2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Red Bug Elementary School

4000 RED BUG LAKE RD
Casselberry, FL 32707
407-746-8350
http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/
schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0511

School Demographics

School Type	Title I	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
Elementary School	No	41%

Alternative/ESE Center	Charter School	Minority Rate
No	No	43%

School Grades History

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

SIP Authority and Template

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridacims.org. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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
Red Bug Elementary School

Principal
Mercedes Agramonte Harper

School Advisory Council chair
Nancy Mele

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

Name	Title
LaToya Jenkins Leader	Team Leader, 5th
Julie Lane	Team Leader, 4th
Abigail Guess	Team Leader, 3rd
Michele Buschmohle	Team Leader, 2nd
Trisha Griffin	Team Leader, 1st
Julie Youngblood	Team Leader, K
Liberty Swanson	Team Leader, ESE
Kerri Segrest	Team Leader, CAMMP

District-Level Information

District
Seminole

Superintendent
Dr. Walt Griffin

Date of school board approval of SIP
11/11/2013

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

Nancy Mele, parent and chair
Beth Johnson, parent and vice chair
Katrina Legenhausen, teacher, grade 4 and Secretary
Melissa Stamer, parent
LaTawnya Alderman, parent
Michelle Rosenblatt, parent
Bill Collester, community member
Michele Buschmohle, teacher grade 2
Kristine Lynch, non-instructional (paraprofessional)

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

First meeting we discussed uses of funds, needs due to FCAT scores, areas were the school should focus on improvements (special focus on lowest quartile math gains and writing proficiency gains K-5). Our over arching goal is to improve our B school grade to an A.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

SAC will support Common Core and Next Generation State Standards and instruction through materials such as printing costs (for progress monitoring assessments, mid-chapter tests, etc.), instructional resources such as items for project based instruction.

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

SAC has voted to use funds to support materials for classroom instruction in the 2013-2014 school year. Any left over funds can be put into the school budget into school funds/project zero used for instructional resources.

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

N/A

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:

Mercedes Agramonte Harper		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 7	Years at Current School: 6

Credentials	Bachelor's in Spanish, Master's in Spanish Literature, Educational Specialist in Educational Leadership with a concentration in Curriculum and Instruction, Certified in Teaching Spanish 6-12, Principal certification K-12, ESOL certified, Educational Leadership-all levels
Performance Record	2012-49 (Highly Effective) 2013-(Effective)

Kristen Ramkissoon		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 4	Years at Current School: 1
Credentials	Bachelor's degree in Elem. Ed. and Master's in Ed. Leadership. Areas of certification-Elem. Ed., Ed. Leadership	
Performance Record	All Highly Effective in previous years, and in 2013, Effective	

Instructional Coaches

# of instructional coaches
2

 # receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Victoria Redding		
Part-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 11	Years at Current School: 13
Areas	Reading/Literacy	
Credentials	Elementary Education and Reading Endorsement	
Performance Record	2013-Highly Effective	

Joanna Lee		
Part-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 1	Years at Current School: 10
Areas	Mathematics	
Credentials	Elem. Ed., ESOL endorsed and Integrated Curriculum for Middle Grades, National Board certified	
Performance Record	2013-Highly Effective	

Classroom Teachers

# of classroom teachers
57

 # receiving effective rating or higher
57, 100%

 # Highly Qualified Teachers
96%

 # certified in-field
56, 98%

 # ESOL endorsed
40, 70%

 # reading endorsed
11, 19%

 # with advanced degrees
30, 53%

 # National Board Certified
3, 5%

 # first-year teachers
1, 2%

 # with 1-5 years of experience
10, 18%

 # with 6-14 years of experience
27, 47%

 # with 15 or more years of experience
19, 33%

Education Paraprofessionals

# of paraprofessionals
6

 # Highly Qualified
6, 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

Seminole County Public Schools is always looking for highly qualified, certified teachers to teach our students. The method of recruitment is defined based on the need. Seminole County Public Schools reputation of being an "A" school district brings to us thousands of highly qualified applicants. One of our recruitment strategies is our partnership with State and private colleges and universities. We welcome university and college interns and field study students to our district not only from the State of Florida university system but also out of State. Annually our district participates in many university job fairs and minority and veteran job fairs. This year we have gone out of the United States and are bringing on board a few teachers from Spain to teach the dual language classes.
The district supports all teachers but especially new teachers with mentoring programs. We also

provide in-services and workshops. New teachers with zero years of experience are assigned a one on one mentor. This support is provided beyond the first year.

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

Our school has a school-wide mentor who works with administration to coordinate all mentoring activities on our campus. This school-wide mentor was trained by our county's new teacher facilitator and given materials and agendas to support the new teachers during this calendar year. Before school began, our new teachers spent a day with our school-wide mentor and were given a campus tour and oriented to important procedures and policies that will affect them as they begin the school year. Once school begins, these new teachers meet regularly with the mentor(s) who best fits their needs and follow an agenda of recommended topics that are appropriate for each teacher's given situation. Whether the new teacher is working with a school-wide mentor, peer teacher, or alternative certification mentor, he or she is working with an individual who has been trained by our county to support the teacher's various needs. Each of these mentor roles are fine-tuned each year based on the feedback from our new teachers the year before.

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 has a core Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) problem solving team, comprised of members with expertise in academic and behavioral domains. The MTSS team utilizes the continuous problem solving process to identify students who are at-risk in academics and/or behavior and determines why the problem is occurring. The MTSS team designs and implements research-based interventions and regularly monitors student progress/response to interventions. The school utilizes the online MTSS module to document all interventions, meetings, and parent involvement in the process.

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

Collaboration to identify student needs and interventions to support academic and behavioral success. The MTSS team meets with teachers to ensure interventions are appropriate and that the progression from tier to tier are being done with fidelity and that the needs of individual students are being addressed.

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

Administration is consistent with weekly classroom walk-throughs focused on specific interventions, data review and record review as we progress from tier to tier.

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

Our management system is EdInsight and the data used is a combination of reading, writing and mathematics progress monitoring and assessments.

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

Professional Development for all instructional employees is planned for the fall and training on EdInsight as well as computer time to practice is scheduled. Parent/teacher/MTSS team member conferences are scheduled every 6 to 8 weeks to review the progress of their child on MTSS.

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: 1,400

Tutorial; 30 minutes before or after (parents pick for students can choose which serves them best)

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

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

Sucessmaker reports, SRI levels and DE data

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

The lead teacher for tutorial gathered the data and meet regularly with tutorial teachers and homeroom teachers of the students.

Strategy: Weekend Program

Minutes added to school year: 240

Writing Boot Camp to review and extend 6 Traits strategies

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

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

Monitoring of writing samples and District prompts

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Each fourth grade teacher monitored their data and shared at PLCs

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

Name	Title
Julie Youngblood	Kindergarten
Trisha Griffin	First Grade
Michele Buschmohle	Second Grade
Abigail Guess	Third Grade
Julie Lane	Fourth Grade
LaToya Jenkins	Fifth Grade
Kerri Segrest	CAMMP representative
Libby Swanson	ESE representative

How the school-based LLT functions

We meet bi-monthly to discuss school information,District initiatives, data and concerns,
The role of the LLT is for the representatives to act as a liaison between administration and their team members.

Major initiatives of the LLT

Collaborative efforts to accomplish our school-wide goals

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

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

Literacy is central to the life and success of any school. Our vision of literacy reaches beyond reading strategies to incorporate a broader approach that involves students in reading, speaking, writing and habits of thinking as they are practiced in specific disciplines of English language arts, history, math, science, and every content our students encounter. This emphasis on disciplinary knowledge paired with critical thinking skills allows the secondary teacher to give all students the opportunity to engage in sophisticated, challenging academic work. School leaders function as instructional leaders, helping the entire school community function as a community of practice, working in concert to study, develop, share, and learn from state-of-the-art methods for developing literacy skills and capacity.

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

Red Bug has a Blended Model Pre-K and VPK VE program this year. Students in the Voluntary Pre-K (VPK) Program visit the kindergarten classrooms at the end of the school year to learn about what to expect in kindergarten. During the summer, students entering kindergarten in selected Title I Schools can attend Kinder Camp to help prepare them for success in kindergarten. Schools offer an Open House before school starts and kindergarten teachers are available for individual conferences.

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

Our school provides students with fourth and fifth grade Primes as well as one student taking Primes in fifth grade through our SCPS Virtual school in an attempt to prepare our students for STEM and provide opportunities for advancement where able. We attend Lake Howell Cluster meetings and are currently working with literacy coaches in reading and math from Lake Howell and Tuskawilla Middle School to refine our efforts and focus on what the upper schools see as deficits as the students matriculate from elementary school.

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

Our guidance department works with students on middle school magnet programs, character keys and decision-making for their future. We provide FOCUS education through the Seminole County Sheriff's Office and guide them as needed.

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

We attend Lake Howell Cluster meetings to stay in tune with vertical articulation and concerns.

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	73%	78%	Yes	75%
American Indian				
Asian	87%	85%	No	88%
Black/African American	49%	68%	Yes	54%
Hispanic	62%	78%	Yes	66%
White	76%	79%	Yes	78%
English language learners	53%	67%	Yes	57%
Students with disabilities	43%	25%	No	49%
Economically disadvantaged	63%	70%	Yes	67%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	139	32%	35%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	203	46%	49%

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 %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	178	62%	65%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	41	58%	60%

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)	15	65%	68%
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]*		23%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	13	57%	60%

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		0%

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	93	70%	73%
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	72%	75%	Yes	75%
American Indian				
Asian	90%	92%	Yes	91%
Black/African American	43%	57%	Yes	49%
Hispanic	57%	71%	Yes	61%
White	78%	78%	Yes	81%
English language learners	53%	44%	No	57%
Students with disabilities	50%	25%	No	55%
Economically disadvantaged	63%	68%	Yes	67%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	148	34%	37%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	180	41%	44%

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	170	59%	62%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	27	42%	50%

Middle School Acceleration

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Middle school participation in high school EOC and industry certifications	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		0%
Middle school performance on high school EOC and industry certifications	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		0%

Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		0%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		0%

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		0%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		0%

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	60	38%	41%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	29	18%	21%

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%

Middle School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		0%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		0%

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)	7		10
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	810	57%	60%

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses	0	0%	0%
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more *accelerated* courses	0	0%	0%
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in *accelerated* courses		0%	0%
Students taking CTE industry certification exams	0	0%	0%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams		0%	0%
CTE program concentrators	0	0%	0%
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications	0	0%	0%

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	55	7%	5%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	17	2%	1%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	28	19%	15%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	22	2%	1%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	15	2%	1%

Middle School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	0	0%	0%
Students who fail a mathematics course	0	0%	0%
Students who fail an English Language Arts course	0	0%	0%
Students who fail two or more courses in any subject	0	0%	0%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	0	0%	0%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	0	0%	0%

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

Parent Portal in Skyward (Access to student data)
Increase parent participation in school-wide events; PTA, SAC, Dividend Volunteers, Super Scientists, FCAT Night, Discovery Eduction primary and DE Intermediate Nights, FCAT Writes Night, Book Fair Parent Night, Love of the Arts, Field trip chaperones, Skate Nights, Red Bug Dines, Room Parents, Reading Mentors.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Increase parent enrollment in Skyward Parent Portal	164	25%	28%
Increase parent participation in school-wide events	298	35%	38%

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

n/a

Specific Additional Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
n/a	n/a	n/a%	n/a%

Goals Summary

G1. Student proficiency rates and learning gains with our lowest 25% will increase due to the repeated review of data and the implementation of intervention strategies, differentiated instruction and inter-rater reliability.

Goals Detail

G1. Student proficiency rates and learning gains with our lowest 25% will increase due to the repeated review of data and the implementation of intervention strategies, differentiated instruction and inter-rater reliability.

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 Learning Gains, Middle School Acceleration)

Resources Available to Support the Goal
- Department of Teaching and Learning resources

- Literacy and Math support teachers: provide data for teachers and assist with the creation of data boards to visually assess student reading and math growth, with special attention to the lowest 25% and what interventions are in place for them.

- Professional Development opportunities to enhance reading, writing and math strategies

- Daily time for Professional Learning Communities

- Administrative support (walk-throughs, PLC discussions, etc.)

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal
- Lack of knowledge in differentiated instruction, inter-rater reliability and strategies for intervention

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Increased proficiency in reading, writing and math

Person or Persons Responsible
Students in grades 3-5 will increase from 66% proficient in reading to 70% and 54 % proficient in math to 60% proficient, and in writing a grade-level average of 1.64 points in writing to an average of 4.0 in the spring.

Target Dates or Schedule:
Monitoring at second DE and third and final DE administration in the spring.

Evidence of Completion:
Data growth reports, data boards and progress monitoring assessments in classes.

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

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

G1. Student proficiency rates and learning gains with our lowest 25% will increase due to the repeated review of data and the implementation of intervention strategies, differentiated instruction and inter-rater reliability.

G1.B1 Lack of knowledge in differentiated instruction, inter-rater reliability and strategies for intervention

G1.B1.S1 Implement meaningful and purposeful PLCs with focus on data and instructional strategies

Action Step 1

Professional Learning Communities daily (once a week with administration and instructional support teachers to review data and once a week with administration and/or district personnel to learn more about instructional strategies)

Person or Persons Responsible

Mercedes Agramonte-Harper, Kristen Ramkissoon, Victoria Redding, Joanna Lee, Elizabeth Gehron, Val Brown, Shannon Cadden, Liza Ferreira, and/or Lindsey Hosack

Target Dates or Schedule

During PLCs, PD Wednesdays or District PD opportunities

Evidence of Completion

PLC agendas and evidences, Learning Logs, PD points, etc.

Facilitator:

Teachers that attended Kagan and FL DOE CC Summer Institute and Elizabeth Gehron, Val Brown, Shannon Cadden, Liza Ferreira, and/or Lindsey Hosack

Participants:

Instructional personnel

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

Review data and student growth in reading, writing and math

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Instructional support staff and teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Agendas from PLCs, grade-level data boards, data tracking sheets, and student data notebooks

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Student academic growth in reading, writing and math will be reviewed on data boards, data tracking sheets and individual student completed data notebooks.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Instructional support staff and teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Agendas from PLCs, grade-level data boards, data tracking sheets, student data notebooks and discussion of interventions and strategies used for our students who are not moving at the desired rate.

G1.B1.S2 Implement grade level iii and math centers daily, with fidelity, and differentiate instruction to meet the students at their level and support their needs for academic growth

Action Step 1

Specific differentiated instruction, inter-rater reliability and strategies for intervention in reading, writing and math during iii and math centers daily.

Person or Persons Responsible

Instructional personnel

Target Dates or Schedule

Daily

Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans, walk-through data, feedback and instructional observations

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S2

Review of growth data and instructional strategies within iii and math centers that support student needs.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration (Mercedes and Kristen) and academic support teachers (Vicki and Joanna)

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly in PLCs

Evidence of Completion

PLC agendas, data boards, data reports for progress monitor assessments and student data notebooks.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S2

Review of growth data and instructional strategies within iii and math centers that support student needs.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration (Mercedes and Kristen) and academic support teachers (Vicki and Joanna)

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

PLC agendas, data boards, data reports for progress monitor assessments and student data notebooks.

G1.B1.S3 Implement before school and after school tutorial for our lowest 25% in reading and math and conduct Boot Camps on Saturdays for writing

Action Step 1

Tutorial and Boot Camp support

Person or Persons Responsible

Lowest 30% of students in reading and math/ instructional personnel teaching tutorial (4th grade teachers for Boot Camp)

Target Dates or Schedule

Fall and Spring session, Boot Camps on Saturdays starting in Jan. 2014

Evidence of Completion

Data report and progress monitoring assessment results (DE).

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S3

Tutorial and Boot Camps

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal and Assistant Principal (Mercedes and Kristen)

Target Dates or Schedule

Bi-weekly

Evidence of Completion

Student data from SuccessMaker and progress monitoring assessments in Tutorial.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S3

Instructional strategies and small group support

Person or Persons Responsible

Instructional personnel and administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Bi-weekly

Evidence of Completion

Student data from SuccessMaker and progress monitoring assessments in Tutorial.

G1.B1.S4 Train teachers on inter-rater reliability

Action Step 1

Inter-rater reliability in grading writing prompts

Person or Persons Responsible

Fourth grade teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Week of Sept. 9, 2013

Evidence of Completion

Learning logs and PD points given.

Facilitator:

Given by Shannon Cadden and Pat Goldman

Participants:

Fourth grade teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S4

Review of writing prompt data

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and 4th grade teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

4 times per year

Evidence of Completion

PLC data review agenda and discussion notes

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S4

Inter-rater reliability in grading writing prompts and giving feedback to students

Person or Persons Responsible

4th grade teachers and administration will monitor

Target Dates or Schedule

PLCs

Evidence of Completion

PLC agendas and discussion notes

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

Red Bug Elementary School will coordinate Supplemental Academic Instruction and Exceptional Student Education funds to provide additional academic tutorial and/or intervention time for students in need of remediation. These funding sources are coordinated to maximize the number of students and the amount of services available for academic interventions. In addition, the school district coordinates IDEA funds to provide our school additional paraprofessionals that facilitate small group instruction during the school day. We also coordinate with the Director of ESOL for the use of Title III funds for Summer Learning Camp opportunities for our students of other languages.The coordination and integration of these funds and services ensure students are provided the time and support needed to master the standards and improve academic achievement.

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. Student proficiency rates and learning gains with our lowest 25% will increase due to the repeated review of data and the implementation of intervention strategies, differentiated instruction and inter-rater reliability.

G1.B1 Lack of knowledge in differentiated instruction, inter-rater reliability and strategies for intervention

G1.B1.S1 Implement meaningful and purposeful PLCs with focus on data and instructional strategies

PD Opportunity 1

Professional Learning Communities daily (once a week with administration and instructional support teachers to review data and once a week with administration and/or district personnel to learn more about instructional strategies)

Facilitator

Teachers that attended Kagan and FL DOE CC Summer Institute and Elizabeth Gehron, Val Brown, Shannon Cadden, Liza Ferreira, and/or Lindsey Hosack

Participants

Instructional personnel

Target Dates or Schedule

During PLCs, PD Wednesdays or District PD opportunities

Evidence of Completion

PLC agendas and evidences, Learning Logs, PD points, etc.

G1.B1.S4 Train teachers on inter-rater reliability

PD Opportunity 1

Inter-rater reliability in grading writing prompts

Facilitator

Given by Shannon Cadden and Pat Goldman

Participants

Fourth grade teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Week of Sept. 9, 2013

Evidence of Completion

Learning logs and PD points given.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G1.	Student proficiency rates and learning gains with our lowest 25% will increase due to the repeated review of data and the implementation of intervention strategies, differentiated instruction and inter-rater reliability.	$18,460
	Total	$18,460

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Personnel	Total
PD budget and SAC funds	$0	$0
State Tutorial funds	$17,900	$17,900
PD funds	$560	$560
Total	$18,460	$18,460

Budget Details

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

G1. Student proficiency rates and learning gains with our lowest 25% will increase due to the repeated review of data and the implementation of intervention strategies, differentiated instruction and inter-rater reliability.

G1.B1 Lack of knowledge in differentiated instruction, inter-rater reliability and strategies for intervention

G1.B1.S2 Implement grade level iii and math centers daily, with fidelity, and differentiate instruction to meet the students at their level and support their needs for academic growth

Action Step 1

Specific differentiated instruction, inter-rater reliability and strategies for intervention in reading, writing and math during iii and math centers daily.

Resource Type

Personnel

Resource

We used substitute teachers to cover the teachers attending having time to plan iii and to become familiar with the new materials with Reading Street. There are 48 teachers and 2 days will be given, at half-day intervals.

Funding Source

PD budget and SAC funds

Amount Needed

$0

G1.B1.S3 Implement before school and after school tutorial for our lowest 25% in reading and math and conduct Boot Camps on Saturdays for writing

Action Step 1

Tutorial and Boot Camp support

Resource Type

Personnel

Resource

Hiring certified teachers to support lowest 30% student needs in reading, writing and math for both ESE and General Education students

Funding Source

State Tutorial funds

Amount Needed

$17,900

G1.B1.S4 Train teachers on inter-rater reliability

Action Step 1

Inter-rater reliability in grading writing prompts

Resource Type

Personnel

Resource

We used substitute teachers to cover the teachers attending the training on inter-rater reliability. There were 7 teachers that attended.

Funding Source

PD funds

Amount Needed

$560