2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Coppergate Elementary School

3460 COPPER COLTS COURT
Middleburg, FL 32068
904-291-5594
http://cge.oneclay.net

School Demographics

School Type	Title I	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
Elementary School	No	53%

Alternative/ESE Center	Charter School	Minority Rate
No	No	34%

School Grades History

2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11
A	B	A	A

SIP Authority and Template

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridacims.org. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
    ◦ Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
    ◦ Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
    ◦ Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
    ◦ Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
    ◦ Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School
Coppergate Elementary School

Principal
David Nix

School Advisory Council chair
Elizabeth Crane and Heather Turner

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
David Nix,	Principal
Debra Gaynes	Assistant Principal
Christy Gemmill	RtI Coach
Pamela Kennett	ITF
Lisa Barbetti	School Psychologist
Donna Halcomb	School Counselor

District-Level Information

District
Clay

Superintendent
Mr. Charles E Van Zant, Jr.

Date of school board approval of SIP
11/19/2014

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

David Nix, Principal; Debra Gaynes, Assistant Principal; Elizabeth Crane and Heather Turner, Co-Chairs; Nicole Deleon, parent; Alexandra Bautista, parent; Tricia Hargrove, parent; Amanda Miller, parent; Lillian Borges, parent;

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

The members are provided with the data regarding our school...FCAT, FAIR(K - 2), and Performance Matters Math (K - 6), Performance Matters Reading (gr. 3 - 6), and Performance Matters Science (gr. 4 - 6). We discuss the steps we are taking to make improvements and they provide input regarding the steps. Changes are made as necessary. The members also vote on expenditures of the SIP $'s as well as "A" $ distribution The members of SAC feel free to express their opinions and provide possible solutions and resolutions as necessary.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

1. Discuss expenditure of funds for a reading initiative as well as implementation and why.
2. Discuss expenditure of funds for the math initiative as well as implementation and why.
3. Continue to inform SAC of the data collected and the steps we are taking to improve student learning as well as student achievement after each assessment cycle.
4. Discuss and possibly revise student dismissal procedures, parent pick-up and drop-off procedures, as well as school procedures.
5. Concerns from the community will be brought forth either by members or faculty.

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

The SAC monies are being used to support our reading and math initiatives to improve learning and test scores in both areas as well as to prepare the students for the next grade level.

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC
Not In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

We are always in search of parents and a nomination/vote for a support employee to file a position is in progress, to be a part of our SAC committee who will attend the meetings and assist with decision-making for appropriate use of funds and the direction we need to take.

Highly Qualified Staff
This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

# of administrators
2

 # receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

David Nix		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 29	Years at Current School: 6

Credentials	Bachelor of Science, Master of Education, Master of Human Resource Management Certifications: Professional: Guidance And Counseling, (prekindergarten - Grade 12) Professional: School Principal, (all Levels)
Performance Record	During the 2012-2013 school year, Coppergate Elementary received a preliminary grade of B with 69% meeting high standards in Reading, 62% meeting high standards in mathematics, 52% meeting high standards in writing in grade 4 and 49% meeting high standards in science in grade 5. Our students during this assessment period made significant gains in reading, 74%, and mathematics, 70%, including our lowest quartile students in both reading, 74%, and math, 71%. Our preliminary points earned were 521 with 525 required for a grade of A. For school year 2011-2012, Coppergate Elementary received a grade of A with 67% meeting high standards in reading, 63% meeting high standards in mathematics, 73% meeting high standards in writing in grade 4, and 43% meeting high standards in science in grade 5. Our gains in reading, 74%, and math, 70%, contributed greatly to our attainment of an A as well as the gains earned by our lowest quartile students in reading, 76%, and mathematics,66%. At the conclusion of school year 2010-2011, Coppergate Elementary received a grade of A based upon the achievement of our students with 89% of our students meeting high standards in reading, 80% meeting high standards in mathematics, 91% meeting high standards in writing in grade 4 after a tremendous emphasis school-wide on writing concluding with the publishing of an Anthology for grades K - 6, and 69% of fifth graders meeting high standards in science. However, the improvement shown by our students who made gains in reading, 72%, and math, 60%, making a year's worth of progress as well as struggling students in reading, 65%, and math, 62%, making a year's worth of progress contributed greatly to our attainment of a grade of A. AYP was not met with 85% of the criteria satisfied. For school year 2009-2010, Coppergate Elementary received a grade of A with 88% of the student achieving high standards in reading, 79% in mathematics, 82% in writing in grade 4, and 67% in science in grade 5. Students making a year's worth of growth in reading, 73%, and in mathematics, 60%, as well as the students in the lowest quartile in reading, 63%, and in mathematics, 50%, contributed to the achievement of an A grade for this school year. At the conclusion of the 2008-2009 school year, Coppergate received a grade of A, 89% meeting high standards in Reading, 80% meeting high standards in math, 87% meeting high standards in writing and 62% meeting high standards in science, AYP was not attained with 90% criteria met. 2007-2008

Coppergate received a grade of A, 86% meeting high standards in reading, 74% meeting high standards in math, 74% meeting high standards in writing and 60% meeting high standards in science. AYP was not met with 97% of the criteria met.
2008-2009 Coppergate received a grade of A, 89% meeting high standards in Reading, 80% meeting high standards in math, 87% meeting high standards in writing and 62% meeting high standards in science, AYP was not attained with 90% critieria met.
2007-2008 Coppergate received a grade of A, 86% meeting high standards in reading, 74% meeting high standards in math, 74% meeting high standards in writing and 60% meeting high standards in science. AYP was not met with 97% of the criteria met. During the school year 2006-2007, I was principal of Ridgeview Elementary for part of the year while I transitioned to Coppergate. RVE received a B that year and had five years of a grade of A from 2001-2006.

Debra Gaynes		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 9	Years at Current School: 6

Credentials	Bachelor of Science, Master of Education Certification Professional: Educational Leadership, (all Levels) Professional: General Science, (grades 5 - 9) Professional: Mathematics, (grades 6 - 12) Professional: Middle Grades, Endorsement Professional: School Principal, (all Levels)
Performance Record	During the 2012-2013 school year, Coppergate Elementary received a preliminary grade of B with 69% meeting high standards in Reading, 62% meeting high standards in mathematics, 52% meeting high standards in writing in grade 4 and 49% meeting high standards in science in grade 5. Our students during this assessment period made significant gains in reading, 74%, and mathematics, 70%, including our lowest quartile students in both reading, 74%, and math, 71%. Our preliminary points earned were 521 with 525 required for a grade of A. For school year 2011-2012, Coppergate Elementary received a grade of A with 67% meeting high standards in reading, 63% meeting high standards in mathematics, 73% meeting high standards in writing in grade 4, and 43% meeting high standards in science in grade 5. Our gains in reading, 74%, and math, 70%, contributed greatly to our attainment of an A as well as the gains earned by our lowest quartile students in reading, 76%, and mathematics,66%. At the conclusion of school year 2010-2011, Coppergate Elementary received a grade of A based upon the achievement of our students with 89% of our students meeting high standards in reading, 80% meeting high standards in mathematics, 91% meeting high standards in writing in grade 4 after a tremendous emphasis school-wide on writing concluding with the publishing of an Anthology for grades K - 6, and 69% of fifth graders meeting high standards in science. However, the improvement shown by our students who made gains in reading, 72%, and math, 60%, making a year's worth of progress as well as struggling students in reading, 65%, and math, 62%, making a year's worth of progress contributed greatly to our attainment of a grade of A. AYP was not met with 85% of the criteria satisfied. For school year 2009-2010, Coppergate Elementary received a grade of A with 88% of the student achieving high standards in reading, 79% in mathematics, 82% in writing in grade 4, and 67% in science in grade 5. Students making a year's worth of growth in reading, 73%, and in mathematics, 60%, as well as the students in the lowest quartile in reading, 63%, and in mathematics, 50%, contributed to the achievement of an A grade for this school year. At the conclusion of the 2008-2009 school year, Coppergate received a grade of A, 89% meeting high standards in Reading, 80% meeting high standards in math, 87% meeting high

standards in writing and 62% meeting high standards in science, AYP was not attained with 90% criteria met. 2007-2008 Coppergate received a grade of A, 86% meeting high standards in reading, 74% meeting high standards in math, 74% meeting high standards in writing and 60% meeting high standards in science. AYP was not met with 97% of the criteria met.

As a curriculum specialist for five years, I have worked with our Title 1 schools, providing professional development, model lessons, and parent-student nights for math, reading, and FCAT. The purpose of this work was to not only help teachers, administrators and students improve in the areas of reading, math and science, but to also assist parents in helping their students at home with concepts learned at school. Also I have been privileged to work with all elementary schools and secondary schools providing the same services as with Title I schools. I have also participated on many state committees for FCAT, Content Advisory for Math, ESOL, CELLA assessor, Assessment, and various other committees. I have also been a statewide trainer for the Math Science Professional Development (MSPD) for elementary teachers in the areas of math and science for two years. Also, I have received training from the state in Classroom Walkthroughs as a state trainer. I have trained in other other districts and regional training. For the Schultz Center in Jacksonville, I am a trainer for Curriculum Mapping and have led the way in the curriculum mapping process that is currently in place in our district. During my time as a curriculum specialist and then as the Director of School Improvement, Professional Development, Assessment, and ESOL training was provided in a scaffolded format for elementary teachers K-2 and grades 3-5 in Reader's and Writer's Workshop over a two to three year period with beginning and advanced training provided on Saturdays for a period of three to four months duration of each training. This training has proven to be invaluable as most of our staff is currently proficient in both workshops-beginning and advanced. With the current emphasis of Common Core State Standards, the trainings in Reader's and Writer's workshop as well as the Literacy Training with Janet Allen has proven invaluable as the training transcends time.

Instructional Coaches

of instructional coaches
1

receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Melissa (Christy) Gemmill		
Part-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 4	Years at Current School: 2

Areas	RtI/MTSS
Credentials	Certifications Professional: Elementary Education, (grades 1 - 6) Professional: Reading, Endorsement

Performance Record

Classroom Teachers

# of classroom teachers

49

 # receiving effective rating or higher

49, 100%

 # Highly Qualified Teachers

0%

 # certified in-field

, 0%

 # ESOL endorsed

15, 31%

 # reading endorsed

8, 16%

 # with advanced degrees

10, 20%

 # National Board Certified

5, 10%

 # first-year teachers

6, 12%

 # with 1-5 years of experience

20, 41%

 # with 6-14 years of experience

25, 51%

 # with 15 or more years of experience

28, 57%

Education Paraprofessionals

# of paraprofessionals

8

 # Highly Qualified

8, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel

# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above

 # receiving effective rating or higher

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

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

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

All K-10 and level 1 & 2 11th and 12th grade students will take a benchmark assessment 3 times per year. School-based leadership teams will meet after each assessment period to review student data. Quality of Tier 1 instruction will be analyzed within these meetings. Coaches are in place at each school and will focus upon supporting quality Tier 1 instruction in all content areas. Administrators will meet monthly with all grade level/content area teams. At these monthly meetings, administrators and teachers will look at specific student data and will initiate Tier 2 or Tier 3 plans for those students who are struggling to meet grade level / course expectations. These monthly meetings will focus on student achievement and the provision of appropriate, effective interventions. District and school resources will be allocated based upon individual student needs.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

The function of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is to analyze school-wide data to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction for all students. Data to be analyzed includes K-2 FAIR, 3-12 Performance Matters benchmark assessments, and formal assessments such as FCAT 2.0 and high school EOCs. The principal is the leader of the meeting. Assistant principals attend the meetings in a support role for the principal. The reading/intervention coach serves to suggest effective interventions for Tier 1 instructional needs. The Intervention Team Facilitator is present to help ensure that the district's MTSS plan is followed. Lead teachers sometimes serve on the SBLT as a liaison to other teachers in their grade/content area grouping.

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

All students receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions are tracked with the Performance Matters MTSS tracking system. Training on this tracking system took place in August, 2013. To assist administrators in

identifying which students should be receiving interventions, administrators are able to pull a report from FOCUS that will indicate which students are receiving each tier of interventions, along with a date to reassess student performance. Students listed on the FOCUS reports will be addressed at the monthly intervention meetings. At this time, the teachers and administrators – as an intervention team – will make the decision as to continue interventions at the current level, change or intensify interventions, or discontinue the intervention.

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

Core reading instruction is analyzed at the K-2 level using FAIR. Data is accessed through the PMRN and also within the Performance Matters data warehouse. In grades 3-10 (and level 1 & 2 11th and 12th grade), core reading and math instruction is analyzed using benchmark assessments within the Performance Matters system. Supplemental and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science and writing are analyzed using in-program assessments, progress monitoring assessments available through Performance Matters, District-supplied assessments, and through teacher-selected progress monitoring assessments. District specialists and reading/intervention coaches provided engagement strategy training during pre-planning of the 2013 school year and will continue to provide support in this area throughout the year.The data sources utilized are and were FCAT Reading, Math, Writing, Science, and Clay BUS data for the past year (s) as well as FAIR data for this school year and past performance of students on FAIR; Performance Matters data for math (K-6), Go Math (K-5), and Clay Writes data (K-6). The data management systems utilized is FOCUS and Performance Matters.

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

Meetings have been scheduled with school administrators and district staff (October, January & May) to discuss MTSS implementation. Meetings with Intervention Team Facilitators will meet in August, January and May to discuss and clarify procedures for documenting MTSS plans for students. A brochure explaining MTSS has been updated and posted on the district website. Copies of this brochure are available to hand to parents during conference

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Extended Day for All Students

Minutes added to school year:

Strategy Purpose(s)
""

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title
David Nix	Principal
Debra Gaynes	Assistant Principal
Kimberly Miskowski	Media Specialist
Christy Gemmill	RtI Coach
Laura Taylor	1st Grade Teacher
Sharon Cavins	4th Grade Teacher

How the school-based LLT functions

The function of the team is to troubleshoot areas of concerns in reading and all aspects of literacy. Areas are identified via collective data and recommendations are made from this committee.

Major initiatives of the LLT

One of the major functions of the group is to ensure books are placed in the hands and homes of students and families without books in their homes. We have been collecting books for all ages that will be given to students and families at our Fall Festival and other times throughout the year. Also, other major initiatives are to increase the number of words read by each student and the grade levels, as well as increase the traffic in the media center through check-outs not only of students but also of parents and grandparents. The most major initiative is to increase the number of students READING for information as well as pleasure. With the implementation of the new Accelerated Reader STAR/ENTERPRISE, more data is provided when students are given the STAR assessment at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. The data is comparable to DRA and DAR.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Preschool Transition

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(G) and 1115(c)(1)(D), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs

Most of our kindergarten students have been in preschool. In order to assist these students in the transition from preschool to an elementary school setting, during registration, tours of the school are conducted upon request. The first two days of kindergarten are staggered enrollment with the first day for students whose birthday occurs before February 1st of the current school year and the day two for the remainder of the students. During their staggered enrollment days, the students are oriented to the school, introduced to the staff, the cafeteria procedures, drop-off and pick-up procedures. Students also have sentence strip hats with their name and student number to help all of the staff identify them. These are worn all year during lunch to assist with identifying students who are purchasing lunch. Before school opens, orientation is conducted for the parents and students to meet the teacher, see the classroom and the entire school. and meet mos to the remainder of the staff. WE also conduct a parent only night for parents of kindergarteners. During the parent night, the parents meet the teacher who explains the rituals and routines. The administration introduce the Common Core State Standards and the kindergarten standard based report card to the parents.

College and Career Readiness

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

How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	72%	69%	No	75%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	55%	42%	No	60%
Hispanic	75%	67%	No	78%
White	73%	75%	Yes	76%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	51%	44%	No	56%
Economically disadvantaged	65%	60%	No	69%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	105	30%	35%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	134	39%	44%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		0%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		0%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)		69%	74%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)		74%	75%

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)			
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)			
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)			

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.			

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	52	52%	57%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4			

Area 3: Mathematics

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 and EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	63%	62%	No	67%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	48%	31%	No	53%
Hispanic	72%	67%	No	75%
White	63%	66%	Yes	66%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	41%	44%	Yes	47%
Economically disadvantaged	56%	54%	No	60%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	118	35%	40%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	89	27%	32%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6			
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains			
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)		71%	

Middle School Acceleration

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Middle school participation in high school EOC and industry certifications			
Middle school performance on high school EOC and industry certifications			

Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

Area 4: Science

Elementary School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6			
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

Middle School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6			
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)

All Levels

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)			
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students			

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses			
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more *accelerated* courses			
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in *accelerated* courses			
Students taking CTE industry certification exams			
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams			
CTE program concentrators			
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications			

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

Elementary School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time			
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	19		
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	34	37%	
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals			
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.			

Middle School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time			
Students who fail a mathematics course			
Students who fail an English Language Arts course			
Students who fail two or more courses in any subject			
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals			
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.			

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

Specific Additional Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %

Goals Summary

G1. Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grades 3-6 will improve in the area of reading by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Reading with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.

G2. Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grades 3-6 will improve in the area of math by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Math with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.

G3. Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grade 4will improve in the area of writing by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.

Goals Detail

G1. Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grades 3-6 will improve in the area of reading by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Reading with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains)

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- DAR assessment by Pearson to determine strengths and weakness in all areas of reading. Phonics for Reading is utilized in this four hour reading block one day per week. Sounds Abounds, Earobics, Text Talk, PAL series for K - 2, Phonemic Awareness in Young Children, and Rewards for grades 4 - 6.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Comprehension, Phonics, Phonemic Awareness, Vocabulary and writing are areas in which the children participating in this program struggle. Each area is addressed each week in the four-hour block of time.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Reading Intervention Plan 15 minutes Phonemic Awareness instruction 45 minutes Phonics Instruction 30 minutes of Differentiated Instruction (Small group instruction) 30 minutes Comprehension Instruction 30 minutes Independent Reading 30 minutes Teacher Modeling - Read Aloud 30 minutes of Student Journaling of written responses to read aloud 30 minutes of Progress Monitoring

Person or Persons Responsible

Christine Macher Tracy Nedresky Pam Kennett Sue Hoyt Lynn Kuske Stan Moore Karen Boree Jeanene Johnson Dania Johnston

Target Dates or Schedule:

SY 2013

Evidence of Completion:

Data collection from progress monitoring at interim and end of the 9 weeks utilizing DAR.

G2. Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grades 3-6 will improve in the area of math by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Math with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.

Targets Supported

- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains)

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Math Warm Ups (grades 3-6)

- Florida Achieves (grades 3-6)

- Math Superstars (grades K-6)

- That's a FACT (grades K-6)

- Ten Marks (grades 1-6)

- Massive Math (grades 1-6)

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Students knowledge of math facts (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division).

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Math Warm Ups Math Superstars That's A FACT Ten Marks Massive Math

Person or Persons Responsible

Debra Gaynes June HIldebrandt Heather Turner

Target Dates or Schedule:

SY 2013

Evidence of Completion:

Data collection

G3. Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grade 4will improve in the area of writing by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.

Targets Supported

- Writing

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Being a Writer for grades K - 5

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Most students do not like to write, nor do they like to put the time into writing.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Student writing for the various types of common core responses.

Person or Persons Responsible
Classroom teachers

Target Dates or Schedule:
Daily

Evidence of Completion:
Clay Writes for all grade levels; Journals for reading, math, writing, and science, FCAT 2.0 for grade 4 only.

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal   **B** = Barrier   **S** = Strategy

G1. Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grades 3-6 will improve in the area of reading by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Reading with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.

G1.B1 Comprehension, Phonics, Phonemic Awareness, Vocabulary and writing are areas in which the children participating in this program struggle. Each area is addressed each week in the four-hour block of time.

G1.B1.S1 A four hour reading intervention block will be scheduled for our targeted students who are in the lowest 25%.

Action Step 1

Reading Intervention Plan 15 minutes Phonemic Awareness instruction 45 minutes Phonics Instruction 30 minutes of Differentiated Instruction (Small group instruction) 30 minutes Comprehension Instruction 30 minutes Independent Reading 30 minutes Teacher Modeling - Read Aloud 30 minutes of Student Journaling of written responses to read aloud 30 minutes of Progress Monitoring

Person or Persons Responsible

Christine Macher Tracy Nedresky Pam Kennett Sue Hoyt W. Stan Moore Lynn Kuske

Target Dates or Schedule

SY 2013

Evidence of Completion

Data collection from progress monitoring utilizing DAR as the main instrument.

Facilitator:

Debra Gaynes

Participants:

Christine Macher, Pam Kennett, Lynn Kuske, Sue Hoyt, Dania Johnston, Stan Moore, Tracy Nedresky, Karen Boree, Jeanene Johnson

Action Step 2

Accelerated Reader Star Enterprise is the up-graded version of Accelerated Reader providing a plethora of useful data for the classroom ELA (English Language Arts) teacher.

Person or Persons Responsible

Ms. Miskowski and ELA teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Daily, weekly, quarterly

Evidence of Completion

Accelerated Reader reports of students improving reading levels as well as number of words read

Facilitator:

Ms. Miskowski

Participants:

CGE Faculty

Action Step 3

Provide tutoring either before or after school for students in grades 4 - 6 who are struggling with reading skills.

Person or Persons Responsible

Classroom teachers who apply for the position(s).

Target Dates or Schedule

Before or after school beginning in January 2014.

Evidence of Completion

Consistent attendance through attendance rosters as well as improvement on PM Reading assessments and periodic assessments by the tutor.

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S1

Reading Intervention Plan 15 minutes Phonemic Awareness instruction 45 minutes Phonics Instruction 30 minutes of Differentiated Instruction (Small group instruction) 30 minutes Comprehension Instruction 30 minutes Independent Reading 30 minutes Teacher Modeling - Read Aloud 30 minutes of Student Journaling of written responses to read aloud 30 minutes of Progress Monitoring

Person or Persons Responsible

Christine Macher Tracy Nedresky Pam Kennett Sue Hoyt

Target Dates or Schedule

SY 2013

Evidence of Completion

Data Collection from progress monitoring

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Reading Intervention Plan 15 minutes Phonemic Awareness instruction 45 minutes Phonics Instruction 30 minutes of Differentiated Instruction (Small group instruction) 30 minutes Comprehension Instruction 30 minutes Independent Reading 30 minutes Teacher Modeling - Read Aloud 30 minutes of Student Journaling of written responses to read aloud 30 minutes of Progress Monitoring

Person or Persons Responsible

Christine Macher Tracy Nedresky Pam Kennett Sue Hoyt

Target Dates or Schedule

SY 2013

Evidence of Completion

Data collection from progress monitoring

G2. Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grades 3-6 will improve in the area of math by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Math with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.

G2.B1 Students knowledge of math facts (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division).

G2.B1.S1 Students at CGE will participate in the following math programs: Math Warm Ups (3-6), Florida Achieves (3-6), Math Superstars (K-6), That's a FACT (K-6), Ten Marks (1-6), Massive Math (1-6)

Action Step 1

Math Warm Ups

Person or Persons Responsible

Grades 3-6

Target Dates or Schedule

SY 2013

Evidence of Completion

Homework

Action Step 2

Math Superstars

Person or Persons Responsible

Grades K-6

Target Dates or Schedule

SY 2013

Evidence of Completion

Homework

Action Step 3

That's A FACT

Person or Persons Responsible

Grades K-6

Target Dates or Schedule

SY 2013

Evidence of Completion

Homework

Action Step 4

Ten Marks

Person or Persons Responsible

Grades 1-6

Target Dates or Schedule

SY 2013

Evidence of Completion

Homework

Action Step 5

Massive Math

Person or Persons Responsible

Grades 1-6

Target Dates or Schedule

SY 2013

Evidence of Completion

Classroom Poster

Action Step 6

Provide math tutoring for students who continue to struggle with mathematics in grades 4 - 6.

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers who apply for tutoring positions.

Target Dates or Schedule

Tutoring to begin in January 2014.

Evidence of Completion

Consistent attendance as evidenced by tutoring attendance records as well as improvement shown on PM Math assessments and other assessments given by the teacher who is tutoring.

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B1.S1

Math programs Math Warm Ups Math Superstars That's A FACT Ten Marks Massive Math

Person or Persons Responsible

Debra Gaynes

Target Dates or Schedule

SY 2013

Evidence of Completion

Data collection

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S1

Math Warm Ups Math Superstars That's A FACT Ten Marks Massive Math

Person or Persons Responsible

Debra Gaynes

Target Dates or Schedule

SY 2013

Evidence of Completion

Data collection

G3. Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grade 4will improve in the area of writing by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.

G3.B1 Most students do not like to write, nor do they like to put the time into writing.

G3.B1.S1 We will utilize Being a Writer in grades K-5.

Action Step 1

Being A Writer program

Person or Persons Responsible

All K-5 teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

SY 2013-2014

Evidence of Completion

Student portfolio work

Facilitator:

Debra Gaynes, AP Sharon Cavins, 4th grade teacher for teachers of grades 3 - 5 Kelly Phillips, 2nd grade teacher for teachers of grades K - 2

Participants:

K-5 teachers will meet monthly in their PLC's by grade level.

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B1.S1

Implementation of Being a Writer Curriculum K - 5

Person or Persons Responsible

Mr. Nix, Principal and Mrs. Gaynes, Assistant Principal

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly CWT

Evidence of Completion

Clay Writes K - 6; CWT data; FCAT Writes 2.0 grade 4

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B1.S1

Implementation of Being a Writer Curriculum

Person or Persons Responsible

Mr. Nix, Principal and Mrs. Gaynes, Assistant Principal

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly CWT's

Evidence of Completion

Increase of student scores in Clay Writes K - 6; CWT's; FCAT Writes 2.0 grade 4 only.

Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grades 3-6 will improve in the area of reading by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Reading with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.

G1.B1 Comprehension, Phonics, Phonemic Awareness, Vocabulary and writing are areas in which the children participating in this program struggle. Each area is addressed each week in the four-hour block of time.

G1.B1.S1 A four hour reading intervention block will be scheduled for our targeted students who are in the lowest 25%.

PD Opportunity 1

Reading Intervention Plan 15 minutes Phonemic Awareness instruction 45 minutes Phonics Instruction 30 minutes of Differentiated Instruction (Small group instruction) 30 minutes Comprehension Instruction 30 minutes Independent Reading 30 minutes Teacher Modeling - Read Aloud 30 minutes of Student Journaling of written responses to read aloud 30 minutes of Progress Monitoring

Facilitator

Debra Gaynes

Participants

Christine Macher, Pam Kennett, Lynn Kuske, Sue Hoyt, Dania Johnston, Stan Moore, Tracy Nedresky, Karen Boree, Jeanene Johnson

Target Dates or Schedule

SY 2013

Evidence of Completion

Data collection from progress monitoring utilizing DAR as the main instrument.

PD Opportunity 2

Accelerated Reader Star Enterprise is the up-graded version of Accelerated Reader providing a plethora of useful data for the classroom ELA (English Language Arts) teacher.

Facilitator

Ms. Miskowski

Participants

CGE Faculty

Target Dates or Schedule

Daily, weekly, quarterly

Evidence of Completion

Accelerated Reader reports of students improving reading levels as well as number of words read

G3. Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grade 4will improve in the area of writing by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.

G3.B1 Most students do not like to write, nor do they like to put the time into writing.

G3.B1.S1 We will utilize Being a Writer in grades K-5.

PD Opportunity 1

Being A Writer program

Facilitator

Debra Gaynes, AP Sharon Cavins, 4th grade teacher for teachers of grades 3 - 5 Kelly Phillips, 2nd grade teacher for teachers of grades K - 2

Participants

K-5 teachers will meet monthly in their PLC's by grade level.

Target Dates or Schedule

SY 2013-2014

Evidence of Completion

Student portfolio work

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G1.	Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grades 3-6 will improve in the area of reading by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Reading with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.	$4,389
G2.	Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grades 3-6 will improve in the area of math by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Math with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.	$3,659
	Total	$8,048

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Evidence-Based Program	Total
School Improvement Funds 1183 $592. 65 Professional Development Funds 6400 $900 for professional materials to study	$1,492	$1,492
School Improvement Funds 1183 $933.87 and School Improvement Funds 1184 $1047.93	$1,981	$1,981
School Improvement Funds 1184	$1,832	$1,832
School Improvement Funds 1183 $1675.00 Professional Development Funds 6400 $1,068.80	$2,743	$2,743
Total	$8,048	$8,048

Budget Details
Budget items identified in the SIP as necessary to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grades 3-6 will improve in the area of reading by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Reading with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.

G1.B1 Comprehension, Phonics, Phonemic Awareness, Vocabulary and writing are areas in which the children participating in this program struggle. Each area is addressed each week in the four-hour block of time.

G1.B1.S1 A four hour reading intervention block will be scheduled for our targeted students who are in the lowest 25%.

Action Step 1

Reading Intervention Plan 15 minutes Phonemic Awareness instruction 45 minutes Phonics Instruction 30 minutes of Differentiated Instruction (Small group instruction) 30 minutes Comprehension Instruction 30 minutes Independent Reading 30 minutes Teacher Modeling - Read Aloud 30 minutes of Student Journaling of written responses to read aloud 30 minutes of Progress Monitoring

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

Resource

Phonics for Reading Levels 1 - 3 Teacher Editions and Student Editions PLC to study strategies to implement this program will continue throughout the school year.

Funding Source

School Improvement Funds 1183 $592. 65 Professional Development Funds 6400 $900 for professional materials to study

Amount Needed

$1,492

Action Step 2

Accelerated Reader Star Enterprise is the up-graded version of Accelerated Reader providing a plethora of useful data for the classroom ELA (English Language Arts) teacher.

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

Resource

Accelerated Reader Star Enterprise up-graded version of Accelerated Reader

Funding Source

School Improvement Funds 1183 $933.87 and School Improvement Funds 1184 $1047.93

Amount Needed

$1,981

Action Step 3

Provide tutoring either before or after school for students in grades 4 - 6 who are struggling with reading skills.

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

Resource

Tutoring provided by teachers

Funding Source

School Improvement Funds 1184

Amount Needed

$916

G2. Based on the data from SY 2012, by the end of SY 2013, CGE students in grades 3-6 will improve in the area of math by 5% over last year's results as measured by FCAT 2.0 Math with an emphasis on SWD and LSE.

G2.B1 Students knowledge of math facts (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division).

G2.B1.S1 Students at CGE will participate in the following math programs: Math Warm Ups (3-6), Florida Achieves (3-6), Math Superstars (K-6), That's a FACT (K-6), Ten Marks (1-6), Massive Math (1-6)

Action Step 5

Massive Math

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

Resource

Massive Math Posters, 3' x 6', with hundreds of math facts for students to complete as their work is completed in class. Professional materials for PLC's to be purchased to create a vertical PLC for mathematics.

Funding Source

School Improvement Funds 1183 $1675.00 Professional Development Funds 6400 $1,068.80

Amount Needed

$2,743

Action Step 6

Provide math tutoring for students who continue to struggle with mathematics in grades 4 - 6.

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

Resource

Tutoring provided by teachers

Funding Source

School Improvement Funds 1184

Amount Needed

$916