



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Umatilla Elementary School

401 LAKE ST

Umatilla, FL 32784

352-669-3181

<http://lake.k12.fl.us/uel>

School Demographics

School Type
Elementary School

Title I
No

Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
66%

Alternative/ESE Center
No

Charter School
No

Minority Rate
23%

School Grades History

2013-14
A

2012-13
A

2011-12
B

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	19
Goals Summary	23
Goals Detail	23
Action Plan for Improvement	25
Part III: Coordination and Integration	29
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	30
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	32

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

Umatilla Elementary School

Principal

Debra Rogers

School Advisory Council chair

Kristin Thompson

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

Name	Title
Debra Rogers	Principal
William Gagnon	Assistant Principal
Cheryl Cole	Guidance
Belinda Fuqua	ESE Specialist
Tia Gruetzmacher	CRT
Kimberly Jo McCarraher	Literacy Coach

District-Level Information

District

Lake

Superintendent

Dr. Susan Moxley

Date of school board approval of SIP

12/16/2013

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

Debra Rogers, Principal
 Kristin Thompson, SAC Chair Person
 Betsy Mullen, Recording Secretary

The School Advisory Council (SAC) is composed of the principal and a balanced number of elected teachers, education support employees, and parents, along with appointed business and community people, who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school.

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

SAC evaluates the SIP and recommends changes if needed. They ensure the plan is designed to achieve the state education goals and student performance standards.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

SAC will be involved in the following activities for the upcoming year:

1. Provide input on discretionary spending.
2. Review and approve school-based policies, including policies governing school safety and discipline, truancy, extracurricular activities, and other.
3. Act as a vehicle to develop a culture of community support and involvement in decision-making for school-based policy.
4. Support and promote the programs and initiatives they approved.
5. Examine data on the effectiveness of school-based programs and services and periodically review and revise Action Plan strategies and recommendations to ensure progress continues towards reaching our goals.

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

At this time, no funds are available.

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:

Debra Rogers

Principal

Years as Administrator: 11

Years at Current School: 5

Credentials

BA in Elementary Education
 MA in Educational Leadership
 Certifications include:
 Elementary Education (Grades 1-6)
 School Principal (all levels)

Performance Record

Umatilla Elementary School - Principal
 2012-13 Grade: A
 Reading: 65% of students reading at or above grade level, 69% of students making a year's worth of progress, AMO: Target: 65%: Actual 65%
 Math: 60% of students at or above grade level; 72% of students making a year's worth of progress, AMO: Target: 62%; Actual: 60%
 Writing: 60% of students met state standards in writing,
 Science: 56% of students at or above grade level
 AYP: No Umatilla Elementary School - Principal
 2011-12 Grade: B
 Reading: 60 % of students reading at or above grade level, 68% of students making a year's worth of progress
 Math: 56% of students at or above grade level; 69% of students making a year's worth of progress
 Writing: 79% of students met state standards in writing
 Science: 47% of students at or above grade level
 AYP: No Umatilla Elementary School - Principal
 2010-11 Grade: A
 Reading: 79% of students reading at or above grade level, 67% of students making a year's worth of progress, 67% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress
 Math: 77% of students at or above grade level, 67% of students making a year's worth of progress, 70% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress
 Writing: 87% of students met state standards in writing
 Science: 72% of students at or above grade level
 AYP: No
 Umatilla Elementary School - Assistant Principal
 2009-10 Grade: A
 Reading: 83% of students reading at or above grade level, 72% of students making a year's worth of progress, 52% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress
 Math: 79% of students at or above grade level, 62% of students making a year's worth of progress, 59% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress
 Writing: 76% of students met state standards in writing
 Science 67% of students at or above grade level
 AYP: No
 Mount Dora High School - Assistant Principal
 2008-09 Grade: C

2007-08 Grade: B
2006-07 Grade: C
2005-06 Grade: C

William Gagnon

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 11

Years at Current School: 2

Credentials

BA in History/Social Studies Education

MA in Educational Leadership

Certifications Include:

Social Science (Grades 5-9)

History (Grades 6-12)

Educational Leadership (all levels)

Performance Record

Umatilla Elementary School - Assistant Principal

2012-13 Grade: A

Reading: 65% of students reading at or above grade level, 69% of students making a year's worth of progress, AMO: Target: 65%:

Actual 65%

Math: 60% of students at or above grade level; 72% of students making a year's worth of progress, AMO: Target: 62%; Actual: 60%

Writing: 60% of students met state standards in writing,

Science: 56% of students at or above grade level

AYP: No Umatilla Elementary School - Assistant Principal

2011-12 Grade: B

Reading: 60 % of students reading at or above grade level, 68% of students making a year's worth of progress

Math: 56% of students at or above grade level; 69% of students making a year's worth of progress

Writing: 79% of students met state standards in writing

Science: 47% of students at or above grade level

AYP: No

Eustis High School - Assistant Principal

2010-11 Grade: B

Reading: 46% of students reading at or above grade level, 47% of students making a year's worth of progress, 41% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress

Math: 71% of students at or above grade level, 70% of students making a year's worth of progress, 61% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress

Writing: 68% of students met state standards in writing

Science: 68% of students at or above grade level

AYP: No

Eustis High School - Assistant Principal

2009-10 Grade: B

Carver Middle School - Assistant Principal

2008-09 Grade: A

Eustis High School - Assistant Principal

2007-08 Grade: C

2006-07 Grade: D

2005-06 Grade: C

2004-05 Grade: C

Instructional Coaches

of instructional coaches

2

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:**Kimberly Jo McCarraher**

Full-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 3

Years at Current School: 7

Areas

Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, Science, Data, RtI/MTSS

Credentials

BA in Elementary Education (K-6)

Certifications:

Elementary Education and Early Childhood, ESE K-12

Endorsements:

ESOL and Reading K-12

Performance Record

2012-13 Umatilla Elementary, A School, AYP - yes

Reading Proficiency 65%, Math 60%, Writing - 60%

Reading AMOs -Target: 65 % Actual: 65%

Math AMOs - Target: 62% Actual: 60 %

2011-12 Umatilla Elementary, B School, AYP - no

Reading Proficiency 60%, Math 56%, Writing 79%

2010-11 Umatilla Elementary, A School, AYP - no

Reading Proficiency 70%, Math 77%, Writing 87%

2009-10 Umatilla Elementary, A school, AYP - no

Reading Proficiency 83%, Math 79%, Writing 76%

2008-09 Umatilla Elementary, A school, AYP - yes

Reading Proficiency 83%, Math 84%, Writing 83%

2007-08 Umatilla Elementary, A school, AYP - no

Reading Proficiency 81%, Math 79%, Writing 63%

Tia Gruetzmacher

Full-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 3

Years at Current School: 5

Areas

Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, Science, Data, RtI/MTSS

Credentials

BA in Humanities/Liberal Arts

Certification:

Elementary Education K-6

Endorsements:

ESOL

National Board Certified

Performance Record

2012-13 Umatilla Elementary, A School, AYP - yes

Reading Proficiency 65%, Math 60%, Writing - 60%

Reading AMOs -Target: 65 % Actual: 65%

Math AMOs - Target: 62% Actual: 60 %

2011-12 Umatilla Elementary, B School, AYP - no

Reading Proficiency 60%, Math 56%, Writing 79%

2010-11 Umatilla Elementary, A School, AYP - no

Reading Proficiency 70%, Math 77%, Writing 87%

2009-10 Umatilla Elementary, A school, AYP - no

Reading Proficiency 83%, Math 79%, Writing 76%

2008-09 Umatilla Elementary, A school, AYP - yes

Reading Proficiency 83%, Math 84%, Writing 83%

2007-08 Umatilla Elementary, A school, AYP - no

Reading Proficiency 81%, Math 79%, Writing 63%

Classroom Teachers**# of classroom teachers**

42

receiving effective rating or higher

42, 100%

Highly Qualified Teachers

100%

certified in-field

42, 100%

ESOL endorsed

42, 100%

reading endorsed

5, 12%

with advanced degrees

22, 52%

National Board Certified

3, 7%

first-year teachers

0, 0%

with 1-5 years of experience

3, 7%

with 6-14 years of experience

14, 33%

with 15 or more years of experience

25, 60%

Education Paraprofessionals**# of paraprofessionals**

11

Highly Qualified

11, 100%

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

2

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

Mrs. Rogers screens and interviews each candidate using "Ventures for Excellence" interview process with special consideration given to references and recommendations. All teachers under consideration must be highly qualified. The TQR contact assures that any new teachers are familiar with county/school policies and procedures. Mentor teachers are assigned to new teachers, as well as veteran teachers that are new to our school.

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

New teachers are assigned a mentor in the same grade level. Mentors help the new teacher become familiar with the school, its culture, student body, rules, opportunities and challenges. The mentor shares resources with the novice teacher. New teachers are offered opportunities to observe exemplary teaching and discuss improvements to classroom and instructional practices. Weekly grade level articulation meetings are held to ensure curriculum guidelines are being met. We encourage teachers to take advantage of the opportunity to participate in our County Professional Development classes. The administrative team reviews student data and classroom walkthroughs. As a team, they determine the strengths and weaknesses, then prescribe specific professional development classes as needed.

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

Teachers refer students for MTSS and meetings are scheduled accordingly. Assessment results are analyzed and interventions are set in place. The team convenes 6-7 weeks later to review results of all data to help determine area of deficiency and make adjustments to interventions as necessary. Fidelity assurance roles will be assigned and follow-up meeting dates will be scheduled. All grade level teams and administrative teams have been trained in the MTSS Process and work closely with Guidance, Literacy Coach and the Curriculum Resource Teacher in providing interventions and monitoring of students.

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

The school-based leadership team consists of the Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Specialist, Guidance Counselor, Literacy Coach, and Curriculum Resource Teacher. In an effort to improve student performance in the areas of curriculum and behavior, the MTSS team meets one time per 9 weeks with each grade level to discuss and analyze data for all students. The MTSS team can pinpoint areas of concern for students and school as a whole and consequently take action to address those needs in the school improvement plan.

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

The leadership team conducts walkthroughs to ensure classroom strategies for improvement address the needs of students at all levels of learning. The leadership team collects student data to determine if students are making progress toward the attainment of their goal. Fidelity Logs are checked and collected with the principal's signature as RtI meetings are scheduled.

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

The curriculum team at Umatilla Elementary School has created a notebook system to organize data for each teacher. Teachers keep detailed records pertaining to student progress. Data included in the notebooks are: FCAT 2.0, progress monitoring, FAIR and Edusoft results, Moby Max Placement test results, and Renaissance Learning Data. Students' grades are also included: quarterly progress reports and report card grades.

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

Guidance Counselor presents an in-service each year during pre-planning to update and train teachers on the RtI forms, processes and procedures. On-going professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time. District staff will provide on-going training and support as needed. On-going support will be provided to classroom teachers. The MTSS Team will meet regularly with classroom teachers to review student data and progress and decide the appropriate curriculum and intervention for each student.

Parents receive invitations to the RTI team meetings with options for them to respond as to whether they

can attend. Parents are provided follow up letters with a summary of what plan will be implemented for their child if they are unable to attend.

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: 1,680

The Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy offers a Teen Trendsetters Reading Mentoring program for struggling 3rd graders. Select ROTC students from Umatilla High School receive training to become effective leaders and mentors as they serve as positive role models to their younger peers. They provide one-on-one reading attention in reading comprehension and vocabulary to our students for one hour a week throughout the school year. Our third graders receive approximately 15 free books to build their home library.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

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

To determine the effectiveness of this program the following data is collected and analyzed: FAIR and STAR Reading.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

The Umatilla High School ROTC Commander and Umatilla Elementary Literacy Coach are responsible for monitoring the implementation of this program.

Strategy: Before or After School Program**Minutes added to school year:** 868

Science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) is offered to students in grades 3-5. STEM integrates the four disciplines into one cohesive teaching and learning environment. Students are engaged in real world problems and experiences through project-based, experiential learning activities that lead to higher level thinking. The STEM environment compels students to understand issues, identify problems, and understand processes that lead to innovative solutions.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education

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

To determine the effectiveness of this program the following data is collected: FCAT 2.0, Moby Math, and Edusoft.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

PE Coach and administrators are responsible for monitoring STEM.

Strategy: Before or After School Program**Minutes added to school year:** 1,320

Umatilla Elementary offers after school tutoring in reading and math, twice weekly for four months and is taught by highly qualified teachers. This program is offered to our lower quartile students in grades 3-5. In reading, students are given concentrated practice to reinforce essential reading strategies. Students concentrate on applying one strategy to short pieces of text and are provided experience with short-response questions to make sure they fully grasp the strategy. Math provides instruction to teach every standard with a five-step scaffold approach and focuses on both length and question format of the FCAT 2.0. Both programs provide explicit instruction to include lesson plans and materials.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

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

To determine the effectiveness of this program the following data is collected and analyzed: FAIR, STAR Reading, Moby Math, Edusoft and FCAT 2.0

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

The CRT and teachers are responsible for implementing this program.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)**Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT**

Name	Title
Debra Rogers	Principal
William Gagnon	Assistant Principal
Belinda Fuqua	ESE Specialist
Tia Gruetzmacher	CRT
Kimberly Jo McCarraher	Literacy Coach
Cheryl Cole	Guidance

How the school-based LLT functions

The LLT meets each Monday morning to discuss literacy needs, goals and strategies to achieve the highest level of literacy in every grade level. Administration drives instruction by providing data analysis and training opportunities as needed. The Literacy Coach implements school, district and state literacy initiatives and trains teachers through classroom modeling and grade level meetings. The Guidance Counselor and ESE Specialist place students in appropriate programs based on need and status of eligibility. The Curriculum Resource Teacher maintains that Curriculum BLUEPRINT/Maps and pacing guides are in place and are being implemented accordingly.

Major initiatives of the LLT

Our first major initiative for 2013-14 includes the continuation of Thinking Map Strategies to build common language throughout each grade level and subject. Thinking Maps are used as a teaching tool to foster and encourage lifelong learning.

A second initiative is to continue the implementation of Common Core "Shifts" in English Language Arts and Math to ensure our students are C2 Ready.

Our final initiative is to utilize Kagan structures to achieve greater success through the implementation of cooperative learning strategies.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

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

To ensure every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student, data chats will be held to disaggregate FCAT 2.0, FAIR, Edusoft, Moby Max, and Renaissance/STAR Reading results. Student Teams Achieving Reading Success (STARS) groups will be created to address specific needs of all students based on the data analysis. STARS is a daily 30 minute program which provides targeted intervention for student skill areas at all levels from remedial to enrichment. Within STARS group setting, students will be given individualized strategies to target areas of concern illuminated in data. The effectiveness of STARS will be determined by monitoring student progress through FCAT 2.0, FAIR, Edusoft, Moby Max and Renaissance/ STAR Reading.

Additionally, all teachers will incorporate reading strategies in all content areas. Ongoing strategies will be used with reading, writing and speaking tasks grounded in evidence from text. Teachers will provide regular practice with complex text, higher order thinking questions, and academic language.

Based on data, teachers will differentiate their instruction as a way to reach students with different learning styles and different abilities to help them learn information as well as meeting accommodations for ESE, 504, RtI and ELL Plans.

The administrative team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure proper reading strategies are addressing the needs of all students.

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

UES has 3 Pre-K units on sight. The children that are part of these units participate in school activities, helping them to make an easy adjustment to kindergarten.

At the end of each school year, Pre-K children from local programs visit our school to meet the kindergarten teachers and tour the campus. We also host Kindergarten Round-up to register students. On this night the entire family attends and children tour the lunchroom, library, PE area, classrooms, and ride a school bus. These activities help the student experience the school environment prior to the beginning of the school year, to ease their transition.

Incoming Kindergarten students are Pre-tested by Kindergarten teachers prior to the beginning of the school year to assess their kindergarten readiness and to help teachers plan for the needs of incoming students.

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	65%	65%	Yes	69%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	53%	42%	Yes	57%
Hispanic	54%	47%	No	59%
White	67%	69%	Yes	70%
English language learners	33%	27%	No	39%
Students with disabilities	38%	29%	No	45%
Economically disadvantaged	59%	59%	Yes	63%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	91	31%	34%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	101	34%	36%

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>		0%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		100%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	131	69%	74%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	41	71%	76%

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)	17	40%	42%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	10	24%	26%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		19%

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	60	60%	65%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		2%

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	62%	60%	Yes	66%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	53%	25%	No	57%
Hispanic	51%	55%	Yes	56%
White	64%	63%	Yes	68%
English language learners	33%	33%	Yes	39%
Students with disabilities	40%	24%	No	46%
Economically disadvantaged	56%	52%	No	60%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	97	33%	36%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	79	27%	29%

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>		0%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		100%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	231	72%	77%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	72	72%	77%

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	67	34%	39%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	40	20%	25%

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>		
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		

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)	8		8
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	532	85%	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	86	13%	7%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	34	5%	0%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	38	35%	30%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	23	4%	1%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	4	1%	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

1. Increase Attendance at Curriculum Nights - Curriculum nights will be held for each grade level. A 30 minute general meeting is hosted by the administrative team to address parent support, school website, FCAT testing, online math programs, bully prevention, and general information. Parents will then be hosted in their child's classroom for more specific information and a question and answer session.
2. Report Card Nights - Report Card Nights are held the first 3 nine weeks of the school year. At these meetings, parents meet one on one with the teachers to discuss their child's progress and recent report card.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Curriculum Nights	430	70%	85%
Report Card Nights	500	80%	95%

Goals Summary

- G1.** UES will increase learning gains in reading by using Kagan strategies and Thinking Maps in order to aid in shifts leading to a culture of common core rigor.
- G2.** UES will increase the learning gains in math by using Kagan strategies and Thinking Maps in order to aid in shifts leading to a culture of common core rigor.

Goals Detail

G1. UES will increase learning gains in reading by using Kagan strategies and Thinking Maps in order to aid in shifts leading to a culture of common core rigor.

Targets Supported

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Thinking Maps binders were distributed to each teacher in 2012-13. Teachers were trained through Lake County personnel with follow-up meetings throughout the year. UES will continue the use of Thinking Maps to build a strong common language through all subjects and grade levels. This tool will help foster and encourage lifelong learning.
- Several teachers have attended Kagan Cooperative Learning classes and have presented strategies to the staff during faculty meetings. This method of sharing will continue for 2013-14. Kagan strategies will increase student engagement during instructional delivery through the use of student discourse.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- One of the greatest challenges our classroom teachers face is letting go of traditional methods of teaching.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Data will be collected from FAIR, STAR Reading, and Edusoft

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative Team

Target Dates or Schedule:

FAIR scores will be monitored after each assessment period. STAR Reading will be monitored quarterly and Edusoft in September and January.

Evidence of Completion:

Increased scores on FAIR, STAR Reading, Edusoft will be used to monitor progress toward reaching the goal.

G2. UES will increase the learning gains in math by using Kagan strategies and Thinking Maps in order to aid in shifts leading to a culture of common core rigor.

Targets Supported

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Thinking Maps binders were distributed to each teacher in 2012-13. Teachers were trained through Lake County personnel with follow-up meetings throughout the year. UES will continue the use of Thinking Maps to build a strong common language through all subjects and grade levels. This tool will help foster and encourage lifelong learning.
- Several teachers have attended Kagan Cooperative Learning classes and have presented Kagan strategies to the staff during faculty meetings. This method of sharing will continue for 2013-14. Kagan strategies will increase student engagement during instructional delivery through the use of student discourse.
- Capacity Builders attending C2 Collaborative Cohort Professional Learning Series will share the information on Professional Development Day held the third Wednesday of each month.
- Moby Max online program allows students to work on their specific skill needs. It will remediate missing skills and accelerate students onward if they are ready. It can be used in school and at home.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- One of the greatest challenges our classroom teachers face is letting go of traditional methods of teaching.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

EduSoft Reports, FCAT 2.0 Scores, Moby scores.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative Team

Target Dates or Schedule:

Scores will be monitored monthly and/or quarterly as applicable.

Evidence of Completion:

Increase scores on Edusoft LBA testing, FCAT 2.0 Math, and Moby Placement will show if satisfactory progress is made.

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. UES will increase learning gains in reading by using Kagan strategies and Thinking Maps in order to aid in shifts leading to a culture of common core rigor.

G1.B2 One of the greatest challenges our classroom teachers face is letting go of traditional methods of teaching.

G1.B2.S1 Model Kagan strategies for teachers who are reluctant to transition to cooperative learning strategies in their classroom.

Action Step 1

During monthly faculty meetings, one grade level will share a Kagan Strategy(s) they have implemented in their classroom. The UES Faculty will be asked to integrate one or more of these strategies as part of their lessons throughout the day. The following steps will be used to advocate the use of these strategies for the resistant teacher: 1) A Kagan Strategy will be used during each faculty meeting so teachers can derive the rationale from their own experience; and 2) the Literacy Coach will demonstrate Kagan strategies for classroom teachers as needed. The Literacy Coach will begin with a very simple structure like RoundRobin, RallyRobin, or Talking Chips. The classroom teacher will be encouraged to repeat the same structure until the teacher and students are comfortable with the strategy and it becomes a part of the way lessons are taught. Last of all, teachers will be encouraged to find at least one other teacher who is using Kagan structures so they can share and problem solve together.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

During monthly faculty meetings from October-May.

Evidence of Completion

Classroom walkthroughs, Formal and Informal Observations

Facilitator:

Literacy Coach

Participants:

UES Faculty

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B2.S1

Classroom Walk throughs and Formal Observations

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Daily, Weekly, as scheduled

Evidence of Completion

TEAM Evaluations, lesson plans, Walk through check lists, Observations

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S1

LBA Assessments, Mini Benchmark Assessments, Classroom Teacher evidence, FAIR, STAR Reading, observations

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

EduSoft Reports, FCAT scores, FAIR reports, classroom grades, lesson plans

G2. UES will increase the learning gains in math by using Kagan strategies and Thinking Maps in order to aid in shifts leading to a culture of common core rigor.

G2.B2 One of the greatest challenges our classroom teachers face is letting go of traditional methods of teaching.

G2.B2.S1 Monthly Mini Meetings will be held to address the use of Thinking Maps in the classroom for mathematical skills and problem solving. Provide teachers with examples and resources that they can easily transition into their classrooms. The Curriculum Resource Teacher will present these meetings as grade level specific applications.

Action Step 1

Mini Meetings for use of Thinking Maps in Math

Person or Persons Responsible

Curriculum resource teacher will present to each teacher in each grade level monthly- strategies for using Thinking Maps in mathematics.

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

classroom walk throughs, student evidence

Facilitator:

Tia Gruetzmacher, Curriculum resource Teacher

Participants:

UES Faculty

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B2.S1

Classroom walk throughs, Informal and Formal Observations

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Daily, Weekly, as scheduled

Evidence of Completion

TEAM evaluations, lesson plans, Walk through check lists, observations

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B2.S1

LAB Assessments, Mini Benchmark Assessments, Moby Math Placement tests, observations

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly, Quarterly, as needed

Evidence of Completion

EduSoft Reports, FCAT Scores, Moby Math Reports, classroom grades, lesson plans

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

SAI - Our SAI funds will be used to implement our after school tutoring program for grades 3, 4 and 5. For one hour, twice a week, students from our lower quartile will be tutored in Reading and Math.

Title III - Our Title III fund will be used for a teacher assistant to work with our ELL students, helping them to acquire needed skills to close their achievement gaps.

Title II - Funds are used to increase student achievement by elevating teacher and principal quality through recruitment, hiring, and retention strategies.

Title I - Any Title I funds received are used for an after school tutoring program for our homeless students. This program is one hour, twice a week for reading and math K-5.

Violence Prevention Programs - Our school uses the Be a Buddy, Not a Bully program. Through this program students learn the character traits for good citizenship, how to prevent bullying, and how to improve self esteem. This is an ongoing program of in class lessons presented by our Guidance Counselor throughout the year.

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. UES will increase learning gains in reading by using Kagan strategies and Thinking Maps in order to aid in shifts leading to a culture of common core rigor.

G1.B2 One of the greatest challenges our classroom teachers face is letting go of traditional methods of teaching.

G1.B2.S1 Model Kagan strategies for teachers who are reluctant to transition to cooperative learning strategies in their classroom.

PD Opportunity 1

During monthly faculty meetings, one grade level will share a Kagan Strategy(s) they have implemented in their classroom. The UES Faculty will be asked to integrate one or more of these strategies as part of their lessons throughout the day. The following steps will be used to advocate the use of these strategies for the resistant teacher: 1) A Kagan Strategy will be used during each faculty meeting so teachers can derive the rationale from their own experience; and 2) the Literacy Coach will demonstrate Kagan strategies for classroom teachers as needed. The Literacy Coach will begin with a very simple structure like RoundRobin, RallyRobin, or Talking Chips. The classroom teacher will be encouraged to repeat the same structure until the teacher and students are comfortable with the strategy and it becomes a part of the way lessons are taught. Last of all, teachers will be encouraged to find at least one other teacher who is using Kagan structures so they can share and problem solve together.

Facilitator

Literacy Coach

Participants

UES Faculty

Target Dates or Schedule

During monthly faculty meetings from October-May.

Evidence of Completion

Classroom walkthroughs, Formal and Informal Observations

G2. UES will increase the learning gains in math by using Kagan strategies and Thinking Maps in order to aid in shifts leading to a culture of common core rigor.

G2.B2 One of the greatest challenges our classroom teachers face is letting go of traditional methods of teaching.

G2.B2.S1 Monthly Mini Meetings will be held to address the use of Thinking Maps in the classroom for mathematical skills and problem solving. Provide teachers with examples and resources that they can easily transition into their classrooms. The Curriculum Resource Teacher will present these meetings as grade level specific applications.

PD Opportunity 1

Mini Meetings for use of Thinking Maps in Math

Facilitator

Tia Gruetzmacher, Curriculum resource Teacher

Participants

UES Faculty

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

classroom walk throughs, student evidence

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
	Total	\$0

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Evidence-Based Program	Total
		\$0
Total		\$0

Budget Details

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

G1. UES will increase learning gains in reading by using Kagan strategies and Thinking Maps in order to aid in shifts leading to a culture of common core rigor.

G1.B2 One of the greatest challenges our classroom teachers face is letting go of traditional methods of teaching.

G1.B2.S1 Model Kagan strategies for teachers who are reluctant to transition to cooperative learning strategies in their classroom.

Action Step 1

During monthly faculty meetings, one grade level will share a Kagan Strategy(s) they have implemented in their classroom. The UES Faculty will be asked to integrate one or more of these strategies as part of their lessons throughout the day. The following steps will be used to advocate the use of these strategies for the resistant teacher: 1) A Kagan Strategy will be used during each faculty meeting so teachers can derive the rationale from their own experience; and 2) the Literacy Coach will demonstrate Kagan strategies for classroom teachers as needed. The Literacy Coach will begin with a very simple structure like RoundRobin, RallyRobin, or Talking Chips. The classroom teacher will be encouraged to repeat the same structure until the teacher and students are comfortable with the strategy and it becomes a part of the way lessons are taught. Last of all, teachers will be encouraged to find at least one other teacher who is using Kagan structures so they can share and problem solve together.

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

Resource

Funding Source

Amount Needed

G2. UES will increase the learning gains in math by using Kagan strategies and Thinking Maps in order to aid in shifts leading to a culture of common core rigor.

G2.B2 One of the greatest challenges our classroom teachers face is letting go of traditional methods of teaching.

G2.B2.S1 Monthly Mini Meetings will be held to address the use of Thinking Maps in the classroom for mathematical skills and problem solving. Provide teachers with examples and resources that they can easily transition into their classrooms. The Curriculum Resource Teacher will present these meetings as grade level specific applications.

Action Step 1

Mini Meetings for use of Thinking Maps in Math

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

Resource

Funding Source

Amount Needed