2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Port Orange Elementary School

402 DUNLAWTON AVE

Port Orange, FL 32127

386-756-7100

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/portorange/pages/default.aspx

School Demographics

School Type	Title I	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
Elementary School	No	65%

Alternative/ESE Center	Charter School	Minority Rate
No	No	12%

School Grades History

2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10
A	B	A	A	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

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
Port Orange Elementary School

Principal
Marie E. Stratton

School Advisory Council chair
Lindsey McGuire and Melissa Lucas

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

Name	Title
Marie E. Stratton	Principal
Keturah Thompson	Teacher on Assignment
Rebecca Pitchford	Assistant Principal
Deborah Busse	Kindergarten
Nicole Sallese	1st grade
Jessica Wall	2nd grade
Lindsey McGuire	3rd grade
Kristina Gordon	4th grade
Robert Miller	5th grade
Maragret Williams	Art teacher
Michelle Moore	Guidance counselor
Denise Evers	ESE teacher

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

Marie Stratton - Principal
Lindsey McGuire - SAC co-chair
Melissa Lucas - SAC co-chair

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

The School Advisory Council will assit in writing and collaborating with faculty for the school improvement plan and monitoring the implementation of targets and goals.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

The School Advisory Council will come together once a month to discuss the concerns on campus, and to adjust the school improvement plan as needed.

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

The funds from SAC will be allocated to childcare for parent involvement activities and the substitutes required for School Improvement Planning.

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

3

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Marie E. Stratton		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 13	Years at Current School: 1

Credentials	Graduated 1972 from National College of Education in Evanston, IL. Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education and Middle School. August 8, 1989 University of Central Florida Masters Degree in ED Leadership.
Performance Record	Indian River Elementary * 2000-2001 School Grade B *2001-2002 School Grade C Reading proficiency - 71% Math proficiency 63% Writing Proficiency 57% Reading learning gains (LG) 54%, Math learning gains (LG) 70% Lowest 25% Reading learning gains (LG) 54% * 2002-2003 School grade A Reading proficiency 56% Math proficiency 69% Writing proficiency 84% Reading LG 73%, Math LG 75%, Lowest 25% Reading (LG) 65% Ormond Beach Elementary *2003-2004 School Grade A Reading proficiency 81%, Math proficiency 75%, Writing proficiency 72% Reading LG 75%, Math LG 70%, Lowest 25% Reading LG 77% * 2004-2005 School Grade A Reading proficiency 83%, Math proficiency 73%, Writing proficiency 70% Reading LG 71%, Math LG 68%, Lowest 25% Reading LG 60% *2005-2006 School Grade B Reading proficiency 79%, Math proficiency 78%, Writing proficiency 64% Reading LG 55%, Math LG 77%, Lowest 25% Reading LG 43% *2006-2007 School Grade A Reading proficiency 81%, Math proficiency 82%, Writing proficiency 75%, Science proficiency 45% Reading LG 72%, Math LG 78%, Lowest 25% Reading LG 73%, Lowest 25% Math LG 70% *2007-2008 School Grade A Reading proficiency 86%, Math proficiency 86%, Writing proficiency 76%, Science proficiency 60% Reading LG 65%, Math LG 63%, Lowest 25% Reading LG 53%, Lowest 25% Math LG 68% *2008-2009 School Grade A Reading proficiency 85%, Math proficiency 82%, Writing proficiency 86%, Science proficiency 57% Reading LG 70%, Math LG 55%, Lowest 25% Reading LG 57%, Lowest 25% Math LG 53% Osceola Elementary *2009-2010 School Grade A Reading proficiency 85%, Math proficiency 81%, Writing

proficiency 82%, Science proficiency 72%
Reading LG 66%, Math LG 66%, Lowest 25% Reading LG 51%, Lowest 25% Math LG 64%
*2010- 2011 School Grade A
Reading proficiency 81%, Math proficiency 75%, Writing proficiency 69%, Science proficiency 67%
Reading LG 67%, Math LG 58%, Lowest 25% Reading LG 59%, Lowest 25% Math LG 59%
* 2011-2012 School Grade B
Reading proficiency 59%, Math proficiency 50%, Writing proficiency 73%, Science proficiency 59%
Reading LG 66%, Math LG 60%, Lowest 25% Reading LG 76%, Lowest 25% Math LG 52%
*2012-2013 School Grade B
Reading proficiency 61%, Math proficiency 59%, Writing proficiency 27%, Science proficiency 68%
Reading LG 67%, Math LG 78%, Lowest 25% Reading LG 59%, Lowest 25% Math LG 83%
Ortona Elementary
* 2009-2010 School Grade B
Reading proficiency 83%, Math proficiency 87%, Writing proficiency 84%, Science proficiency 69%
Reading LG 60%, Math LG 65, Lowest 25% Reading LG 47%, Lowest 25% Math LG 77%
* 2010-2011 School Grade B
Reading proficiency 76%, Math proficiency 79%, Writing proficiency 94%, Science proficiency 68%
Reading LG 66%, Math LG 56%, Lowest 25% Reading LG 47%, Lowest 25% Math LG 60%
*2011-2012 School grade A
Reading proficiency 66%, Math proficiency 61%, Writing proficiency 71%, Science proficiency 70%
Reading LG 74%, Math LG 68%, Lowest 25% Reading LG 74%, Lowest 25% Math LG 68%
*2012-2013 School grade A
Reading proficiency 64%, Math proficiency 65%, Writing proficiency 35%, Science proficiency 64%
Reading LG 81%, Math LG 78%, Lowest 25% Reading LG 81%, Lowest 25% Math LG 78%

Rebecca Pitchford		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 3	Years at Current School: 1
Credentials	BS Elementary Education, MA Educational Leadership Certificate, Elementary Education National Board Educational Leadership.	
Performance Record	2011 A School (Reading proficiency 59%, Math proficiency 51%, Reading learning gains 73%, Math learning gains 61%, Lowest 25% in Reading 64%, Lowest 25% in Math 60%.	

Keturah Thompson		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 20	Years at Current School: 8
Credentials	Through the State of Florida Department of Education; Elementary Education (gr.1-6), Mentally Handicapped (gr.K-12), Psychology (gr.6-12), School Principal (all levels), Specific Learning Disabilities (gr. K-12) Bachelor of Arts in Education from Dillard University, 1975 Master of Education from University of New Orleans, 1977	
Performance Record	2012-2013 B 74% Reading, 76% Math, 65% learning gains in Reading, 75% learning gains in Math, 47% Reading lowest 25%, 61% Math lowest 25% 2011-2012 A 71% Reading, 68% Math, 66% learning gains in Reading, 82% learning gains in Math, 72% in Reading lowest 25%, 57% in Math lowest 25%. 2010-2011 A, AYP 97% 90% Reading, 90% Math, 68% learning gains in Reading, 65% learning in Math, 65% in Reading lowest 25%, 59% in Math lowest 25%.	

Classroom Teachers

# of classroom teachers
30

 # receiving effective rating or higher
0%

 # Highly Qualified Teachers
100%

 # certified in-field
, 0%

 # ESOL endorsed
10, 33%

 # reading endorsed
2, 7%

 # with advanced degrees
12, 40%

 # National Board Certified
1, 3%

 # first-year teachers
1, 3%

 # with 1-5 years of experience
7, 23%

 # with 6-14 years of experience
13, 43%

 # with 15 or more years of experience
9, 30%

Education Paraprofessionals

# of paraprofessionals
2

 # Highly Qualified
2, 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

In order to obtain highly qualified and effective teachers, administration implements the use of new teacher programs such as; Individualized PD, mentors, peer classroom visits, and other site visits. We will provide leadership opportunities, professional development, PLC activities, celebrations/ teacher recognition through the teacher of the year committee and participation in District job fair and recruitment activities.

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

A PAR (Peer Assistance and Review Teacher) teacher comes to our school to help our new teachers with questions, lessons, and challenges they might come across. He will be assisting the teachers with their Deliberate Practice Plan.

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 based MTSS/SIP structures will address the school based resources for funding and staffing based on materials and personnel. The problem solving process will determine the continuum of academic support available to students at the individual school site. The use of academic data will be considered to determine priorities and functions of the Curriculum Leadership Team (CLT). The problem solving process ensures that the individual, class-wide, and school-wide issues are addressed systematically with data and monitoring. Supportive interventions are tiered to the specified problems to monitor progress. The school based MTSS leadership team meets regularly throughout the school year

in order to address academic needs that develop throughout the year as well as monitoring outcomes of those supportive interventions.

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

The function and responsibility of each curriculum leadership team member is to identify, implement, and monitor the individual, class-wide, and school-wide needs through the problem solving process according to our identified targets in our School Improvement Plan.

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

The system in place to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP will be the school-based Curriculum Leadership Team and administration. The Curriculum Leadership Team will meet monthly to discuss progress and identify the students in need of academic/behavioral support.

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 data sources used to monitor and analyze the effectiveness in reading, writing, mathematics, science, and writing will include pinnacle grading systems, achievement series, FAIR analysis, and District wide testing through Common Core and Next Generation State Standards. Attendance and behavior support will be managed by the classroom teachers, school administration, guidance, and district based social worker and psychologist.

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

The plan to support the MTSS/SIP for understanding will be based on data used from the pinnacle grading systems, achievement series, FAIR analysis, and District wide testing through Common Core and Next Generation State Standards. In order to build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents by the use of resources such as; SIPPS, FOSS Kits for Scientific Inquiry based learning and after school tutoring for the lowest 25% of student in Reading and Math.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

Name	Title
Marie E. Stratton	Principal
Rebecca Pitchford	Assistant Principal
Keturah Thompson	Teacher on Assignment
Deborah Busse	Kindergarten
Nicole Sallese	First Grade
Jessica Wall	Second Grade
Lindsey McGuire	Third Grade
Kristina Gordon	Fourth Grade
Robert Miller	Fifth Grade
Maragret Williams	Art Teacher

Name	Title
Michelle Moore	Guidance
Denise Evers	ESE Teacher

How the school-based LLT functions

The Curriculum Leadership Team (C.L.T) meets periodically with the principal. The C.L.T will play an integral part in the leadership of the school. The principal will empower the C.L.T to development and implement a variety of strategies to build a culture of reading throughout the school. Strategies may include; professional development opportunities for teachers, a schedule of activities to promote reading, and presentations during faculty meetings. Support will be provided by the principal to ensure diversified team membership, schedule convenient times to meet, leadership for productive team meetings, and allocate resources for teams to implement designated plans.

Major initiatives of the LLT

The initiative of C.L.T. for 2013-12014 will be to support teachers in the implementation of Common Core in reading, writing, listening, speaking, language use, grammar, and math in the K-5 classrooms.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

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

The school ensures that every teacher will contribute to the reading improvement of every student through identifying the lowest 25% of students in reading. By providing professional development for teachers and the use and implementation of P.LC. and P.S.T process.

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 will include providing the opportunity for ongoing communication between agencies to facilitate coordinate of programs and shared expectations for children's learning and development as the children transition to elementary school. Also collaborating and participating in joint professional development including, transition-related training for school staff and pre-school staff when feasible. Provide 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	78%	74%	No	80%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American				
Hispanic	91%	77%	No	92%
White	75%	74%	No	78%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	37%	23%	No	43%
Economically disadvantaged	68%	65%	No	71%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	152	73%	20%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	117	57%	60%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	152	62%	64%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	15	43%	50%

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)	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		51%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		26%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		26%

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	58	74%	70%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		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	75%	76%	No	78%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American				
Hispanic	82%	83%	Yes	84%
White	73%	75%	Yes	76%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	34%	23%	No	41%
Economically disadvantaged	66%	67%	Yes	69%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	155	25%	27%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	103	50%	51%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

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

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	98	71%	72%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	19	56%	58%

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	44	25%	26%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	29	49%	50%

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)	2		2
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	140		

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

Elementary School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time			
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	11	3%	2%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	15	21%	20%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	22	5%	4%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	15	3%	2%

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

To maintain 5 Star School status by implementing consistent parent involvement at all school functions and parent teacher conferences.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
95% of our parents will attend three or more school functions in the 2013-2014 school year	359	90%	91%

Goals Summary

G1. Teachers will utilize effective teaching instruction through the implementation of student interactive notebooks and higher order questioning techniques. Including strategies targeting students in the lowest 25% quartile in reading.

Goals Detail

G1. Teachers will utilize effective teaching instruction through the implementation of student interactive notebooks and higher order questioning techniques. Including strategies targeting students in the lowest 25% quartile in reading.

Targets Supported

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

- Writing

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

- Social Studies

- U.S. History EOC

- Civics EOC

- Science

- Science - Elementary School

- STEM

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Professional Development

- ISTOA

- Access to a variety of materials

- School based teachers

- Master Instructional Strategies Flip-charts

- Collaboration with other schools and district-wide

- Technology resources (hardware, apps, software)

- PLC

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Not all teachers trained

- All the teachers need access to resources

- Preparation Time

- Instructional Time

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Teacher will implement interactive notebooks and/or higher order questioning in all subject areas

Person or Persons Responsible
Classroom teachers

Target Dates or Schedule:
throughout the 9 week marking periods

Evidence of Completion:
90% of classroom teachers will implement interactive notebooks and/or higher order questioning by the end of March 2014, evidence collected using Survey Monkey

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

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

G1. Teachers will utilize effective teaching instruction through the implementation of student interactive notebooks and higher order questioning techniques. Including strategies targeting students in the lowest 25% quartile in reading.

G1.B1 Not all teachers trained

G1.B1.S1 Utilize faculty meetings for Professional Development

Action Step 1

Leadership team with collaborate with various resources from all grade levels to include higher order questioning and interactive notebooks.

Person or Persons Responsible

Curriculum Leadership Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly at CLT meeting

Evidence of Completion

By December 20,2013 at least 50% of teachers will be implementing high order questioning and/or interactive notebooks.

Facilitator:

Administrator and Curriculum Leadership Team

Participants:

All faculty and staff

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

Use Survey Monkey to collect data to determine usage and knowledge of interactive notebooks and higher order thinking questions from teachers.

Person or Persons Responsible

ISTOA, Curriculum Leadership Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Teachers will be surveryed every 9 weeks through Survey Monkey and lesson plans

Evidence of Completion

Model Classrooms

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

All subject areas formative and summative assessments of students

Person or Persons Responsible

Grade Level PLCs

Target Dates or Schedule

Every 9 weeks with school collaboration

Evidence of Completion

Increase of scores in the lowest 25% quartile of students

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. Teachers will utilize effective teaching instruction through the implementation of student interactive notebooks and higher order questioning techniques. Including strategies targeting students in the lowest 25% quartile in reading.

G1.B1 Not all teachers trained

G1.B1.S1 Utilize faculty meetings for Professional Development

PD Opportunity 1

Leadership team with collaborate with various resources from all grade levels to include higher order questioning and interactive notebooks.

Facilitator

Administrator and Curriculum Leadership Team

Participants

All faculty and staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly at CLT meeting

Evidence of Completion

By December 20,2013 at least 50% of teachers will be implementing high order questioning and/or interactive notebooks.

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	Professional Development	Total
N/A	$0	$0
Total	$0	$0

Budget Details

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

G1. Teachers will utilize effective teaching instruction through the implementation of student interactive notebooks and higher order questioning techniques. Including strategies targeting students in the lowest 25% quartile in reading.

G1.B1 Not all teachers trained

G1.B1.S1 Utilize faculty meetings for Professional Development

Action Step 1

Leadership team with collaborate with various resources from all grade levels to include higher order questioning and interactive notebooks.

Resource Type

Professional Development

Resource

Professional Development on the production/implementation of Interactive Notebooks and how to construct/utilize higher order questioning.

Funding Source

N/A

Amount Needed

$0