



**Pam Stewart, Commissioner**

## **2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

---

---

**George W. Marks Elementary School**

1000 N GARFIELD AVE

Deland, FL 32724

386-822-6630

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/georgemarks/pages/default.aspx>

---

## School Demographics

---

<b>School Type</b> Elementary School	<b>Title I</b> No	<b>Free and Reduced Lunch Rate</b> 65%
<b>Alternative/ESE Center</b> No	<b>Charter School</b> No	<b>Minority Rate</b> 32%

---

## School Grades History

---

<b>2013-14</b> C	<b>2012-13</b> B	<b>2011-12</b> A	<b>2010-11</b> 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>14</b>
<b>Goals Summary</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Goals Detail</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Action Plan for Improvement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Part III: Coordination and Integration</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>27</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

George W. Marks Elem. School

##### Principal

Julie Roseboom

##### School Advisory Council chair

Jacquese Slocum

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

Name	Title
Julie Roseboom	Principal
Jacquese Slocum	Assistant Principal
Diane Simon	Kindergarten Teacher
Christine Hall	First Grade Teacher
Laura Manning	Second Grade Teacher
Megan Thomas	Third Grade Teacher
Jill Heffernan	Fourth Grade Teacher
Linda Ryland	Fifth Grade
Arlene Blum	Testing Coordinator
Brenda Hahn	Media Specialist
Jeannie Maddox	School Counselor
Robin Phillips	ESE Teacher
Carol Larson	Gifted Teacher
Pamela Hooker	PE Teacher
Jennifer Griffis	Gradebook Manager
Lori Rosekelly	Gradebook Manager

#### District-Level Information

##### District

Volusia

##### Superintendent

Dr. Margaret A Smith

##### Date of school board approval of SIP

12/10/2013

### 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**

The SAC at George Marks Elementary is comprised of 6 parents, 2 teachers, 1 support staff member, 1 principal, 1 assistant principal and 2 community members. Of the 13 SAC members, 53.8% (7) are parents and community members that are not employed by the district of Volusia County.

Elected Parents: Barbie Bates, Sabrina Brees, Lori Ethridge, Tiffany Freed, Laura Hemmerle, and Heidi Kellogg

Elected Teachers: Jennifer Griffis, Laura Manning

Elected Support Staff: Gail Loose

Appointed Principal: Julie Roseboom

Appointed Assistant Principal: Jacquese Slocum (SAC Chairperson)

Appointed Community Members: Sarah Kundinger (DAC Representative), Audrey Bruner

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

The GME SAC was trained on the new school improvement process and their role in shared decision making and collaborative partnering. SAC members were given information on Annual Measurable Objectives(AMOS) and an overview comparison of school grade data from 2012 and 2013. The SAC members and meeting attendees collaborated in small groups of 4-6 people to brainstorm strategies and ideas to share aloud with the whole group. The ideas were shared with the leadership team.

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

SAC will meet monthly to review progress with strategy implementation, school activities, and input from staff, students, parents, and community members. SAC will review information discussed at District Advisory Council and certain school policies. We will monitor the school improvement plan throughout the school year. SAC review and approve minutes and discuss concerns or actions impacting student performance at George Marks Elementary and in Volusia County Public Schools.

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

No school improvement funds have been provided for the 2013-2014 school year, and there is a \$0 balance from the previous year. There are no Title I funds to discuss for the current school year, yet SAC may offer suggestions that impact school spending of other appropriated funds.

**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:**

<b>Julie Roseboom</b>		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 19	Years at Current School: 1
<b>Credentials</b>	Degrees: BA Education and M.Ed. Education Certifications: School Principal All Levels, Emotionally Handicapped Grades K-12, Mentally Handicapped Grades K-12, Specific Learning Disabilities Grades K-12	
<b>Performance Record</b>	At Holly Hill School K-8: 2013: D School (41% PR / 31% PM; 52% RG / 45% MG; 52% LR / 50% LM)* 2012: C School (41% PR / 39% PM; 51% RG / 63% MG; 60% LR / 67% LM)* At Holly Hill Elementary K-5: 2011: C School, AYP 79% (65% PR / 57% PM; 57% RG / 51% MG; 54% LR / 71% LM)* 2010: C School, AYP 74% (64% PR / 62% PM; 60% RG / 53% MG; 52% LR / 52% LM)* 2009: A School, AYP 100% (75% PR / 73% PM; 70% RG / 78% MG; 71% LR / 73% LM)* Prior to 2009: Based on the Volusia County District evaluation system in place at the time, the principal was consistently rated either meeting or exceeding the 12 competencies required for administrators. *(Proficient Reading/Math; Learning Gains Reading/Math; Lowest 25% Reading/Math)	

<b>Jacquese Slocum</b>		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 3	Years at Current School: 10
<b>Credentials</b>	BS Elementary Education, MA Educational Leadership and ESOL Endorsement	
<b>Performance Record</b>	At George Marks Elementary: 2013: B School (64% PR / 58% PM; 65% RG / 71% MG; 62% LR / 63% LM)* 2012: A School (64% PR / 56% PM; 69% RG / 67% MG; 69% LR / 63% LM)* *(Proficient Reading/Math; Learning Gains Reading/Math; Lowest 25% Reading/Math)	

**Classroom Teachers**

<b># of classroom teachers</b>	41
<b># receiving effective rating or higher</b>	41, 100%



**# Highly Qualified Teachers**

100%

**# certified in-field**

39, 95%

**# ESOL endorsed**

27, 66%

**# reading endorsed**

5, 12%

**# with advanced degrees**

13, 32%

**# National Board Certified**

5, 12%

**# first-year teachers**

4, 10%

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

2, 5%

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

11, 27%

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

24, 59%

**Education Paraprofessionals**

**# of paraprofessionals**

3

**# Highly Qualified**

3, 100%

**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**

Description of Strategy:

1. New Teacher Programs (Individualized PD, mentors, peer classroom visits, other site visits)
2. Leadership Opportunities
3. Professional Development
4. PLC Activities
5. Participation in District Job Fair and Recruitment Activities

Person Responsible/Projected Completion Date:

-Administration/June 2014

-District PAR/June 2014

**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**

Caroline Hood has been paired with Pamela Hooker. Caroline is a first year teacher being mentored by a highly effective teacher, as well as 2 district-assigned Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) Teachers. Sandra Archer and Rachel Hyde are our 2 district PARS.

Esther King has been paired with Laura Hoard. Esther is a first year teacher being mentored by a highly effective teacher, as well as 2 district-assigned Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) Teachers. Sandra Archer and Rachel Hyde are our 2 district PARS.

Alicia Winchell has been paired with Peggy Stortz. Alicia is a first year teacher being mentored by a highly effective teacher, as well as 2 district-assigned Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) Teachers. Sandra Archer and Rachel Hyde are our 2 district PARS.

We have planned coaching, observations, collaborative lesson planning, Empowering Educator Excellence Program (E3) to assist our first year teachers.

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

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

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

The school improvement plan is data driven and focuses on areas of school-based need for both specific content areas as well as specific student populations. Similarly, MTSS is a data-driven framework that seeks to find solutions/resources matched in intensity to student need in academic and behavioral areas. The MTSS framework follows the district's four-step problem solving process, with RtI as an integral component of the process. As a result, the school improvement plan is based on a strategic analysis of data, and identified resources (as identified by the MTSS school based leadership team) are matched to the needs of the students/schools. Building the SIP within the context of MTSS results in the school determining the areas of most significant need and, as importantly, enables the school to develop a plan that can be addressed based on existing resources.

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

The school-based MTSS leadership team identifies school based resources (both materials and personnel) to determine the continuum of academic and behavioral supports available to students at the individual school site. Academic and behavioral data are considered in order to determine priorities and functions of other existing teams (e.g., Problem Solving Teams, Behavior Leadership Teams, and Professional Learning Communities). The Problem Solving process (i.e., Problem Identification, Analysis of Problem, Intervention Implementation and Response to Intervention) is used as the way of work of all teams and not just for individual student concerns. Adherence to the Problem Solving process ensures that individual, class-wide, and school-wide issues are addressed systematically with data; that interventions (supports) are tiered to the targeted problems; and that a plan is in place to monitor progress.

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

The school-based MTSS leadership team meets regularly throughout the school year in order to address the academic and behavioral needs that develop throughout the year, as well as to monitor outcomes of supports and interventions.

**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**

Pinnacle Gradebook provides evidence of performance in core instruction across content areas. In addition, information gleaned from FAIR assessments, DRAs, OPM probes, interim assessments and FCAT provide valuable information regarding reading performance for both individuals and groups of students. Interim assessments and FCAT also provide critical information regarding student performance in the areas of mathematics, science, and writing. Pinnacle Insight reports provide further information regarding performance by both individual and groups of students (disaggregated by specific groups) in order to inform instruction and intervention. Behavioral expectations are communicated by the school to all students and parents. Those students who do not obtain proficiency in behavioral expectations are provided supports and interventions matched to student need. Office discipline data are maintained and monitored by the school site. Tier 2 and tier 3 supports/interventions and the response to these interventions are entered into the electronic PST system. Summary reports within the system are available to MTSS school-based leadership (i.e. the Principal, PST Chair, and school psychologist).

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

School-based support for MTSS will be provided by the District MTSS Leadership Team. In turn, the school-based MTSS Leadership team will disseminate relevant MTSS information to teachers and parents. Data-based meetings throughout the school year will identify those students in need of academic and/or behavioral supports. Furthermore, based on this data-based decision making, supports will be implemented and monitored. School-specific reports, such as those available in Pinnacle Insight, will facilitate the development of a data-based MTSS framework. This data, in conjunction with identified school-based tiered resources, will ensure that a Multi-Tiered System of Supports is an overarching framework that guides the work of the school.

**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:** 3,600

After school tutoring for 6 weeks for two days per week.

**Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Instruction in core academic subjects

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

Student math interim assessment data through the classroom teachers.

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

Administration

**Strategy:** Summer Program

**Minutes added to school year:** 4,800

Students who earned a level 1 on FCAT reading attend the program.

**Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Instruction in core academic subjects

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

Student's alternative assessments and SAT10 results.

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

Reading program instructional staff and administration.

**Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)**

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

Name	Title
	Administration
	Media Specialist
	Grade Book Manager
	Grade Level Curriculum Communicator
	Testing Coordinator

**How the school-based LLT functions**

The school-based LLT leadership team identifies and communicates curriculum information to determine the continuum of literacy instruction. Academic and behavioral data are considered in order to determine best instructional practices. The application of curriculum standards is reviewed for each grade level/ department.

**Major initiatives of the LLT**

The LLT will serve as the key communicator of curriculum standards to keep us focused on student achievement. They will also develop academic incentive programs.

**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**

The District, in conjunction with the local Head Start agency, Early Learning Coalition, VPK Sites and other local pre-school facilities, coordinates efforts to promote continuity of services and effective transitions for children and their families. These include:

- Providing the opportunity for ongoing communication between agencies to facilitate coordination of

programs and shared expectations for children's learning and development as the children transition to elementary school.

- Collaborating and participating in joint professional development, including transition-related training for school staff and pre-school staff when feasible.
- Utilizing pre-school assessments to monitor readiness skills for students transitioning from pre-school to kindergarten.
- Providing to the pre-school agencies local public school policies, kindergarten registration, kindergarten orientation and other relevant information to ease the transition of children and families.

## 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	59%	64%	Yes	63%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	40%	50%	Yes	46%
Hispanic	40%	41%	Yes	46%
White	69%	69%	Yes	72%
English language learners	38%	40%	Yes	45%
Students with disabilities	33%	15%	No	39%
Economically disadvantaged	48%	55%	Yes	54%

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

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	62	26%	29%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	90	38%	39%

#### Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	99	65%	66%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	26	62%	63%

#### 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)	36	47%	50%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	18	24%	30%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	20	26%	30%

**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	43	56%	65%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		0%

**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	58%	59%	Yes	62%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	33%	50%	Yes	40%
Hispanic	40%	34%	No	46%
White	66%	65%	No	69%
English language learners	41%	31%	No	47%
Students with disabilities	37%	17%	No	43%
Economically disadvantaged	48%	54%	Yes	53%

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

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	62	26%	28%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	77	32%	34%

**Learning Gains**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	107	71%	72%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	24	63%	65%

**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	14	17%	27%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	30	37%	38%

**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)	5		7
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	505	100%	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	0	0%	0%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	22	5%	3%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	30	33%	30%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	72	7%	5%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	53	5%	3%

**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**



Engage families in school events. We will encourage grandparent membership at multiple PTA events and host a Grandparents Night in September. Our media specialist will host book nights with PTA.

### Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Increase grandparent membership in PTA.	6	5%	7%
Hold 3 book night events in our Media Center.	30	10%	12%

## Goals Summary

- G1.**
- G2.** George Marks Elementary administration and teachers will deepen their understanding of the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.

## Goals Detail

**G1.**

**Targets Supported**

**Resources Available to Support the Goal**

**Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal**

**Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal**

**Person or Persons Responsible**

**Target Dates or Schedule:**

**Evidence of Completion:**

**G2. George Marks Elementary administration and teachers will deepen their understanding of the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.**

**Targets Supported**

- Writing
- Science - Elementary School
- STEM - All Levels
- Parental Involvement
- EWS - Elementary School

**Resources Available to Support the Goal**

- District Professional Development
- Common Core K-5 Lesson Plan Book
- Grade Level/Department Lesson Studies

**Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal**

- All classroom teachers do not have the Common Core Lesson Plan Book K-5.
- Instructional staff need a greater understanding of formative assessments and the use of interactive student notebooks.
- Instructional staff need more time to process and implement district professional development.

**Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal**

Monitor use of data for decision making.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration

**Target Dates or Schedule:**

Quarterly

**Evidence of Completion:**

PLC minutes along with student formative and summative data.

## Action Plan for Improvement

### Problem Solving Key

**G** = Goal

**B** = Barrier

**S** = Strategy

**G2.** George Marks Elementary administration and teachers will deepen their understanding of the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.

**G2.B1** All classroom teachers do not have the Common Core Lesson Plan Book K-5.

**G2.B1.S1** Use school based funds to ensure that all teachers have a copy of the Common Core K-5 Lesson Plan Book.

#### **Action Step 1**

Purchase Common Core Lesson Plan Book K-5 for all instructional who do not have a copy.

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

Administration

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

The purchase will be made by November 1, 2013

#### **Evidence of Completion**

All instructional staff has a copy of the Common Core Lesson Plan Book K-5

#### **Facilitator:**

Julie Roseboom and Jacquese Slocum

#### **Participants:**

George Marks Elementary Instructional staff.

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

Monitor the use of the Common Core Lesson Plan Book K-5.

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

Administration

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

Monthly grade level updates through PLC.

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Monthly lesson plan checks for CCSS implementation.

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

The implementation of lesson from the Common Core Lesson Plan Book K-5.

### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

### Target Dates or Schedule

Quarterly walk-through observation.

### Evidence of Completion

Walk-through evidence.

**G2.B2** Instructional staff need a greater understanding of formative assessments and the use of interactive student notebooks.

**G2.B2.S1** Provide guided instruction in the use of formative assessments and offer interactive notebook professional development to all instructional staff.

### Action Step 1

Provide formative assessment professional development along with interactive notebook professional development during the first semester.

### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and school based professional development facilitators.

### Target Dates or Schedule

First Semester

### Evidence of Completion

VSET walk-throughs, PLC minutes and

### Facilitator:

Julie Roseboom, Jacquese Slocum, Rebecca Henry and Carol Larson

### Participants:

All instructional staff

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

The effective use of formative assessments.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration and PD Facilitators

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Quarterly Administration Walk-Throughs

**Evidence of Completion**

Scantron Data, VSET Evidence and PLC Minutes

### **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B2.S1**

Verify test results in achievement series.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Every six weeks

**Evidence of Completion**

PLC Minutes

**G2.B3** Instructional staff need more time to process and implement district professional development.

**G2.B3.S1** Restructure the district professional development. Instructional staff will be given one our of professional development and one hour of planning time.

**Action Step 1**

Giving instructional staff time to process and implement district professional development.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration will structure district professional development to allow for processing and implementation time for instructional staff.

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Once per month

**Evidence of Completion**

Grade level/department PLC notes

**Facilitator:**

Julie Roseboom and Jacquese Slocum

**Participants:**

George Marks Elementary instructional staff.

**Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B3.S1**

Monitor attendance and participation in PD.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Once per month

**Evidence of Completion**

Monthly ERD PD Sign-In Sheets and Weekly PLC notes.

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B3.S1

Teachers progressing through implementation of CCSS within lessons.

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Administration

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Quarterly Walk-throughs

### **Evidence of Completion**

Walkt-hrough evidence



## 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.*

**G2.** George Marks Elementary administration and teachers will deepen their understanding of the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.

**G2.B1** All classroom teachers do not have the Common Core Lesson Plan Book K-5.

**G2.B1.S1** Use school based funds to ensure that all teachers have a copy of the Common Core K-5 Lesson Plan Book.

### **PD Opportunity 1**

Purchase Common Core Lesson Plan Book K-5 for all instructional who do not have a copy.

#### **Facilitator**

Julie Roseboom and Jacquese Slocum

#### **Participants**

George Marks Elementary Instructional staff.

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

The purchase will be made by November 1, 2013

#### **Evidence of Completion**

All instructional staff has a copy of the Common Core Lesson Plan Book K-5

**G2.B2** Instructional staff need a greater understanding of formative assessments and the use of interactive student notebooks.

**G2.B2.S1** Provide guided instruction in the use of formative assessments and offer interactive notebook professional development to all instructional staff.

**PD Opportunity 1**

Provide formative assessment professional development along with interactive notebook professional development during the first semester.

**Facilitator**

Julie Roseboom, Jacquese Slocum, Rebecca Henry and Carol Larson

**Participants**

All instructional staff

**Target Dates or Schedule**

First Semester

**Evidence of Completion**

VSET walk-throughs, PLC minutes and

**G2.B3** Instructional staff need more time to process and implement district professional development.

**G2.B3.S1** Restructure the district professional development. Instructional staff will be given one our of professional development and one hour of planning time.

**PD Opportunity 1**

Giving instructional staff time to process and implement district professional development.

**Facilitator**

Julie Roseboom and Jacquese Slocum

**Participants**

George Marks Elementary instructional staff.

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Once per month

**Evidence of Completion**

Grade level/department PLC notes

## Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

### Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G2.	George Marks Elementary administration and teachers will deepen their understanding of the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.	\$2,750
Total		\$2,750

### Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Evidence-Based Materials	Professional Development	Total
School Based Administrative Funds	\$350	\$0	\$350
District Funded Professional Development Budget	\$0	\$2,400	\$2,400
Total	\$350	\$2,400	\$2,750

### Budget Details

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

**G2.** George Marks Elementary administration and teachers will deepen their understanding of the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.

**G2.B1** All classroom teachers do not have the Common Core Lesson Plan Book K-5.

**G2.B1.S1** Use school based funds to ensure that all teachers have a copy of the Common Core K-5 Lesson Plan Book.

#### Action Step 1

Purchase Common Core Lesson Plan Book K-5 for all instructional who do not have a copy.

#### Resource Type

Evidence-Based Materials

#### Resource

Common Core Lesson Plan Book K-5

#### Funding Source

School Based Administrative Funds

#### Amount Needed

\$350

**G2.B2** Instructional staff need a greater understanding of formative assessments and the use of interactive student notebooks.

**G2.B2.S1** Provide guided instruction in the use of formative assessments and offer interactive notebook professional development to all instructional staff.

**Action Step 1**

Provide formative assessment professional development along with interactive notebook professional development during the first semester.

**Resource Type**

Professional Development

**Resource**

Two teacher will attend the train the trainer for interactive student notebook professional development and will come back to train the entire faculty. A Half day sub for each teacher to have grade level/department data meetings will be provided.

**Funding Source**

District Funded Professional Development Budget

**Amount Needed**

\$2,400