



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Whispering Winds Charter School

2481 NW OLD FANNIN RD

Chiefland, FL 32626

352-490-5799

<http://www.whisperingwindscharter.com/>

School Demographics

School Type
Elementary School

Title I
Yes

Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
85%

Alternative/ESE Center
No

Charter School
Yes

Minority Rate
13%

School Grades History

2013-14
C

2012-13
C

2011-12
C

2010-11
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	4
Differentiated Accountability	5
Part I: Current School Status	6
Part II: Expected Improvements	14
Goals Summary	18
Goals Detail	18
Action Plan for Improvement	20
Part III: Coordination and Integration	23
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	24
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	26

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
 - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
 - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
 - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
 - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
 - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School

Whispering Winds Charter School

Principal

Suzann Cornell

School Advisory Council chair

Paul Carlson

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

Name	Title
Jennifer Smith	Grade level teacher
Teresa Schwingel	Grade Level Teacher
Vivian Webster	Grade level teacher
Tamika Sims	Grade level teacher
Kim Bartley	Reading Coach
J. Suzann Cornell, Ph.D.	Principal/ESE
Sandy Heckler	Grade level teacher

District-Level Information

District

Levy

Superintendent

Mr. Robert O Hastings

Date of school board approval of SIP

10/8/2013

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

Paul Carlson, President, Community Member, school bus driver
 Ruthann Ross, Vice-President, Community Member, ESE consultant
 Barbara Locke, Community Member, Public Health consultant
 Jody Studstill, parent
 Jody Woods, parent
 J. S. Cornell, Ph.D., Principal

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

The community members have been involved in the evolution of the SIP for two or three years. The parents on the SAC have been at WWCS for two years. Both are active in the school and are aware of curriculum and policies. All members are independent thinkers and "big picture" people who add much to the conversation in all areas.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

Review of policies and procedures.
 Review of assessments and progress monitoring tools.
 Monitoring of student progress.
 Look at ways to retain good teachers.
 Greater level of true parent involvement

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

Survey parents on policies, student progress. Keep parents informed of children's progress. Copy costs \$350

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

Our Board serves as our SAC with the exception that the Principal serves on the SAC, but not on the Board.

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

1

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Suzann Cornell

Principal

Years as Administrator: 16

Years at Current School: 10

Credentials

Ph.D., Educational Leadership

M.Ed., Special Education

B.S., Sport and Exercise Sciences (Sports Administration)

Performance Record

2004-2005 - C; 2005-2006 F; 2006-2007 - B; 2009-2010 C;
 2010-2011 - B; 2011-12 - C; 2012-13 C.

Numbers of students were not sufficient to receive a grade in years not listed.

2007 Whispering Winds received School Achievement award; Dr. Cornell received "Turnaround Principal of the Year" Award

Instructional Coaches**# of instructional coaches**

2

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:**Kim Bartley**

Part-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 0

Years at Current School: 1

Areas

Reading/Literacy

Credentials

Bachelor's

Performance Record

First year as reading coach, but years as elementary teacher

Debbie Dye

Part-time / District-based

Years as Coach: 4

Years at Current School: 4

Areas

Mathematics

Credentials

Bachelor's

Performance Record**Classroom Teachers****# of classroom teachers**

6

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Highly Qualified Teachers

100%

certified in-field

6, 100%

ESOL endorsed

1, 17%

reading endorsed

1, 17%

with advanced degrees

2, 33%

National Board Certified

0, 0%

first-year teachers

1, 17%

with 1-5 years of experience

1, 17%

with 6-14 years of experience

2, 33%

with 15 or more years of experience

2, 33%

Education Paraprofessionals

of paraprofessionals

2

Highly Qualified

2, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel

of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above

0

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

We advertise on Teachers-Teachers, a state-funded system. We advertise locally. The principal has contacts at two local colleges. Despite all our recruiting efforts, teacher retention is a problem. We are unable to compete with traditional public schools with salary and benefit packages. When we train good teachers, other schools come hire them from us.

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

We have only two teachers at the school who have been at the school for more than one year. These teachers are providing mentoring to the first year teacher and to the teachers new to the school. Everyone is learning the new Common Core State Standards, so to that effect, we are all learning together.

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

We use a cross section of assessments, including, but not limited to FAIR, i-Ready, Levy Instructional Assessment, as well as formative classroom assessments and daily work, to determine if there are system-wide issues, e.g. if there was a broad base of students not understanding common denominators then we would hypothesize the issue was curriculum and/or instruction. If the data was scattered with no clear focus of weaknesses, the issue is s\likely more individually related.

Once we determine curriculum/instruction deficiencies or individual weaknesses, we begin a plan to provide support. We monitor the data to determine whether or not the supports are effective. If so, we keep any curriculum/instructional components in place. At the individual level, we provide support until the child is successful. If the child is not successful we continue to provide more support until the child is successful, then gradually remove the supports until the child can be successful independently. We always continue monitoring data to ensure we are providing the supports needed at the school-wide, class-wide and individual levels.

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

Each teacher brings data from the most recent assessments, including formative and summative. When a child is falling below grade level expectations, the team suggests research based strategies to supplement regular classroom instruction. Once a number of strategies have been suggested, the MTSS data clerk contacts the parent for a meeting. The classroom teacher, the ESE teacher/principal and the data clerk meet to determine the best of the strategies suggested.

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

Classroom assessments from the curriculum will be used on a weekly basis.(Formative)
i-Ready assessments will be used on a 9 week basis.(Summative)
FAIR given quarterly (Summative)
LIA assessments will be used on a quarterly basis. (Summative)
FCAT (Summative)
Write Score (2x year) for 4th grade writing

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

Performance Matters tracks the FAIR, LIA, FCAT
i-Ready has a built-in system that tracks children who are on grade level, above grade level and below grade level. It suggests interventions from broad level down to specific worksheets.
We also receive reports from Write Score to monitor progress in 4th grade writing skills
Skyward tracks tardies, attendance and behavior

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

Parents are told about the MTSS process at Open House. If a child falls below grade level expectations for baseline assessments or any assessments, classroom, i-Ready, FAIR, LIA or FCAT, the parents are brought in for a conference. The MTSS process is gone over step-by-step. We discuss the areas where the child is struggling and what interventions will be used to provide the support necessary for the child to become successful at grade level. If those interventions are not successful, we meet with the parents again to discuss the next step, in increasing the time and intensity of the interventions. We continue to

provide additional support, conferencing with the parents at each step, until the child is successful at grade level. Then, we slowly remove the supports until the child is successful at grade level without interventions. If, at the end of the interventions, the child is still not successful, we may then discuss the possibility of referral for a learning disability, if other factors such as attendance are not an issue. Our staff is provided training during pre-planning. Follow-up assistance is provided by the MTSS coordinator 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: 1,080

Writing Workshop for students after school.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

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

Write Score and teacher formative assessments using FLDOE and CCSS rubrics.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Principal, teachers.

Strategy: Extended Day for All Students

Minutes added to school year: 2,400

Teacher collaboration on new reading curriculum, including serving the needs of below and above grade readers. Collaboration on discipline system. Providing professional development in Reading Street, Everyday Math, Marvin Marshall, Failure is Not an Option (high achievement in low income schools), CIS training.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Teacher collaboration, planning and professional development

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

Principal observation, student test scores.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Principal and teachers.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

Name	Title
Jennifer Smith	Grade Level Teacher
Teresa Schwingel	Grade Level Teacher
Vivian Webster	Grade Level Teacher
Tamika Sims	Grade Level Teacher
Kimberly Bartley	Reading Coach
J. Suzann Cornell	Principal
Sandy Heckler	Grade Level Teacher

How the school-based LLT functions

The LLT meets monthly to analyze data, plan a course of action to address needs indicated by data and monitor the outcomes of the plan of action--adjusting as needed. Team members will bring work samples, informal assessments, research journals, anecdotal records, student interviews, teacher checklists, report cards, FCAT, SAT-10 and formative assessments.

The literacy coach will take a lead role in professional development needs for sustainable school improvement.

The team will act as a problem solving team to discuss areas of strengths and weaknesses.

The team will look at best practices, form focus groups, visit school that have been successful in our areas of weakness, interview others, provide PD and observe each other.

Once a plan is made, the team will continue to collect and analyze data to determine if improvements are being made.

Major initiatives of the LLT

To increase overall levels of reading proficiency.

To increase levels of reading proficiency with students with disabilities.

To increase levels of reading proficiency with economically disadvantaged students.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

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

We have begun a new Common Core reading curriculum this year. We have weekly meetings to discuss how the implementation is going. How well the formative assessments and assessments built into the curriculum match the i-Ready and LIA scores. We also check to ensure whether or not the text complexity and close reading strategies match CCSS. We all offer input on how the program is working and everyone offers tidbits of information on what works well.

We are having weekly meetings to share successes and challenges with Reading Street, our new curriculum. We have been sending a team to Common Core training provided by Florida Charter Schools. We have participated in training at Chiefland Elementary in both reading and math.

The District has provided CIS training for ALL instructional staff. Our Reading Coach has been bringing strategies in Text Complexity and Close Reading back from Reading Coach meetings and is providing professional development for our instructional staff.

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

Although we have asked to extend our program to a Pre-K program, the District has not approved it. We have a Kindergarten day each year to invite incoming Kindergarten children and their families to our school.

College and Career Readiness

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

How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future

We begin talking to students about college in kindergarten.

How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

Expected Improvements

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

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	48%	38%	No	54%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American				
Hispanic				
White	50%	39%	No	55%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	24%	18%	No	32%
Economically disadvantaged	48%	38%	No	54%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		25%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		25%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		100%
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	72	84%	88%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	72	84%	88%

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	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		35%
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	50%	60%	Yes	55%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American				
Hispanic				
White	52%	65%	Yes	57%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	35%	55%	Yes	42%
Economically disadvantaged	46%	63%	Yes	51%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	15	32%	35%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	14	30%	35%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		100%
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	36	76%	80%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	36	76%	80%

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	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		20%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		30%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		100%
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

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)	85		95
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	85	98%	95%

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses			
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses			
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> courses			
Students taking CTE industry certification exams			
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams			
CTE program concentrators			
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications			

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	3	3%	1%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	7	8%	5%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	10	71%	35%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	5	6%	5%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	3	3%	4%

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

Increase the number of parents involved in SAC and Board activities.

Increase the number of parents actually volunteering in WWCS classrooms or grounds.

Although all families are required to do volunteer hours, some donate items rather than volunteer their time.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Increase the number of parents involved in SAC Board activities	2	.1%	5%
Increase number of parent volunteers in classroom or grounds	32	37%	50%

Goals Summary

- G1.** To increase our writing scores to 35% scoring a level 3.5 or above.
- G2.** To increase our FCAT reading scores of 3 and above to 50% overall, economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities.

Goals Detail

G1. To increase our writing scores to 35% scoring a level 3.5 or above.

Targets Supported

- 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, Middle School Acceleration, High School, High School AMO's, High School FAA, High School FAA, High School Postsecondary Readiness)
- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- We are using the writing portion of Reading Street curriculum. Writing is embedded into our reading program.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Poor readers are typically poor writers. As a school, we tend to attract poor readers, and consequently, poor writers.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Write Score interim assessments. Reading Street Essay Scorer. FCAT Writes. 4th grade and 5th grade teacher and 2nd and 3rd grade teachers exchange essays and double grade essays.

Person or Persons Responsible

All instructional staff

Target Dates or Schedule:

Two Write Score Assessments (3 if you count the Spring 2013 Write Score assessment we use as baseline); monthly two teacher grading; and FCAT Writes

Evidence of Completion:

At least 35% of students scoring a level of 3.5 or above on writing

G2. To increase our FCAT reading scores of 3 and above to 50% overall, economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities.

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- We have a new reading curriculum that differentiates the reading to address the needs of diverse learners, including those with disabilities and those without adequate content knowledge.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Training for the new curriculum was not available prior to the beginning of school. Our curriculum did not arrive prior to the beginning of school.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

increase reading scores on FCAT to 50% overall level 3 or above

Person or Persons Responsible

Literacy team

Target Dates or Schedule:

We use i-Ready for ongoing assessment. We give a baseline assessment at the beginning of the year (August) and every nine weeks thereafter. We also use FAIR and LIA (Levy Instructional Assessment)

Evidence of Completion:

We use a cross section of all scores to determine the reliability of scores rather than using a single assessment.

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. To increase our writing scores to 35% scoring a level 3.5 or above.

G1.B1 Poor readers are typically poor writers. As a school, we tend to attract poor readers, and consequently, poor writers.

G1.B1.S1 Use new writing curriculum embedded in Reading Street

Action Step 1

Teachers will exchange student writings to provide double check on rubric grading

Person or Persons Responsible

All instructional staff

Target Dates or Schedule

learn from each other in K-2 and 3-5 groups

Evidence of Completion

ongoing monitoring of formative and summative assessments

Facilitator:

Principal

Participants:

All instructional staff

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

Monitor Reading Street essay scoring (grades 3-5), track improvement using rubrics and two teacher grading, as well as Write Score

Person or Persons Responsible

All instructional staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Once a month teachers will meet to look at Reading Street, rubric grading and Write Score

Evidence of Completion

Compare against rubric and send to essay scorer and Write Score

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Write Score, review of two teacher grading rubrics, Reading Street essay scorer

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly data meetings

Evidence of Completion

scores from essay scorer and Write Score as well as rubric scoring with peers and other teachers

G2. To increase our FCAT reading scores of 3 and above to 50% overall, economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities.

G2.B1 Training for the new curriculum was not available prior to the beginning of school. Our curriculum did not arrive prior to the beginning of school.

G2.B1.S1 We are meeting in groups of K-2 and 3-5 and teaching each other. We are also "tagging along" to District training scheduled for September 5.

Action Step 1

Share what you know. As we did not have PD on the new Reading Curriculum, teachers come together weekly to discuss what is working, what they have found out in online resources, what seems to be the most effective strategies, etc.

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Data meetings (weekly)

Evidence of Completion

Documentation of implementation

Facilitator:

Principal

Participants:

Teachers

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

Monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments in Reading Street as well as i-Ready, FAIR, LIA and FCAT

Person or Persons Responsible

All teachers and principal

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Student test scores, teacher anecdotal reports will indicate increase in scores. If not, we need to determine other interventions and dissect data to determine whether or not issues or systematic or individualized.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S1

Use of and monitoring fidelity of new curriculum components, including science, social studies, writing

Person or Persons Responsible

All teachers, instructional coaches and principal

Target Dates or Schedule

ongoing

Evidence of Completion

student work, teacher reports

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

Title I funds are used primarily to fund the salaries for the Reading Coach and the Math Coach. The remaining funds are used to purchase supplemental instructional materials, and parental involvement activities.

SAI funds are used for i-Ready an assessment and instructional program, as well as Florida Ready supplemental instructional books in Reading, Math and Science.

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. To increase our writing scores to 35% scoring a level 3.5 or above.

G1.B1 Poor readers are typically poor writers. As a school, we tend to attract poor readers, and consequently, poor writers.

G1.B1.S1 Use new writing curriculum embedded in Reading Street

PD Opportunity 1

Teachers will exchange student writings to provide double check on rubric grading

Facilitator

Principal

Participants

All instructional staff

Target Dates or Schedule

learn from each other in K-2 and 3-5 groups

Evidence of Completion

ongoing monitoring of formative and summative assessments

G2. To increase our FCAT reading scores of 3 and above to 50% overall, economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities.

G2.B1 Training for the new curriculum was not available prior to the beginning of school. Our curriculum did not arrive prior to the beginning of school.

G2.B1.S1 We are meeting in groups of K-2 and 3-5 and teaching each other. We are also "tagging along" to District training scheduled for September 5.

PD Opportunity 1

Share what you know. As we did not have PD on the new Reading Curriculum, teachers come together weekly to discuss what is working, what they have found out in online resources, what seems to be the most effective strategies, etc.

Facilitator

Principal

Participants

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Data meetings (weekly)

Evidence of Completion

Documentation of implementation

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals