

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Citrus Elementary
87 N CLARKE RD
Ocoee, FL 34761
407-445-5475

School Demographics

School Type Elementary School	Title I No	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate 67%
Alternative/ESE Center No	Charter School No	Minority Rate 75%

School Grades History

2013-14 C	2012-13 C	2011-12 B	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	3
Differentiated Accountability	4
Part I: Current School Status	5
Part II: Expected Improvements	15
Goals Summary	19
Goals Detail	19
Action Plan for Improvement	21
Part III: Coordination and Integration	27
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	28
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	31

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

Citrus Elementary

Principal

Delaine Bender

School Advisory Council chair

George Quesada

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

Name	Title
Delaine Bender	Principal
Christina Howell	Instructional Support
Courtney Sellers	Guidance Counselor
Ellen Smith	Curriculum Resource Teacher
Jackie Hoffmeyer	Staffing Specialist/Compliance Teacher

District-Level Information

District

Orange

Superintendent

Dr. Barbara M Jenkins

Date of school board approval of SIP

1/28/2014

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

The SAC membership is made up of a group of parents, staff, a community member and the principal that reflect the racial/ethnic make up of the school.

Principal: Delaine Bender

Chair: George Quezada, parent

Secretary: Rebecca Follon, parent

Community Member: Shasta Quinn, West Oaks Library

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

School grade data was reviewed and analyzed. SAC made recommendations for school focus and goals for the School Improvement Plan.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

The SAC meets 8 times per year. Activities planned for this school year include close monitoring of the School Improvement Plan, creating and distributing a needs assessment survey, analysis of survey results, making recommendations for budget and school improvement based on survey results.

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

The entire amount, \$2,342.43, of school improvement funds will be used to compensate teachers who provide after school tutoring for our struggling students. However, this amount will not cover the entire cost of compensation for teachers and materials. SAC approved the expenditure.

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

1

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Delaine Bender

Principal

Years as Administrator: 7

Years at Current School: 5

Credentials

Bachelor of Science Elementary Education
Masters of Education Educational Leadership

Performance Record

2012-2013: Principal Citrus Elementary School, School Grade - C; 61% met high standards in reading, 54% met high standards in math, 59% met high standards in writing, 55% met high standards in science, 63% made learning gains in reading, 47% made learning gains in math, 61% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 39% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

2011-2012: Principal Citrus Elementary School, School Grade - B; 62% met high standards in reading, 60% met high standards in math, 73% met high standards in writing, 54% met high standards in science, 66% made learning gains in reading, 62% made learning gains in math, 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 51% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math

2010-2011: Principal Citrus Elementary School, School Grade - B; 73% met high standards in reading, 79% met high standards in math, 82% met high standards in writing, 41% met high standards in science, 63% made learning gains in reading, 56% made learning gains in math, 69% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 56% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-No-74%

2009-2010: Principal Citrus Elementary School, School Grade - A; 78% met high standards in reading, 83% met high standards in math, 85% met high standards in writing, 46% met high standards in science, 71% made learning gains in reading, 70% made learning gains in math, 59% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-No-97%

2008-2009: Assistant Principal Citrus Elementary School, School Grade - A; 79% met high standards in reading, 74% met high standards in math, 86% met high standards in writing, 44% met high standards in science, 75% made learning gains in reading, 59% made learning gains in math, 74% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 64% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-No-92%

2007-2008: Assistant Principal Lake Whitney Elementary School, School Grade - A; 90% met high standards in reading, 86% met high standards in math, 79% met high standards in writing, 65% met high standards in science, 66% made learning gains in reading, 62% made learning gains in math, 58% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 58% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-No-97%

2006-2007: Assistant Principal Lake Whitney Elementary School, School Grade - A; 92% met high standards in reading, 91% met high standards in math, 87% met high standards in writing, 72%

met high standards in science, 86% made learning gains in reading, 77% made learning gains in math, 94% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 66% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-Yes-100%

Instructional Coaches

of instructional coaches

2

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Christina Howell

Full-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 1

Years at Current School: 11

Areas

Reading/Literacy, RtI/MTSS

Credentials

Bachelor of Science Elementary Education
Master of Education Educational Leadership

Performance Record

2012-2013: School Grade - C; 61% met high standards in reading, 54% met high standards in math, 59% met high standards in writing, 55% met high standards in science, 63% made learning gains in reading, 47% made learning gains in math, 61% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 39% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math
2011-2012: Curriculum Resource Teacher School, School Grade - B; 62% met high standards in reading, 60% met high standards in math, 73% met high standards in writing, 54% met high standards in science, 66% made learning gains in reading, 62% made learning gains in math, 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 51% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math

Ellen Smith		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 4	Years at Current School: 12
Areas	Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, Science, Data, RtI/MTSS	
Credentials	Bachelor of Science Elementary Education	
Performance Record	<p>2012-2013: School Grade - C; 61% met high standards in reading, 54% met high standards in math, 59% met high standards in writing, 55% met high standards in science, 63% made learning gains in reading, 47% made learning gains in math, 61% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 39% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math</p> <p>2011-2012: Curriculum Resource Teacher School, School Grade - B; 62% met high standards in reading, 60% met high standards in math, 73% met high standards in writing, 54% met high standards in science, 66% made learning gains in reading, 62% made learning gains in math, 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 51% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math</p> <p>2010-2011: Curriculum Resource Teacher Citrus Elementary School, School Grade - B; 73% met high standards in reading, 79% met high standards in math, 82% met high standards in writing, 41% met high standards in science, 63% made learning gains in reading, 56% made learning gains in math, 69% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 56% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-No-74%</p> <p>2009-2010: Curriculum Resource Teacher Citrus Elementary School, School Grade - A; 78% met high standards in reading, 83% met high standards in math, 85% met high standards in writing, 46% met high standards in science, 71% made learning gains in reading, 70% made learning gains in math, 59% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-No-97%</p>	

Classroom Teachers

of classroom teachers
43

receiving effective rating or higher
43, 100%

Highly Qualified Teachers
100%

certified in-field
43, 100%

ESOL endorsed
26, 60%

reading endorsed

3, 7%

with advanced degrees

16, 37%

National Board Certified

0, 0%

first-year teachers

6, 14%

with 1-5 years of experience

20, 47%

with 6-14 years of experience

19, 44%

with 15 or more years of experience

4, 9%

Education Paraprofessionals**# of paraprofessionals**

3

Highly Qualified

3, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel**# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above**

2

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

In order to retain highly qualified teachers the CRT, Instructional Support, Guidance Counselor and Staffing Specialist, as well as all paraprofessionals and support staff support classroom teachers in various ways. Many tasks are taken care of so that teachers can focus on the task of providing high quality instruction to our students. The principal, CRT, Instructional Support, Guidance Counselor and Staffing Specialist provide professional development for teachers based on their needs. When recruiting highly qualified staff the principal utilizes the E-Recruiting employment site to monitor applicants, check references, and interview qualify applicants. The School Secretary works with Employment Services to ensure highly qualified candidates clear the application process in E-Recruiting before the principal schedules interviews. The principal carefully checks resumes to ensure teachers possess a degree in Elementary Education and are appropriately certified. Once hired, new teachers are assigned a mentor with several years of effective teaching experience. Mentors provide assistance in the day to day operations, lesson planning, record keeping, data analysis, and effective instructional strategies. Instructional Support coordinates the mentor program

and schedules monthly meetings to ensure new teachers are provided extra assistance throughout the school 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

First year teachers, new teachers to the district and teachers new to a grade level are assigned a mentor. The mentor teacher is a teacher with several years of effective ratings and someone who has a proven record of high academic achievement for students. Mentors have also taken the Clinical Educator class offered by the district. Mentees meet on a monthly basis with the mentor coordinator and on an as needed ongoing basis with their mentor. Planned activities this school year consist of training in the Marzano Evaluation system, Thinking Maps, I-Ready and how to effectively use the Journeys and Go Math resources for instruction.

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 leadership team assists in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan by identifying those students in the lowest 30% and subgroups who need intensive monitoring through the MTSS process. The MTSS problem solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP by disaggregating FCAT data to determine school wide objectives and goals for the upcoming school year. Once objectives and goals have been set, the MTSS leadership team consistently refers to the SIP during MTSS meetings to determine if progress is being made toward the established goals. The school based MTSS Leadership team meets on a weekly basis to monitor student progress and to identify those students who may need to go through the MTSS process. Those students are identified by utilizing the OCPS Decision Making Form which helps to determine what the problem is, why it is occurring, and determine an instruction/intervention plan and progress monitoring. The MTSS Leadership team works with grade level MTSS representatives to coordinate MTSS efforts through communicating with their grade level teammates on how to identify Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, how to effectively deliver an intervention and how to progress monitor students using the MTSS graphing template.

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

The MTSS team is comprised of the principal, staffing coordinator, curriculum resource teacher, school psychologist, instructional support, guidance counselor and classroom teachers. The principal closely monitors students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, the curriculum resource teacher and instructional support conduct fidelity checks on interventions to ensure the intervention is being delivered as prescribed, the staffing specialist and guidance counselor conduct classroom observations and make recommendations for accommodations or modifications as needed and the school psychologist assists the team in determining when a student is eligible for an evaluation. The MTSS team continually meets to review intervention data and determine if progress is being made towards the School Improvement Goals.

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

During data meetings and MTSS meetings data is reviewed to monitor the effectiveness of interventions used with Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Each grade levels data sheets are monitored weekly by an assigned staff member and teachers monitor students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions through weekly progress monitoring. During PLC meetings teachers also review progress towards SIP goals by reviewing grade level data, discuss progress of their students receiving interventions, those on grade level and those needing enrichment.

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 summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, and science are FCAT 2.0 data, Performance Matters benchmark assessments, I-Ready, FAIR data, Journeys and Go Math Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. The data source used to summarize data at each tier for writing is monthly school-wide writing prompts and Write Score reports for 4th grade. The data sources used to summarize data at each tier for behavior is Student Management System (SMS)/Educational Data Warehouse (EDW) Instructional programs are monitored through lesson plan checks, team meetings and data meetings. Teachers also record assessment information on class data sheets so that staff who work with students can easily access all assessments.

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

The leadership team will work with all faculty members and provide training to support their implementation of MTSS. We will analyze data and discuss student needs at our weekly MTSS meeting to ensure we decrease the disproportionate classification in Special Education.. Parents are notified when students are receiving Tier 2 and again when then move to Tier 3 interventions. Parents are informed of academic progress and next steps during these meetings.

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Before or After School Program

Minutes added to school year: 3,960

Citrus Elementary will offer after school tutoring on Tuesdays and Thursdays from October until April. Each tutoring session will be split into two 45 minute blocks. We will utilize I-Ready for our Level 1 and Level 2 students in 4-5 grade and for our struggling and bubble students in 3rd grade along with Ready Common Core workbooks. The workbooks contain lessons tailored to students specific needs. We are also exploring interest in Saturday tutoring for interested parents.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

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

We will utilize the I-Ready diagnostic assessments, I-Ready reports, progress monitoring, and benchmark assessments to determine if I-Ready and the targeted lessons are effective. Through analysis of the I-Ready reports we will be able to determine what skills need to be targeted.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

The Curriculum Resource Teacher, administration and classroom teacher will monitor the progress of the students receiving tutoring through I-Ready reports and benchmark testing.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

Name	Title
Delaine Bender	Principal
Amy Combs	Intervention Teacher
Meredith Wilson	Media Specialist
Ellen Smith	Curriculum Resource Teachers
Christina Howell	Instructional Support

How the school-based LLT functions

The school-based LLT will meet on a bi-weekly basis to disaggregate student data and to develop a plan of action to address the needs of the Lowest 25% and Tier 3 students who are not meeting mastery on in class, school and/or district assessments.

Major initiatives of the LLT

The major initiative of the LLT this year for students in grades K-2 is to decrease the number of students who are reading below grade level according to Diagnostic Reading Assessment and FAIR data. This will be done by the following:

- *Include a 140 English Language Arts block within the master schedule.
- *Continue to provide a Reading Intervention teacher for those struggling readers above the 120 minutes in the classroom.
- *Utilize I-Ready which is a computer based reading intervention program which is based upon the student's individual reading level.

- *Reading Intervention teacher will utilize Journeys tiered interventions.
 - *Continue the use of the FAIR progress monitoring tool kit.
 - *The Media Specialist will provide recognition for the class and students with the most Accelerated Reading points for each nine weeks.
 - *The LLT will meet bi-weekly to review data and student progress.
- The major initiative of the LLT this year for students in grades 3-5 will be to increase the number of students making learning gains for those scoring proficient and for the lowest 25% in reading.
- *Include a 140 minute English Language Arts block within the master schedule.
 - *Utilize I-Ready which is a computer based reading intervention program which is based upon the student's individual reading level.
 - *The Media Specialist will provide recognition for students reading the Sunshine State books and for the class and students with the most Accelerated Reading points for each nine weeks.
 - *The LLT will meet with bi-weekly with teachers to review student data and student progress

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

Each year we conduct a kindergarten orientation for incoming kindergartners, introduce parents to the kindergarten team, and provide time to visit classrooms and ask questions. When students enter kindergarten in August teachers assess students on kindergarten readiness skills using FLKRS and FAIR. Students that fall in the lowest 30% for letter sounds and letter recognition receive extra support from a reading intervention teacher during the school day.

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	62%	61%	No	66%
American Indian	47%	71%	Yes	52%
Asian	79%	75%	No	81%
Black/African American	58%	50%	No	63%
Hispanic	57%	53%	No	61%
White	70%	69%	No	73%
English language learners	52%	38%	No	57%
Students with disabilities	30%	9%	No	37%
Economically disadvantaged	55%	53%	No	60%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	95	26%	30%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	132	35%	40%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6			
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	142	63%	66%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	35	61%	66%

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)	56	62%	66%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	20	22%	26%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	17	19%	25%

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	70	59%	70%
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	66%	54%	No	69%
American Indian	58%	71%	Yes	63%
Asian	90%	78%	No	91%
Black/African American	58%	35%	No	63%
Hispanic	59%	57%	No	63%
White	78%	61%	No	80%
English language learners	56%	49%	No	60%
Students with disabilities	37%	9%	No	43%
Economically disadvantaged	58%	47%	No	63%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	119	32%	40%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	78	22%	30%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6			
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	106	47%	66%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	24	39%	66%

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	37	30%	33%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	35	27%	30%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6			
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)	1		3
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	131	25%	50%

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	53	7%	5%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	26	4%	2%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	54	41%	30%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	42	6%	2%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	43	6%	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

Our goal is to increase parental involvement in school events such as Open House, PTA events, and FCAT nights.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Increase parental involvement at school events.	200	29%	50%

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

Specific Additional Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
--------	---------------	---------------	---------------

Goals Summary

- G1.** Our goal for the 2013-2014 school year is to increase learning gains in math for the lowest quartile.
- G2.** We will increase the learning gains for all students in reading.

Goals Detail

G1. Our goal for the 2013-2014 school year is to increase learning gains in math for the lowest quartile.

Targets Supported

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Resources we have available are the new GO Math curriculum materials and I-Ready. I-Ready is a computer program that starts with a diagnostic assessment, progress monitors students and provides tools for instruction. We have several teachers on campus trained in Thinking Maps.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teachers lack of knowledge and understanding about how to implement differentiated instruction limits the time spent effectively targeting individual students needs.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Monitor the progress of implementation of the MTSS process as it relates to the progress of the lowest quartile in math.

Person or Persons Responsible

Delaine Bender, MTSS team, Minority Achievement Office

Target Dates or Schedule:

October 2013-ongoing

Evidence of Completion:

FAIR, Performance Matters benchmark assessments, I-Ready diagnostic and progress monitoring reports

G2. We will increase the learning gains for all students in reading.

Targets Supported

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

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Journeys, I-Ready, Thinking Maps

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teachers have difficulty with implementation of the new core Journeys curriculum.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Monitor the effectiveness of I-Ready implementation as it relates to the overall reading performance of students.

Person or Persons Responsible

Delaine Bender, MTSS team, Minority Achievement Office

Target Dates or Schedule:

October 2013-Ongoing

Evidence of Completion:

FAIR, Performance Matters benchmark assessments, I-Ready diagnostic and progress monitoring reports

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. Our goal for the 2013-2014 school year is to increase learning gains in math for the lowest quartile.

G1.B1 Teachers lack of knowledge and understanding about how to implement differentiated instruction limits the time spent effectively targeting individual students needs.

G1.B1.S1 N-Student achievement will increase by continuing to implement the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) process. The Minority Achievement Office will be working with our MTSS team and provide training for the team and teachers.

Action Step 1

Implementation and training in the MTSS process

Person or Persons Responsible

MTSS team, Minority Achievement Office

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013-ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Attendance at trainings, PLC notes, MTSS meeting notes

Facilitator:

MTSS team and Minority Achievement Office

Participants:

MTSS team, K-5 teachers

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

Monitoring the implementation of the MTSS process

Person or Persons Responsible

Delaine Bender, MTSS team

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013-ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans, classroom observations, MTSS meeting notes, data meetings, PLC notes

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Monitoring the effectiveness of implementation of the MTSS process.

Person or Persons Responsible

MTSS team, Leadership team

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013-ongoing

Evidence of Completion

FAIR, Performance Matters benchmark assessments, I-Ready diagnostic and progress monitoring reports

G1.B1.S2 N-Teachers will utilize the I-Ready computer program that assesses student math quantile level and provides skill specific practice at all levels. I-Ready consultant will provide professional development for teachers on how to utilize reports to provide differentiated instruction and skill specific practice.

Action Step 1

Professional development with I-Ready consultant to train teachers on utilizing reports to differentiate instruction.

Person or Persons Responsible

I-Ready consultant, Delaine Bender, Leadership team, MTSS team, K-5 teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013, ongoing progress monitoring

Evidence of Completion

Sign in sheets for training

Facilitator:

I-Ready consultant

Participants:

Leadership team, all K-5 teachers

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

I-Ready reports, student assessments

Person or Persons Responsible

Delaine Bender, Leadership and MTSS team, K-5 teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013-ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Notes from MTSS and data meetings, Performance Matters Benchmark tests, student assessments

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S2

Monitor effectiveness of I-Ready implementation as it relates to the lowest 25% in math.

Person or Persons Responsible

Delaine Bender, MTSS team, K-5 teachers, Math Alignment Committee

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013-ongoing

Evidence of Completion

FAIR, Performance Matters benchmark assessments, I-Ready progress monitoring and diagnostic reports

G2. We will increase the learning gains for all students in reading.

G2.B1 Teachers have difficulty with implementation of the new core Journeys curriculum.

G2.B1.S1 N-Identify and provide teachers that need professional development with the new core curriculum.

Action Step 1

Understanding of how to deliver the new core curriculum

Person or Persons Responsible

Delaine Bender, CRT, Instructional Support, and Reading Intervention Teacher

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013-ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Classroom observations, PLC meetings, lesson plans

Facilitator:

CRT and Reading Intervention Teacher

Participants:

all K-5 teachers

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

Monitor that the core is implemented with fidelity

Person or Persons Responsible

Delaine Bender, CRT

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013-ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Classroom observations, walkthroughs, student assessment results

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S1

Monitor the effectiveness of the implementation of the new core.

Person or Persons Responsible

Delaine Bender

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Classroom observations, walkthroughs, and student assessment data

G2.B1.S2 N-Teachers will utilize the I-Ready computer program that assesses student reading Lexile level and provides skill specific practice at all levels. I-Ready consultant will provide professional development for teachers on how to utilize reports to provide differentiated instruction and skill specific practice.

Action Step 1

Professional Development with I-Ready consultant to train teachers on utilizing reports to differentiate instruction.

Person or Persons Responsible

I-Ready consultant, Delaine Bender, Leadership team, MTSS team, K-5 teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013-ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Sign in sheets for training

Facilitator:

I-Ready consultant

Participants:

Leadership team, all K-5 teachers

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

I-Ready reports, student assessments

Person or Persons Responsible

Delaine Bender, Leadership and MTSS team, K-5 teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013-ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Notes from MTSS and data meetings, Performance Matters Benchmark tests, student assessments

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S2

Monitor the effectiveness of I-Ready implementation as it relates to the overall reading performance of students.

Person or Persons Responsible

Delaine Bender, MTSS team, K-5 teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013-Ongoing

Evidence of Completion

FAIR, Performance Matters benchmark assessments, I-Ready progress monitoring and diagnostic 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

Supplemental Academic Instruction funds are used to purchase a portion of an Instructional Support position. This person supports the I-Ready computer program, is part of the MTSS team, and is the mentoring coordinator at the school.

Title II funds will be used to pay for substitute teachers in order to provide time for teachers to attend MTSS training, Journeys core training, Go Math and Math Alignment committee meetings. Substitutes will be provided for new teachers to attend Thinking Maps training.

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. Our goal for the 2013-2014 school year is to increase learning gains in math for the lowest quartile.

G1.B1 Teachers lack of knowledge and understanding about how to implement differentiated instruction limits the time spent effectively targeting individual students needs.

G1.B1.S1 N-Student achievement will increase by continuing to implement the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) process. The Minority Achievement Office will be working with our MTSS team and provide training for the team and teachers.

PD Opportunity 1

Implementation and training in the MTSS process

Facilitator

MTSS team and Minority Achievement Office

Participants

MTSS team, K-5 teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013-ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Attendance at trainings, PLC notes, MTSS meeting notes

G1.B1.S2 N-Teachers will utilize the I-Ready computer program that assesses student math quantile level and provides skill specific practice at all levels. I-Ready consultant will provide professional development for teachers on how to utilize reports to provide differentiated instruction and skill specific practice.

PD Opportunity 1

Professional development with I-Ready consultant to train teachers on utilizing reports to differentiate instruction.

Facilitator

I-Ready consultant

Participants

Leadership team, all K-5 teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013, ongoing progress monitoring

Evidence of Completion

Sign in sheets for training

G2. We will increase the learning gains for all students in reading.

G2.B1 Teachers have difficulty with implementation of the new core Journeys curriculum.

G2.B1.S1 N-Identify and provide teachers that need professional development with the new core curriculum.

PD Opportunity 1

Understanding of how to deliver the new core curriculum

Facilitator

CRT and Reading Intervention Teacher

Participants

all K-5 teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013-ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Classroom observations, PLC meetings, lesson plans

G2.B1.S2 N-Teachers will utilize the I-Ready computer program that assesses student reading Lexile level and provides skill specific practice at all levels. I-Ready consultant will provide professional development for teachers on how to utilize reports to provide differentiated instruction and skill specific practice.

PD Opportunity 1

Professional Development with I-Ready consultant to train teachers on utilizing reports to differentiate instruction.

Facilitator

I-Ready consultant

Participants

Leadership team, all K-5 teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October 2013-ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Sign in sheets for training

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G1.	Our goal for the 2013-2014 school year is to increase learning gains in math for the lowest quartile.	\$400
G2.	We will increase the learning gains for all students in reading.	\$1,000
Total		\$1,400

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Professional Development	Evidence-Based Materials	Total
Title II	\$400	\$1,000	\$1,400
Total	\$400	\$1,000	\$1,400

Budget Details

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

G1. Our goal for the 2013-2014 school year is to increase learning gains in math for the lowest quartile.

G1.B1 Teachers lack of knowledge and understanding about how to implement differentiated instruction limits the time spent effectively targeting individual students needs.

G1.B1.S1 N-Student achievement will increase by continuing to implement the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) process. The Minority Achievement Office will be working with our MTSS team and provide training for the team and teachers.

Action Step 1

Implementation and training in the MTSS process

Resource Type

Professional Development

Resource

Provide substitutes for teachers to attend MTSS training.

Funding Source

Title II

Amount Needed

\$400

G2. We will increase the learning gains for all students in reading.

G2.B1 Teachers have difficulty with implementation of the new core Journeys curriculum.

G2.B1.S1 N-Identify and provide teachers that need professional development with the new core curriculum.

Action Step 1

Understanding of how to deliver the new core curriculum

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Materials

Resource

Journeys and I-Ready

Funding Source

Title II

Amount Needed

\$1,000