



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Gulf Elementary School

3400 SW 17TH PL

Cape Coral, FL 33914

239-549-2726

<http://gfe.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

School Type Elementary School	Title I No	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate 52%
Alternative/ESE Center No	Charter School No	Minority Rate 34%

School Grades History

2013-14 B	2012-13 A	2011-12 A	2010-11 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	4
Differentiated Accountability	5
Part I: Current School Status	6
Part II: Expected Improvements	15
Goals Summary	19
Goals Detail	19
Action Plan for Improvement	20
Part III: Coordination and Integration	23
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	24
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	26

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

Gulf Elementary School

Principal

Kim Verblaauw

School Advisory Council chair

Stacy Spencer

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

Name	Title
MaryBeth Grecsek	Assistant Principal
Shannon Schaal	Curriculum Specialist
Jeanne Stratton	STEM Teacher
Dani Clark	ESOL/School Counselor
Andrea Cook	ESE Teacher
Marty Tubb	5th Grade Teacher
Michelle Woolf	Kindergarten Teacher
Breanne Costa	1st Grade Teacher
Kristine Carter	2nd Grade Teacher
Janelle Williams	3rd Grade Teacher
Ellen Davis	4th Grade Teacher
Jennifer King	Behavior Specialist

District-Level Information

District

Lee

Superintendent

Dr. Nancy J Graham

Date of school board approval of SIP

10/22/2013

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

Stacy Spencer/parent is the SAC Representative. Gina Esposito/parent, Tammy Jackson/parent, Cynthia Watkins/teacher, Jose Rodriguez/staff, Shannon Schaal/teacher, Kim Verblaauw/prinicpal.

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

Discussed 2012-2013 school academic data. Revised goals for the 2013-2014 school year.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

Review academic data, informational meetings about STEM, engaging families.

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

Provide staff development in professional learning communities and analyzing data. After school tutoring for identified students not meeting grade level standards.

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC

In Compliance

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

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:

Kim Verblaauw

Principal

Years as Administrator: 9

Years at Current School: 1

Credentials

Bachelor's Degree in Education from University of Florida.
Master's Degree in Educational Leadership from NOVA.

Performance Record

MaryBeth Grecsek

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 1

Years at Current School: 18

Credentials

BS in Elementary Education from Otterbein College
MS in Educational Leadership from Barry University
Ed. S in Curriculum and Instruction from FGCU

Performance Record

Instructional Coaches

of instructional coaches

1

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Shannon Schaal

Part-time / District-based

Years as Coach: 5

Years at Current School: 11

Areas

Reading/Literacy, Data, RtI/MTSS

Credentials

Elementary Education K-6
 ESOL Endorsement
 Reading Endorsement
 Bachelor's Degree in Education from SUNY at Cortland
 Master's Degree in Educational Leadership from FGCU.

Performance Record

Classroom Teachers

of classroom teachers

69

receiving effective rating or higher

0%

Highly Qualified Teachers

100%

certified in-field

, 0%

ESOL endorsed

61, 88%

reading endorsed

6, 9%

with advanced degrees

, 0%

National Board Certified

5, 7%

first-year teachers

0, 0%

with 1-5 years of experience

9, 13%

with 6-14 years of experience

29, 42%

with 15 or more years of experience

31, 45%

Education Paraprofessionals

of paraprofessionals

21

Highly Qualified

100, 476%

Other Instructional Personnel**# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above**

1

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

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

District provides support for new teachers. Teachers that are out of field must sign a contract to obtain credentials to obtain certification. Teachers are provided a peer teacher for support.

MaryBeth Grecsek, Assistant Principal

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

Provided peer teacher within same grade level. Teacher/Peer teacher have common planning to review data and plan for learning.

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

The MTSS Leadership Team use the Tier 1 Problem Solving process to set Tier 1 goals, and monitors academic and behavioral data to evaluate progress towards those goals at least three times per year by:

1. Holding regular team meetings where problem solving is the sole focus.
2. Using the four step problem solving process as the basis for goal setting, planning, and program evaluation during all team meetings that focus on increasing student achievement or behavioral success.
3. Determining how we will know if students have made expected levels of progress towards proficiency? (What progress will show a positive response?)
4. Respond when grades, subject areas, classes, or individual students have not shown a positive response? (MTSS problem solving process and monitoring progress of instruction)
5. Responding when students are demonstrating a positive response or have met proficiency by raising goals or providing enrichment respectively.
6. Gather and analyze data at all Tiers to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by group or individual student diagnostic and progress monitoring assessment.
7. Ensure that students in need of intervention are actually receiving appropriate supplemental Tier 2

intervention. Gather ongoing progress monitoring for all interventions and analyze that data using the Tier 2 problem solving process after each progress monitoring.

Tier 2

The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support. Tier 2 problem solving meetings occur regularly (monthly is suggested) to:

1. Review OPM data for intervention groups to evaluate group and individual student response.
2. Support interventions where there is not an overall positive group response
3. Select students (see SST guidelines) for SST Tier 3 intervention

The school improvement plan (SIP) summarizes the school's academic and behavioral goals for the year and describes the school's plan to meet those goals. The specific supports and actions needed implement the SIP strategies are closely examined, planned, and monitored on the MTSS Tier 1 worksheets completed three times per year. The MTSS Problem-Solving process is used to first carry out, monitor, and adjust if necessary, the supports that are defined in the SIP. Annual goals are translated into progress monitoring (3 times per year) and ongoing progress monitoring measures (approximately once per month) that can reliably track progress on a schedule based on student need across Tiers.

Tier 2 supports are provided to students who have not met proficiency or who are at risk of not meeting proficiency.

Finally, MTSS End of Year Tier 1 problem solving evaluates the SIP efforts and dictates strategies for the next year's SIP. At this time, previous years trend data across grade levels is used to examine impact grades for support focus or prevention/early intervention efforts.

While the SIP plan does not focus on the primary (untested) grades, the MTSS leadership team extends the intent of the SIP to kindergarten, first, and second grades as they contribute extensively to later grades performance and student engagement.

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

Tier 1(Leadership Team)

- Administrator(s), MaryBeth Grecsek and Kim Verblaauw will schedule and facilitate regular Rtl meetings, ensure attendance of team members, ensure follow up of action steps, allocate resources; In addition to the school administrator(s) the school's Leadership Team will include the following members who will carry out SIP planning and MTSS problem solving
- Shannon Schaal school Reading Specialist, Jeanne Stratton school Math and Science Specialist, and Jennifer King school Behavior Specialist
- Special education personnel:
Yvette Kirgan, School Nurse, if needed
Erin De la Costa, Social Worker, if needed
Marty Uhlar or Kathy Keil, Speech and Language Pathologist, if needed
Diana Bledsoe, School Psychologist, if needed
Cathy Santoro, Michelle Brown ESE Teacher, if needed
Susan Treichler, Staffing Specialist, if needed
Doris Ramos, ESOL Representative, if needed
- School guidance counselor, Dani Clark
- Member of advisory group, community stakeholders, parents, Gina Esposito, Stacy Spencer, and
- In addition to Tier 1 problem solving, the Leadership Team members will meet periodically (specify frequency) to review consensus, infrastructure, and implementation of building level MTSS.

Tier 2

Selected members of the MTSS Leadership Team will conduct regular meetings to evaluate intervention efforts for students by subject, grade, intervention, or other logical organization.

In addition to those selected other teachers will be involved when needed to provide information or

revise efforts.

Tier 2 Members

Administration, MaryBeth Grecsek and Kim Verblaauw, Shannon Schaal school Reading Specialist, Jeanne Stratton school Math and Science specialist, Jennifer King school Behavior Specialist, and Dani Clark School Counselor.

Tier 3 SST

Selected members of the Leadership Team, Tier 2 Team, and parent/guardian make up the Tier 3 SST Problem Solving Team.

Tier 3 members:

Administration, MaryBeth Grecsek and Kim Verblaauw, Shannon Schaal school Reading Specialist, Jeanne Stratton school Math and Science Specialist, Jennifer King school Behavior Specialist, Dani Clark School Counselor and Michelle Brown ESE Specialist.

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

The Tier 1 and Tier 2 worksheets document goal lines and supports for any academic or behavioral goal listed on the SIP plan. They also document the specific plan to monitor fidelity of MTSS implementation. These documents are the centerpiece of any discussion related to these areas in any school meeting that plans, reviews, or revises efforts at increasing academic or behavioral proficiency. The 4 step problem solving process then becomes a structure for these meetings, and fidelity data is reviewed each time a group meets. Data gathered through the MTSS process informs the discussion at MTSS leadership, grade level, attendance review, Tier 2, and Tier 3 SST meetings.

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

Data Sources

Academic

- STAR reading and math assessment and STAR Early Literacy
- Oral Reading Fluency Measures
- Compass Odyssey
- Performance Matters
- Interim assessments
- State/Local Math and Science assessments
- FCAT
- Student grades
- School site specific assessments
- Great Leaps

Behavior

- Positive Behavior Support System
- Detentions
- Suspensions
- Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
- Team climate surveys
- Attendance
- Functional Assessment
- Frequency Monitoring

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

The MTSS Leadership Team will monitor the school's consensus, infrastructure, and implementation using (suggested tools can be found at http://www.floridarti.usf.edu/resources/program_evaluation/ta_manual_revised2012/index.html to reach a rating of at least 80% MTSS implementation in the school. The school will utilize back to school night to present MTSS to parents and hand out parent MTSS brochures
 A description of MTSS and MTSS parent resources will be available on the school's web site.

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: Before or After School Program
Minutes added to school year: 5,280

Certified teachers will instruct Kindergarten through 5th grade students in small groups. The curriculum for the Extended Day Program will be intensive reading, and /or mathematics instruction for students who are below district and state standards. The instruction will target specific areas that students are weak in and will continuously be assessed to determine mastery.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education
- Teacher collaboration, planning and professional development

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

Data is collected by homeroom teachers, after school program teachers, and administration. This data is reviewed on a consistent basis and instruction is revised as necessary. At the end of each semester grade level data is reviewed to determine the effectiveness of the program by evaluating student gains and comparing students in the program against those not in the program. Professional Learning Communities are also beneficial in determining the effectiveness of this strategy.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Shannon Schaal, the Curriculum Specialist and coordinator of the Extended School Day program is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the strategy.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

Name	Title
Kim Verblaauw	Principal
MaryBeth Grecsek	Assistant Principal
Shannon Schaal	Curriculum/Reading Specialist
Jeanne Stratton	Math and Science Specialist

Name	Title
Jennifer King	Behavior Specialist
Michelle Molloy	1st Grade/PLC Team Facilitator
Leslie Mikell	K/PLC Team Facilitator
Rachelle Resendes	3rd/PLC Team Facilitator
Reginna Notarianni	3rd/PLC Team Facilitator

How the school-based LLT functions

Work as a Professional Learning Community, with everyone having a role in determining the vision and the implementation plan, and each member bringing specific expertise to building the culture of literacy in the school. The LLT will meet 1x per month.

Major initiatives of the LLT

Reading Leadership Teams will be encouraged and supported in developing Lesson Studies to focus on developing and implementing instructional routines that use complex text and incorporate text dependent questions. Multi-disciplinary teams will develop lessons that provide students with opportunities for research and incorporate writing throughout. The team will also participate in a book study.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

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

1. Teachers consistently implement high quality initial instruction and follow-up small group instruction that is well-differentiated according to student needs.
2. Teachers use student data to guide reading instruction.
3. Resources are provided for teachers to implement interventions for struggling readers.
4. Providing excellent, ongoing professional development for Reading Instruction.
5. Providing teacher adequate materials to support high quality instruction.
6. Each classroom has a library of books written at different levels of difficulty.
7. Teachers provide students with supplemental reading materials as well as access to technology to improve student reading skills. This is monitored through lesson plans, classroom walk-thoughts, PLC Data chats, as well as grade level intervention time, sharing lesson plans, model classrooms, teachers training teachers.

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

Administration of kindergarden screening tool. Provide extended school day for students who who been identified in STAR Early Literacy.

College and Career Readiness

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

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	78%	75%	No	81%
American Indian				
Asian	86%	100%	Yes	87%
Black/African American	56%	42%	No	60%
Hispanic	74%	64%	No	77%
White	80%	79%	No	82%
English language learners	34%	30%	No	41%
Students with disabilities	48%	35%	No	53%
Economically disadvantaged	71%	66%	No	74%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	81	27%	32%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	141	47%	49%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

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

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	288	64%	68%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	69	61%	64%

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)	13	50%	60%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		26%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		15%

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	113	60%	65%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		3%

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	76%	73%	No	78%
American Indian				
Asian	100%	100%	Yes	100%
Black/African American	48%	53%	Yes	53%
Hispanic	74%	63%	No	77%
White	78%	77%	No	80%
English language learners	43%	40%	No	49%
Students with disabilities	43%	37%	No	49%
Economically disadvantaged	70%	63%	No	73%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	195	35%	39%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	216	37%	39%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		3%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		3%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	192	64%	68%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	68	61%	67%

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			

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)	7		25
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	700	70%	90%

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	84	8%	6%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	10	1%	0%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	21	11%	8%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	8	0%	0%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	3	0%	0%

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

Implementation of Watch D.O.G.S. program, Dad's of Great Students. Dad's volunteer 1 full day per year. Math Night, STEM Night, Book Fair, Fall Festival, Technology Tools for Parents, SAC and PTO meetings, Conferences, Music Performances, Talent Show, Field Day.

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.** All teachers will routinely plan for learning and engaging students in reading informational text and the research process to perform tasks across the content areas including writing within the content areas as measured by lesson plans, classroom walkthru

Goals Detail

G1. All teachers will routinely plan for learning and engaging students in reading informational text and the research process to perform tasks across the content areas including writing within the content areas as measured by lesson plans, classroom walkthru

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, Learning Gains, CELLA)
- Writing
- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains)
- Science
- Science - Elementary School
- STEM
- STEM - All Levels

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- C-Palms, Compass, new reading and math curriculum, STEM special, technology special
- PLCs, common planning time, professional development
- Extended School Day, MTSS

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teachers lack knowledge of collaborative, data driven analysis of instruction

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

PLC meeting scheduled, charting remediation, writing samples.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule:

Monthly

Evidence of Completion:

PLC agendas, meeting minutes, grade level data, lesson plans. Mid year and end of year assessments.

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. All teachers will routinely plan for learning and engaging students in reading informational text and the research process to perform tasks across the content areas including writing within the content areas as measured by lesson plans, classroom walkthro

G1.B1 Teachers lack knowledge of collaborative, data driven analysis of instruction

G1.B1.S1 Design and implement ongoing support through structured PLCs.

Action Step 1

Delivered professional development, sharing data and PLC structure to staff

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration/Leadership Team

Target Dates or Schedule

August 1, 2013

Evidence of Completion

agenda, sign in sheets

Facilitator:

Administration and leadership team

Participants:

All teachers

Action Step 2

Established guidelines to establish PLCs, created handbook and expectations and protocols of the first six meetings

Person or Persons Responsible

School based leadership/administration

Target Dates or Schedule

August 12, 2013

Evidence of Completion

submission of grade level norms, SMART goals, Professional Learning Team Data-Literacy, Structuring Data Conversation worksheet

Action Step 3

Ongoing collaboration: Plan, establish and publish agendas from PLC meetings, facilitate meetings, meeting minutes, facilitate weekly sign in sheets to the meetings, track and log

Person or Persons Responsible

School based PLC in collaboration with administration and school leadership

Target Dates or Schedule

ongoing weekly

Evidence of Completion

minutes, agenda, student data, instruction and intervention plans

Facilitator:

PLC grade level leaders

Participants:

All teachers

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

Design and implement ongoing support for teachers through structured PLCs (weekly)

Person or Persons Responsible

school based administration and leadership teams

Target Dates or Schedule

ongoing

Evidence of Completion

PLC agendas, minutes, classroom walkthrough data collection, data chats, individual professional development plans

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

collect and analyze student data to monitor for mastery of standards

Person or Persons Responsible

administration

Target Dates or Schedule

ongoing monthly

Evidence of Completion

MTSS/student progress monitoring data

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

We will use supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows: Title 2

- training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL, ESE, Implementation of CCSS.

- training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols

Title III funds are used to supplement and enhance the programs for English Language Learner (ELL) and Recently Arrived Immigrant Children and Youth by providing funds to implement and/or provide:

- tutorial programs
- parent outreach activities
- professional development on best practices for ESOL and content area teachers
- coaching and mentoring for ESOL and content area teachers
- reading and supplementary instructional materials(K-5)
- cultural supplementary instructional materials (K-5)
- purchase of supplemental hardware and software for the development of language and literacy skills in reading, mathematics and science.

SAI supplemental funds will be used for improving reading and math for students by providing them after school tutoring four days a week.

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. All teachers will routinely plan for learning and engaging students in reading informational text and the research process to perform tasks across the content areas including writing within the content areas as measured by lesson plans, classroom walkthru

G1.B1 Teachers lack knowledge of collaborative, data driven analysis of instruction

G1.B1.S1 Design and implement ongoing support through structured PLCs.

PD Opportunity 1

Delivered professional development, sharing data and PLC structure to staff

Facilitator

Administration and leadership team

Participants

All teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

August 1, 2013

Evidence of Completion

agenda, sign in sheets

PD Opportunity 2

Ongoing collaboration: Plan, establish and publish agendas from PLC meetings, facilitate meetings, meeting minutes, facilitate weekly sign in sheets to the meetings, track and log

Facilitator

PLC grade level leaders

Participants

All teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

ongoing weekly

Evidence of Completion

minutes, agenda, student data, instruction and intervention plans

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G1.	All teachers will routinely plan for learning and engaging students in reading informational text and the research process to perform tasks across the content areas including writing within the content areas as measured by lesson plans, classroom walkthru	\$6,000
Total		\$6,000

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Professional Development	Evidence-Based Materials	Total
SIP	\$5,000	\$1,000	\$6,000
Total	\$5,000	\$1,000	\$6,000

Budget Details

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

G1. All teachers will routinely plan for learning and engaging students in reading informational text and the research process to perform tasks across the content areas including writing within the content areas as measured by lesson plans, classroom walkthru

G1.B1 Teachers lack knowledge of collaborative, data driven analysis of instruction

G1.B1.S1 Design and implement ongoing support through structured PLCs.

Action Step 1

Delivered professional development, sharing data and PLC structure to staff

Resource Type

Professional Development

Resource

Teachers will attend local and State trainings to assist with the implementation of PLC and CCSS.

Funding Source

SIP

Amount Needed

\$5,000

Action Step 3

Ongoing collaboration: Plan, establish and publish agendas from PLC meetings, facilitate meetings, meeting minutes, facilitate weekly sign in sheets to the meetings, track and log

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Materials

Resource

CCSS map resources, book study for PLC (Grading for Learning), attend trainings.

Funding Source

SIP

Amount Needed

\$1,000