



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

## 2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

---

---

### Seminole Springs Elementary School

26200 W HUFF RD

Eustis, FL 32736

352-589-1117

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

---

## School Demographics

---

|   |                             |   |
|---|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type</b><br>Elementary School | <b>Title I</b><br>No        | <b>Free and Reduced Lunch Rate</b><br>60% |
| <b>Alternative/ESE Center</b><br>No     | <b>Charter School</b><br>No | <b>Minority Rate</b><br>22%               |

---

## School Grades History

---

|                     |                     |                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <b>2013-14</b><br>C | <b>2012-13</b><br>B | <b>2011-12</b><br>A | <b>2010-11</b><br>B |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|

---

## 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**

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>                             | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Differentiated Accountability</b>                              | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Part I: Current School Status</b>                              | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Part II: Expected Improvements</b>                             | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Goals Summary</b>  | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Goals Detail</b>   | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Action Plan for Improvement</b>                                | <b>22</b> |
| <b>Part III: Coordination and Integration</b>                     | <b>28</b> |
| <b>Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals</b> | <b>29</b> |
| <b>Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals</b>                        | <b>31</b> |

---

## **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**

Seminole Springs Elem. School

**Principal**

Leah Fischer

**School Advisory Council chair**

Lori Myers

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

| Name            | Title                       |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Leah Fischer    | Principal                   |
| Lori Myers      | Literacy Coach              |
| Therese Choy    | Curriculum Resource Teacher |
| Sally Wolford   | ESE school specialist       |
| Debra Ortega    | Guidance Counselor          |
| Marjorie Abston | Assistant Principal         |

#### 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**

Treasurer-Barb Drake  
 Secretary-Tracy Choy  
 Chair-Lori Myers

**Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP**

The School Advisory Council met to discuss current data and recommend educational decisions based on information disseminated to the voting membership.

**Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year**

The School Advisory Council will meet monthly to discuss current academic trends and recommend educational decisions based on information disseminated to the voting membership.

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

SAC funds will be used to purchase Reading A-Z and RAZ Kids subscription renewal (approx. \$1,061.10) and Project Wisdom materials (\$499.00). Reading A-Z and RAZ Kids are online reading materials that are used by teachers and students. Project Wisdom is a character development program that will be used by guidance and the Safety Committee.

**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:**

**Leah Fischer**

Principal

Years as Administrator: 6

Years at Current School: 0

**Credentials**

Bachelors degree, University of Central Florida, Primary Education and Elementary Ed; Master in Educational Leadership, Barry University; and ESOL K-12 Certification

**Performance Record**

3 years at Tavares Elementary

2012-2013

Grade:C

AYP:No

Learning Gains:

Reading: 59% of students reading at or above grade level; 65% in the lowest 25% improved; 65% of student make learning gains

Math: 57% of student at or above grade level; 65% of student making learning gains; 58% in the lowest 25% improved

Writing: 49% of students are meeting state standards

Science: 60% of students at or above grade level

2011-2012

Grade:B

AYP:No

Learning Gains:

Reading: 56% of students reading at or above grade level; 59% of students making a year's worth of progress; 66% in the lowest 25% improved; all subgroups did not meet their goals

Math: 56% of student at or above grade level; 67% of student making learning gains; 61% in the lowest 25% improved; all subgroups did not meet their goals for math

Writing: 78% of students are meeting state standards

Science: 43% of students at or above grade level

2010-2011

Grade: B

AYP: No

Percent of Criteria Met: 79%

Learning Gains:

Reading: 78% of students reading at or above grade level; 64% of students making a year's worth of progress; 61 % of struggling students making a year's worth of progress; 61% in the lowest 25% improved; all subgroups did not meet their goals

Math: 74% of student at o above grade level; 58% of student making a year's worth of progress; 59% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress; 59% in the lowest 25% improved; all subgroups did not meet their goals for math

Writing: 80% of students are meeting state standards

Science: 46% of students at or above grade level

3 years at Umatilla High School

2009-2010

School grade: C

AYP: No

Percent of criteria met: 90%

Reading: 42% met high standards (FCAT Level 3 and above);



48% of students made learning gains; 48% made adequate progress of the lowest 25%  
 Math: 81% met high standards (FCAT Level 3 and above); 77% of students made learning gains; 72% made adequate progress of the lowest 25%  
 Writing: 84% met high standards (FCAT Level 3 and above)  
 Science: 43% met high standards (FCAT Level 3 and above)  
 2008-2009  
 School Grade: D  
 AYP: No  
 Percent of criteria met: 87%  
 Reading: 40% met high standards (FCAT Level 3 and above); 44% of students made learning gains; 39% made adequate progress of the lowest 25%  
 Math: 80% met high standards (FCAT Level 3 and above); 76% of students made learning gains; 65% made adequate progress of the lowest 25%

**Marjorie Abston**

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 15

Years at Current School: 1

**Credentials**

BS in Elementary Education, University of Central Florida; Master of Science in Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern; Principal Certification, State of Florida

**Performance Record**

2012-2013 Assistant Principal Seminole Springs Elementary, School Grade "B", Reading Proficiency Math Proficiency Writing Proficiency 74%; Science Proficiency 59%; Reading Gains 73%; Math Gains 83%; Reading Gains Lowest 25%--78%, Math Gains Lowest 25%--83%  
 2011-2012 Assistant Principal Treadway Elementary, School grade "A", Reading Proficiency 63%; Math Proficiency 69%; Writing Proficiency 74%; Science Proficiency 59%; Reading Gains 73%; Math Gains 83%; Reading Gains Lowest 25%--78%, Math Gains Lowest 25%--83%  
 2010-2011 Assistant Principal of Villages Elementary, School grade "A", made AYP with 100%, Reading Mastery 87%, Math Mastery 86%, Writing Mastery 86%, Science Mastery 67%.  
 2009-2010 Assistant Principal of Villages Elementary, School Grade B Reading Mastery 84%; Math Mastery 84%; Science Mastery 51%; made AYP 100%.  
 2008-2009 Asst. Principal of Villages Elementary, School Grade: A; Reading Mastery: 86%; Math Mastery: 82%; Science Mastery: 66%; AYP: 97%; Students with Disabilities did not meet AYP in the areas of math or reading.  
 2007-2008 Asst. Principal of Villages Elementary, School Grade: A; Reading Mastery: 82%; Math Mastery: 84%; Science Mastery: 62%; AYP: 100%.

**Instructional Coaches**

**# of instructional coaches**

1

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 10)

**Instructional Coach Information:**

**Lori Myers**

Full-time / District-based

Years as Coach: 4

Years at Current School: 6

**Areas**

Reading/Literacy, Data, RtI/MTSS

**Credentials**

Bachelor Degree from Simpson College  
 Masters Degree from Stetson University  
 Certifications:  
 K-6 Elementary Education  
 Exceptional Student Education K-12  
 Reading Endorsement  
 English Language Learning

**Performance Record**

2012-2013 School Grade B with the implementation of adjusted scores. The actually school grade is a C with 61% of students meeting proficiency in reading and 63% in math. In writing, 53% of the students scored at proficiency or higher and 59% scored at satisfactory or above in science. Sixty-two percent of the students taking the FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment made gains, while 48% of the students made gains in math. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile in reading and math, 64% made learning gains in reading while 43% made gains in math.

2011-2012 School Grade A with the implementation of new cut scores Seminole Springs had 67% meeting high standards in reading and 66% in math. In writing, 88% of the students met high standards and 68% met high standards in science. Sixty-nine percent of students made learning gains in reading and 83% made learning gains in math. Of the students identified in the lowest quartile, 62% made learning gains in reading and 69% in math.

Part-time / District-based

Years as Coach:

Years at Current School:

**Areas**

[none selected]

**Credentials**

**Performance Record**

**Classroom Teachers**

**# of classroom teachers**

42

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

40, 95%

**# Highly Qualified Teachers**

100%

**# certified in-field**

41, 98%

**# ESOL endorsed**

34, 81%

**# reading endorsed**

6, 14%

**# with advanced degrees**

14, 33%

**# National Board Certified**

2, 5%

**# first-year teachers**

0, 0%

**# with 1-5 years of experience**

6, 14%

**# with 6-14 years of experience**

16, 38%

**# with 15 or more years of experience**

20, 48%

**Education Paraprofessionals**

**# of paraprofessionals**

12

**# Highly Qualified**

12, 100%

**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**

Administration will interview and hire the best qualified candidate for the job. Upon hiring, Administration will provide "Buddies" for new employees, as well as a mentor. This will pair them with two people who are familiar with the school and who can provide them with assistance. New teachers will also be on a grade level team. The grade level team will provide opportunities to work together during plan times and PLC's to ensure everyone on the team works collaboratively.

New teachers will be invited to attend additional Professional Learning opportunities provided by Lake County Staff Development. A teacher mentor from the Professional Development Department will also be available to provide support to new teachers. In addition Seminole Springs has a teacher on staff who is the New Teacher Consultant Mentor who will help create sustainable, high quality mentoring and professional development to teachers in need.

### **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**

Administration will provide "Buddies" for new employees that are next door to help them learn the routines. The new teacher will also be provided a mentor. The mentor and mentee will meet monthly during grade level meetings to discuss evidence validated teaching strategies. Grade level teams will also conduct planning meetings to promote consistent policies across the grade level. The grade level team will also provide opportunities for PLC's to ensure everyone on the team works collaboratively. In addition, the Instructional Coach will visit monthly.

New teachers will be invited to attend additional Professional Learning opportunities provided by Lake County Staff Development. A teacher mentor from the Professional Development Department will also be available to provide support to new teachers. In addition Seminole Springs has a teacher on staff who is the New Teacher Consultant Mentor who will help create sustainable, high quality mentoring and professional development to teachers in need.

### **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**

SSES RTI team meets weekly to problem solve and address the progress monitoring of the core instruction. The administration, CRT and Literacy coach provide classroom walkthroughs. The team meets weekly to monitor the MTSS structure, provide teacher support to help implement small group and individual student needs through the PAWS grouping, and review student data and identify students in need of academic or behavioral interventions.

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

Administrators – As leaders of the RTI team the school administration provide models for informed data based decision making. The administration is responsible for the fidelity of RTI implementation at the school site.

Curriculum Resource Teacher/Literacy Coach – Researches existing literature on academic interventions to be implemented with students exhibiting specific need. Provide professional development to promote the implementation of evidence based instructional strategies in the classroom. Assist with the collection of progress monitoring data and assessment.

Classroom Teacher – The classroom teacher is primarily responsible for the delivery of tier one, two and tree interventions and data collection.

Guidance Counselor – The guidance counselor plays an integral role in the collection and documentation of student data as well as data analysis and interpretation. Researches existing literature on behavior interventions to be implemented with students exhibiting specific need. She also maintains student RTI

records and schedules follow-up meetings to discuss student progress with the team.

School Psychologist – Provides professional development and contributes to the development of academic and behavioral interventions and other data based decisions.

ESE School Specialist – Provides assistance in decision making when students reach tier three of RTI.

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

The Response to Intervention Team meets each week to review student data and identify students in need of academic or behavioral interventions. Working cooperatively, the Team will plan instructional strategies, determine the effectiveness of interventions, and create a system for continued monitoring of student progress

### **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 RTI Team uses the EduSoft, FAIR, Benchmark testing in Math, Reading, Science, writing, attendance and behavioral information to analyze and monitor student progress.

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

Professional development will be provided by district and school staff on site. The RTI team will also determine professional development needs during weekly RTI meetings. Then, the RTI team will provide professional development trainings for staff during staff meetings and PLCs. Parents will be provided training at workshops as needed throughout the year.

## **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:** 1,980

All level 1 and 2 students in math and reading will be invited for tutoring to assist them in their area of weakness.

**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?**

Pre and post test will be given to determine the effectiveness of the tutoring.

**Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?**

The administration will monitor the progress of this strategy, as well as the attendance of the students participating.

**Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)**

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

| <b>Name</b>       | <b>Title</b>   |
|-------------------|----------------|
| Lori Myers        | Literacy Coach |
| Leah Fischer      | Principal      |
| Mary Bass         | Teacher        |
| Barbara Fortner   | Teacher        |
| Tammy Vidler      | Teacher        |
| Daniel Swanson    | Teacher        |
| Lauren Long       | Teacher        |
| Lindsay Fraser    | ESE Teacher    |
| Michelle Castillo | ESE Teacher    |

**How the school-based LLT functions**

Meetings are held once a month to discuss data, literacy instruction, and reading events throughout the year. The team will also assess the effectiveness of the programs initiated and share strategies for effective Common Core implementation.

**Major initiatives of the LLT**

Professional development of instructional shifts in Common Core Standards, family literacy events, and grant writing to fund materials needed for literacy instruction.

**Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction**

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

The school ensures that all teachers contribute to the reading improvement of every student by doing the following: Attending Professional Development for implementing the new reading series, McGraw-Hill; Participating in MTSS meetings; Four times a week for 30 minutes called "Practicing and Working Strong – PAWS" Groups in Reading for enrichment/excelerate, intervention, and on-grade level groups; Planning with grade level; Review of Lesson Plans and Classroom Walkthroughs "CWT".

### **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**

Seminole Springs Elementary School has one Pre-K unit with 18 students, and an ESE Pre-K unit to help prepare students for Kindergarten.

Parents and preschool students are invited to tour our school, especially the kindergarten classrooms, during the spring, preceding each school year.

In addition, a night program is conducted each spring for the parents of upcoming Kindergarten students to better prepare them for the transition in to Kindergarten.

In addition, the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener will be administered within the first 30 school days. Parents complete a "Tell Us about Your Child" questionnaire upon registering a kindergarten student. Information from these sources will be used to plan for the academic and social/emotional instruction for all 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               | 74%           | 61%           | No          | 77%           |
| American Indian            |               |               |             |               |
| Asian                      |               |               |             |               |
| Black/African American     |               | 67%           |             |               |
| Hispanic                   | 65%           | 33%           | No          | 69%           |
| White                      | 74%           | 65%           | No          | 77%           |
| English language learners  | 44%           | 10%           | No          | 50%           |
| Students with disabilities | 39%           | 30%           | No          | 45%           |
| Economically disadvantaged | 61%           | 52%           | No          | 65%           |

#### Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

|  | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3          | 86            | 28%           | 39%           |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 99            | 32%           | 38%           |

#### Learning Gains

|   | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)       | 113           | 62%           | 66%           |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0) | 29            | 64%           | 68%           |

#### 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) | 18   | 62%           | 100%          |
| Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)   | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> |               | 100%          |
| 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> |               | 100%          |



**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 | 48            | 51%           | 90%           |
| 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               | 68%           | 63%           | No          | 72%           |
| American Indian            |               |               |             |               |
| Asian                      |               |               |             |               |
| Black/African American     |               | 58%           |             |               |
| Hispanic                   | 56%           | 45%           | No          | 60%           |
| White                      | 71%           | 65%           | No          | 74%           |
| English language learners  | 41%           | 15%           | No          | 47%           |
| Students with disabilities | 48%           | 37%           | No          | 53%           |
| Economically disadvantaged | 56%           | 51%           | No          | 60%           |

**Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)**

|  | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3          | 74            | 24%           | 32%           |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 111           | 36%           | 42%           |

**Learning Gains**

|   | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Learning Gains  | 89            | 48%           | 53%           |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC) | 21            | 43%           | 50%           |

**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          | 30            | 29%           | 36%           |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 30            | 30%           | 37%           |

**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%            |

**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             |               | 10          |
| Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students  | 500           | 90%           | 100%        |

**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  | 91            | 15%           | 12%           |
| Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.   | 17            | 3%            | 2%            |
| Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade   | 37            | 36%           | 23%           |
| Students who receive two or more behavior referrals   | 30            | 5%            | 3%            |
| Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S. | 21            | 3%            | 1%            |

**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**

A minimum of 60% of families are involved in a positive way in the school more than once during the school year.

**Specific Parental Involvement Targets**

| Target   | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| This may include but is not limited to Meet the Teacher Day, Open House, Terrific Kid Celebrations, Student of the Month Recognition, Fall Festival, and 2 mandatory parent conferences per student. | 630           | 100%          | 100%          |

## Goals Summary

- G1.** Increasing accountability of Common Core instruction through the review of student performance task samples. (authentic student work)
- G2.** Increase student engagement during instructional delivery through the use of cooperative structures in math, reading, science and writing.

## Goals Detail

**G1.** Increasing accountability of Common Core instruction through the review of student performance task samples. (authentic student work)

### Targets Supported

- All Areas
- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- 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
- Parental Involvement
- EWS
- EWS - Elementary School

### Resources Available to Support the Goal

- CPALMS, task cards, connection cards, focus calendar, math flip charts, new reading series

### Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teacher background knowledge of Common Core Standards and performance tasks.

### Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

assessment data

#### Person or Persons Responsible

The leadership team and teachers

#### Target Dates or Schedule:

will monitor monthly

#### Evidence of Completion:

through data chats and teacher talks.

**G2. Increase student engagement during instructional delivery through the use of cooperative structures in math, reading, science and writing.**

**Targets Supported**

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- 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**

- New Reading Series, Kagan Structures, Technological Resources, MTSS, ESOL Support, Team Collaboration, intervention groups, PLC's, lesson studies, and Thinking Maps,

**Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal**

- (1) Quality instructional time, and focus on essential content with rigor (2) Limited opportunities for disseminating information and training for faculty (3) Classroom Autonomy and Teacher shift from traditional to facilitative role

**Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal**

monitor classroom engagement

**Person or Persons Responsible**

(1) Leadership Team

**Target Dates or Schedule:**

will visit weekly and

**Evidence of Completion:**

through Soft Touch visits and classroom walkthroughs.

## Action Plan for Improvement

### Problem Solving Key

**G** = Goal

**B** = Barrier

**S** = Strategy

**G1.** Increasing accountability of Common Core instruction through the review of student performance task samples. (authentic student work)

**G1.B1** Teacher background knowledge of Common Core Standards and performance tasks.

**G1.B1.S1** Creating a collaborative culture among faculty through PLC's, common planning time, and lesson studies.

#### Action Step 1

PLC's, lesson studies, and common planning time;

#### Person or Persons Responsible

The leadership team and capacity builders

#### Target Dates or Schedule

will facilitate collaborative learning among colleagues during monthly

#### Evidence of Completion

this will be exhibited through lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, soft touch visits, and student achievement.

#### Facilitator:

C2 Collaborative Cohort, ASU Instructional Academy, Providing C2 Tools 4U2 Use, Math Content Training, Lake Writes, LCS professional development, PLC's and Lesson Studies

#### Participants:

The leadership team and capacity builders

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

lesson plans, student work samples, classroom observations, soft touch visit data;

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

The leadership team will

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

monitor weekly

#### **Evidence of Completion**

the effectiveness of these strategies will be validated by increased student growth and academic achievement.

### **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1**

student work samples, lesson plans, classroom walk throughs;

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

The leadership team and teachers

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

will weekly monitor

#### **Evidence of Completion**

this will be evident through student growth and academic achievement.

**G2.** Increase student engagement during instructional delivery through the use of cooperative structures in math, reading, science and writing.

**G2.B1** (1) Quality instructional time, and focus on essential content with rigor (2) Limited opportunities for disseminating information and training for faculty (3) Classroom Autonomy and Teacher shift from traditional to facilitative role

**G2.B1.S1** (1) Integrate content areas during instruction.

**Action Step 1**

PLC's, lesson studies, and mini meetings

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Capacity Builders and instructional leaders

**Target Dates or Schedule**

will conduct monthly

**Evidence of Completion**

this will be evident through sign in logs, lesson plans and classroom observations.

**Facilitator:**

Lake Writes training, C2 Collaborative Cohort, LCS professional development, STEM training, Reading Inservice, Math content training

**Participants:**

Capacity Builders and instructional leaders

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

lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, soft touch, classroom observations;

**Person or Persons Responsible**

The leadership team will

**Target Dates or Schedule**

monitor weekly

**Evidence of Completion**

through TEAM evaluation process and Soft Touch data.



### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S1

the use of cooperative structures

#### Person or Persons Responsible

The leadership team will

#### Target Dates or Schedule

monitor weekly

#### Evidence of Completion

through lesson plans, classroom observation, classroom walkthroughs, and Soft Touch data.

### G2.B1.S2 (2) On line: Video taping professional development (TEAM, PD 360, webinars) Mini-meetings

#### Action Step 1

PLCs, lesson studies, on-line Professional Development offered by Staff Development, and mini meetings

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Capacity Builders and instructional leaders

#### Target Dates or Schedule

monthly

#### Evidence of Completion

through sign in logs, lesson plans, and classroom observations

### Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B1.S2

lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, soft touch, classroom observations, reflections written by teachers of observations;

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Capacity Builders and Instructional Leaders

#### Target Dates or Schedule

monitor weekly

#### Evidence of Completion

through TEAM evaluation process and Soft Touch data.

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S2

the use of on-line information and professional development

### Person or Persons Responsible

Capacity Builders and Instructional Leaders

### Target Dates or Schedule

monitor weekly

### Evidence of Completion

through lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, soft touch, classroom observations;

## G2.B1.S3 (3) Model teachers, coaching, mentoring Continue Kagan training and Thinking Maps

### Action Step 1

PLCs, lesson studies, and mini meetings

### Person or Persons Responsible

Capacity Builders and instructional leaders

### Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

### Evidence of Completion

evident through lesson plans, classroom observations, classroom observation

## Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B1.S3

lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, soft touch, classroom observations, feedback from coaching;

### Person or Persons Responsible

The Leadership Team will

### Target Dates or Schedule

monitor weekly

### Evidence of Completion

through TEAM evaluation process, coaching feedback, and Soft Touch data.

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S3

the use of new Common Core instruction and improved teaching techniques

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

The Leadership Team will

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

monitor weekly

### **Evidence of Completion**

through lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, soft touch, classroom observations.

## 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 funding is used to support some of our technology needs (AR Enterprise and STAR Reading Enterprise for grade 1, and Math Enterprise for grades 1-5), and tutoring.

Title X Homeless will provide tutoring for homeless students.

A Violence Prevention program was provided through Safe Schools, (Anti Bullying Program).

## 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.** Increasing accountability of Common Core instruction through the review of student performance task samples. (authentic student work)

**G1.B1** Teacher background knowledge of Common Core Standards and performance tasks.

**G1.B1.S1** Creating a collaborative culture among faculty through PLC's, common planning time, and lesson studies.

### **PD Opportunity 1**

PLC's, lesson studies, and common planning time;

#### **Facilitator**

C2 Collaborative Cohort, ASU Instructional Academy, Providing C2 Tools 4U2 Use, Math Content Training, Lake Writes, LCS professional development, PLC's and Lesson Studies

#### **Participants**

The leadership team and capacity builders

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

will facilitate collaborative learning among colleagues during monthly

#### **Evidence of Completion**

this will be exhibited through lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, soft touch visits, and student achievement.

**G2.** Increase student engagement during instructional delivery through the use of cooperative structures in math, reading, science and writing.

**G2.B1** (1) Quality instructional time, and focus on essential content with rigor (2) Limited opportunities for disseminating information and training for faculty (3) Classroom Autonomy and Teacher shift from traditional to facilitative role

**G2.B1.S1** (1) Integrate content areas during instruction.

**PD Opportunity 1**

PLC's, lesson studies, and mini meetings

**Facilitator**

Lake Writes training, C2 Collaborative Cohort, LCS professional development, STEM training, Reading Inservice, Math content training

**Participants**

Capacity Builders and instructional leaders

**Target Dates or Schedule**

will conduct monthly

**Evidence of Completion**

this will be evident through sign in logs, lesson plans and classroom observations.

## Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals