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	4a.1. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	4a.1. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling		

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

Mathematics Goal #4a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2031 FCAT math will be at 50% or higher.</i>							
	50% (173 students) decrease from last years 51%	50% or higher					
		4a.2. Students struggle with math text.	4a.2. Through instructional planning increase opportunities that allow students to apply vocabulary in context.	4a.2. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	4a.2. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	4a.2. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling	
		4a.3. Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing grade level benchmarks and Common Core State Standards (K-1 CCSS).	4a.3. Align and guide instructional planning to benchmark/CCSS standards. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	4a.3. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	4a.3. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	4a.3. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 65%	67.9%	70.8%	73.7%	76.6%	79.5%	82.4% to 82.5%
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> <i>By the 2016-2017 school year we will decrease the percentage of nonproficient students from 35 % to 17.5%.</i> Baseline 65% proficient (35% nonproficient) and increase to 82.4 %.							
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		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. Students struggle with multi-step word problems (moving from concrete to abstract).	5B.1 Provide additional opportunities for students to engage in real world problem solving, with multiple steps (with an emphasis on fractions, fact recall and making numbers).	5B.1. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	5B.1. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	5B.1. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling		

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Mathematics Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>The percent of white students math proficiency will increase to %.</i>							
	White: % increase/decrease from last year 59%	White: %					
		5B.2. Students struggle with math text.	5B.2. Through instructional planning increase opportunities that allow students to apply vocabulary in context.	5B.2. . Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	5B.2 Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	5B.2. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling	
		5B.3. Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing grade level benchmarks and Common Core State Standards (K-1 CCSS).	5B.3. Align and guide instructional planning to benchmark/CCSS standards. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	5B.3. . Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	5B.3. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	5B.3. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. Students struggle with multi-step word problems (moving from concrete to abstract).	5D.1. Provide additional opportunities for students to engage in real world problem solving, with multiple steps (with an emphasis on fractions, fact recall and making numbers).	5D.1 . Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	5D.1 Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	5D.2. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling		
Mathematics Goal #5D: <i>The percent of students with disabilities math proficiency will increase to %</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	% increase/decrease from last years 25%	%					
		5D.2. Students struggle with math text.	5D.2. Through instructional planning increase opportunities that allow students to apply vocabulary in context.	5D.2. . Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	5D.2. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	5D.2. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling	
		5D.3. Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing grade level benchmarks and Common Core State Standards (K-1 CCSS).	5D.3. Align and guide instructional planning to benchmark/CCSS standards. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	5D.3. . Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	5D.3. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	5D.3. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. Students struggle with multi-step word problems (moving from concrete to abstract).	5E.1. Provide additional opportunities for students to engage in real world problem solving, with multiple steps (with an emphasis on fractions, fact recall and making numbers).	5E.1. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	5E.1. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	5E.1. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u> <i>The percent of economically disadvantaged students math proficiency will increase to %.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	% increase/decrease from last years 53%	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		5E.2. Students struggle with math text.	5E.2 Through instructional planning increase opportunities that allow students to apply vocabulary in context.	5E.2. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	5E.2. Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	5E.2. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling	

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

		5E.3 Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing grade level benchmarks and Common Core State Standards (K-1 CCSS).	5E.3 Align and guide instructional planning to benchmark/CCSS standards. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	5E.3 . Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Math Committee and Teacher	5E.3 Observations, coaching cycle, analyzing student data, instructional planning and implementation of the focus calendars (2-5)	5E.3 Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, pre/post test assessments and student products/journaling	
--	--	--	---	---	---	--	--

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Interactive Notebooks	K-5	Grade Level Representative, BIT, Math Resource	School-wide	August 2012-October 2012	Coaching Cycle/Observation of implementation in the classroom	Administration, Math Committee/ Math Representative, Math Resource Teacher

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

Standards for Mathematical Practice: Developing Processes and Proficiencies in Mathematics Learners	K-5	M Math Committee, Math Resource Teacher	School-wide	August 2012-June 2012	Coaching Cycle/Observation of implementation in the classroom	Administration, Math Committee/ Math Representative, Math Resource Teacher
CCSS in Math: K-1 implementation and 2-5 learning about	K-1 and 2-5	Math Resource	School-wide	August 2012-June 2013	Cycle/Observation of implementation	Administration, Math Resource Teacher

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
Support Tier 1,2 and 3 efforts	Supplemental resources and materials	Title 1	1,548.00
Subtotal: 1,548.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Support for Tier 1	TIMEZ Attack program	Title 1	840.00
Subtotal: 840.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: \$2,388.00			

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle 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		
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1a.1. Instructional staff is at various levels of understanding and implementing grade level benchmarks.	1a.1. Align and guide instructional planning to benchmark standards. Guide teachers in understanding how to select and teach students using complex text.	1a.1. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Science Committee and Teacher	1a.1. Observations, Analyzing Student Data, Lesson Plans	1a.1. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, student journaling and student work samples, BOK assessments at the BOY, MOY, EOY		

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

Science Goal #1a: <i>Students scoring a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 26% (28 students) to 33 %.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	26% (28 students)	33% (7% increase)					
		1a.2. Students struggle with the vocabulary and have limited opportunities to respond to higher order thinking questions.	1a.2. Through instructional planning increase opportunities that allow students to apply vocabulary in context when responding to higher order question.	1a.2. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Science Committee and Teacher	1a.2. Observations, Analyzing Student Data, Lesson Plans	1a.2. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, student journaling and student work samples, BOK assessments at the BOY, MOY, EOY	
		1a.3. Instructional staff accepting responses from students that fall within the lower cognitive complexity level.	1a.3. Determine and monitor student responses based on desired level of test complexity.	1a.3. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Science Committee and Teacher	1a.3. Observations, Analyzing Student Data	1a.3. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, student journaling and student work samples	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2a.1. Time spent focused on lower quartile students Time to develop enrichment activities and provide student conferencing	2a.1. Provide additional opportunities that allow for depth, application and mastery of the Inquiry Based Learning Process.	2a.1. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Science Committee, Gifted Teacher and Teacher	2a.1. Observations, Analyzing Student Data, Lesson Plans	2a.1. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, student journaling and student work samples, BOK assessments at the BOY, MOY, EOY		
Science Goal #2a: <i>Students scoring a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 5 % (6 students) to 15%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	5 % increase from last years 3%	15% (10% increase)					
		2a.2. Focus on lower quartile students	2a.2. Provide differentiated instruction throughout the structures within the science and enrichment block.	2a.2. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, Science Coach, Science Committee, Gifted Teacher and Teacher	2a.2. Observations, Analyzing Student Data, Lesson Plans	2a.2. Administration walkthroughs, CORE K-12, student journaling and student work samples	
		2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	
		2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity <div>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</div>						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Continued from 2011-2012: Integration of science through literature and math	K-5	Science Coach, Literacy Coach, Math Resource Teacher	Grade level Planning	August 2012-May 2013	Observation and Lesson Plans	Administration, Math Resource, Science Coach, Literacy Coach
Comprehensive Instruction Sequence Model (CIS)	5 th	Staci Cashen and Science Coach	5 th Grade Level Planning	September 2012-December 2012	Observation and Lesson Plans	Administration, Science Coach

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: \$0			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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		

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

1a. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1a.1. Students not engaged in writing to respond to reading. Students have difficulty writing to show evidence.	1a.1. Students will write to show evidence across content areas.	1a.1. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Teacher, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher	1a.1. Teacher, Administration Observations and analyzing student data.	1a.1. Rubrics and student products/journals		
<u>Writing Goal #1a:</u> <i>Students scoring a level 3.0 on the 2013 FCAT Writing will increase from 72 % (79 students) to 84%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	72% (79 students)	84% (12% increase)					
		1a.2. Students are taught the writing skills and processes in isolation.	1a.2. Integrate the process of writing, text structures for writing, paragraph or sentence construction skills and grade level expectations for conventions across content areas.	1a.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Teacher, Science Coach, Math Resource Teacher	1a.2. Teacher, Administration Observations and analyzing student data.	1a.2. Student self monitoring progress tool and goal setting, rubrics, student products	
		1a.3. Students have difficulty showing what they know/learned through writing.	1a.3. Teachers will explicitly model how students will write routinely over extended and short time frames for a range of disciplines.	1a.3. Administration, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Math Resource, Science Coach and Teacher	1a.3. Teacher and Administration Observations and analyzing student data.	1a.3. Journals, rubrics, student self monitoring, student products	

Writing Professional Development

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

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Across Curriculum: Build a deeper understanding of writing/reading connections through benchmark standards and common core standards	K-5	Literacy Coach, LLT and District	School-Wide K-5	August 2012-May 2013	Observations of implementation on Classrooms	Administration and Literacy Coach/LLT

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: \$0			

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

1. Attendance	<p>1.1. Family perception that school is not a priority</p> <p>Mobility Rate</p> <p>Economic Issues</p> <p>Suspensions from EBD Unit</p>	<p>1.1. Implement Tier Level of Supports: Monitor all students attendance and need for additional academic support (PMP) and increase parent contact and provide an on-track system for students who meet the projected goal.</p> <p>Inform staff members and parents of the various student services assistance that are available</p> <p>Incorporate a check in and check out system for students requiring additional academic support in multiple areas (PMP) due to poor attendance</p>	<p>1.1. Administration, Guidance Counselors, Social Worker, Classroom Teachers and Behavior Specialist</p>	<p>1.1. Monitor Attendance through the Tier Level of Services (File Maker Pro System)</p>	<p>1.1. Attendance Records: File Maker Pro/TERMS</p>		
<p>Attendance Goal #1:</p> <p><i>By July 2013, the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) will increase from 95.91% to 97%. (previous year 92.69%)</i></p> <p><i>By July 2013, the total number of students with excessive tardies will decrease from 90 to 70.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p>					
	<p>95.91% (Total ADA 680 out of 709 ADM)</p>	<p>97%</p>					

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

	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of Students</u> <u>with Excessive</u> <u>Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of Students</u> <u>with Excessive</u> <u>Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>					
	307 students (increase from last year 295)	250					
	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive Tardies</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive Tardies</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>					
	90 students	70 students					
		1.2. Early Bell Schedule Parent Work Schedule Varied Sibling Schedules	1.2. Implement Tier Level of Supports: Tier 1 Monitor all students tardies and need for additional academic support (PMP) and increase parent Tier 2 Inform staff members and parents of the various student services assistance that are available Tier 3 Incorporate a check in and check out system for students requiring additional academic support in multiple areas (PMP) due to tardies	1.2. Administration, Guidance Counselors, Social Worker, Classroom Teachers and Behavior Specialist	1.2. Monitor Tardies through the Tier Level of Supports	1.2. Attendance Records/TERMS	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Professional						
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
School-Wide PBS expectations and Attendance Initiatives	All Staff Members	PBS Chair Behavior Specialist Guidance Counselor	School-wide	August 2012-May 2013 and ongoing 1x monthly	Feedback from Teachers, problem solving process to reflect and make revisions as needed	PBS Team which includes Administration

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
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: \$0			

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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		

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

1. Suspension	<p>I.1. Increased Number of EBD Units</p> <p>Multiple referrals per student</p> <p>Bus Suspensions and no other Means of transportation</p> <p>Non-compliant behavior (safety and physical aggression)</p>	<p>I.1. Implement Tier Level of Supports:</p> <p>Tier 1 Implement PBS plan school-wide</p> <p>Tier 2 Provide CI/CO system, individual behavior plans and/or guidance focus groups for students requiring additional supports</p> <p>Tier 3 Provide a combination of Tier 1 and Tier 2 level supports and incorporate individualized support with Behavior Specialist/ Guidance Counselor</p> <p>Note: On-track System implemented as a reward system</p>	<p>I.1. Administration, Guidance Counselors, Behavior Specialist, PBS Team</p>	<p>I.1. Collect data and share-out with staff, engage in problem solving process (reflect on current practices and revise plan as needed)</p> <p>File Maker Pro System</p>	<p>I.1. PBS Team which includes Administration</p>		
Suspension Goal #1:							
<i>Decrease total number of students by 10% receiving OSS and maintain percent for ISS.</i>	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
	<i>5 (met goal from previous year)</i>	<i>Maintain at 5 students or less</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	<i>5 students (met goal from last year)</i>	<i>Maintain 5 students or less</i>					

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

	<u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	56	50					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School</u>					
	20 students	16 students					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
School-Wide PBS expectations and Behavior Initiatives	All Staff Members	PBS Chair Behavior Specialist	School-wide	August 2012-May 2013 and ongoing 1x monthly	Feedback from Teachers, problem solving process to reflect and make revisions as needed/File Maker Pro System (On-Track System)	PBS Team which includes Administration

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

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

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Implement Tier Level of Supports: Tier 1 Implement PBS plan school-wide	Research Based Supplemental Materials and resources that will be used to guide Social Skills Instruction	Title 1	2,245.00
Subtotal: 2,245.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Implement Tier Level of Supports: Tier 1 Implement PBS plan school-wide	Guidance Counselor	Title 1	57,450.00
Tier 2 Provide CI/CO system, individual behavior plans and/or guidance focus groups for students requiring additional supports			
Tier 3 Provide a combination of Tier 1 and Tier 2 level supports and incorporate individualized support with Behavior Specialist/Guidance Counselor			

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Subtotal: \$57,450.00			
Total: \$59,695.00			

End of Suspension Goals

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	1.1. Work Schedules Lack of Transportation Competing with extra curricular activities Economic obstacles	1.1. Parent/ Student workshops provided during the school day to meet the needs of our parents and community stakeholders.	1.1. Administration, Parent Involvement Committee, Literacy Coach, Math Resource, Team Leaders	1.1. Feedback from parents, students, and teachers	1.1. Surveys, sign in sheets, agendas, and SAC minutes		

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

By June of 2013, parent participation in curriculum based information sessions and/or workshops will increase by 10%.	<u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
	10% attendance	20% attendance (10% increase)					
		1.2. Communication of Events	1.2. School connect phone messages, fliers, marquee announcement, class and teacher incentives	1.2. Administration, Parent Involvement Committee, Literacy Coach, Math Resource, Team Leaders	1.2. Feedback from parents, students, and teachers	1.2. Surveys, sign in sheets, agendas, and SAC minutes	
		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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

Strategies to build positive relationships with parents and increase parent involvement	All	Administrative Leadership Team	School-wide	August Initial Meeting	Increased parent contact and/or parent participation in school events	Leadership Team Teachers

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
	Parent Involvement Coordinator	Title 1	24,700.00
Subtotal: \$24,700.00			

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Total: \$24,700.00			
--------------------	--	--	--

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: 0			

End of STEM Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total: 157,604.00
Mathematics Budget	Total: 2,388.00
Science Budget	Total: 0
Writing Budget	Total: 0
Attendance Budget	Total: 0
Suspension Budget	Total: 59,695.00
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total: 0
Parent Involvement Budget	Total: 24,700.00
Additional Goals	Total: 0
	Grand Total: \$244,387.00

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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	X <input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

X ☐ Yes ☐ No

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discuss Parent Involvement and School-Wide Initiatives• Discuss how funds will be used• Reflecting and Updating on the School Improvement Plan• Community Outreach Projects

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Staff Development	TBD
Support School-Wide Incentives	TBD