

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Lake Whitney Elementary
1351 WINDEMERE RD
Winter Garden, FL 34787
407-877-8888

School Demographics

School Type Elementary School	Title I No	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate 14%
Alternative/ESE Center No	Charter School No	Minority Rate 34%

School Grades History

2013-14 A	2012-13 B	2011-12 A	2010-11 A	2009-10 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	3
Differentiated Accountability	4
Part I: Current School Status	5
Part II: Expected Improvements	20
Goals Summary	27
Goals Detail	27
Action Plan for Improvement	28
Part III: Coordination and Integration	34
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	35
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	37

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

Lake Whitney Elementary

Principal

Elizabeth Prince

School Advisory Council chair

Karyn Hewett

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

Name	Title
Kimberlee Smirti	Curriculum Resource Teacher
Shannon Ross	Instructional Support
Tambi Durham	Guidance Counselor

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

Elizabeth Prince, Principal

Karyn Hewett, Parent

Lorrie Beahler, Parent

Denise Malloney, Parent

Leslie Tavares, Parent

Nicole Wilson, Parent

Jane Folgert, Community Member

Tambi Durham, Faculty

Brian Bruton, Classified

Shannon Ross, Faculty

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

A survey was conducted during the 2012-2013 school year. Parents, teachers, school staff, and community members responded favorably toward the education our students receive. School data was reviewed and analyzed. SAC made recommendation toward school focus and goals for the School Improvement Plan as well as the SIP budget.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

The SAC will share the responsibilities of the implementation of the school improvement plan. The SAC team meets 8 times per year. Activities of the year will include monitoring the SIP, conducting a school-wide survey, analyze the survey results by sub-committee and provide recommendations to principal, and give recommendations to support SIP goal and SIP budget.

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

We received approximately \$3,000 in school improvement funds. These funds will be used to compensate teachers for school tutoring. A motion was made to the SAC committee for approval. It passed unanimously.

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC

In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

Highly Qualified Staff

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

Administrators

of administrators

1

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Elizabeth Prince

Principal

Years as Administrator: 15

Years at Current School: 15

Credentials

Specialist
Degree;Educational
Leadership K-12/
Masters
Degree;Elementary
Education 1-6 /
Bachelors Degree;
Marketing

Performance Record

2012-2013: B grade; 73% met high standards in reading, 69% met high standards in math, 64% met high standards in writing; 72% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 83% made learning gains in math; 45% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

2011-2012: A grade; 85% met high standards in reading, 81% met high standards in math, 92% met high standards in writing; 81% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 83% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 72% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

2010-2011: A grade; 91% met high standards in reading,92% met high standards in math 91% met high standards in writing; 81% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 74% made learning gains in math; 67% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 70% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%

2009-2010: A grade; 91% met high standards in reading,91% met high standards in math 91% met high standards in writing; 74% met high standards in science; 60% made learning gains in reading; 66% made learning gains in math; 60% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 76% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in

math; AYP-yes-100%
2008-2009: A grade; 93% met high standards in reading,91% met high standards in math 87% met high standards in writing; 76% met high standards in science; 74% made learning gains in reading; 70% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%
2008-2009: A grade; 93% met high standards in reading,91% met high standards in math 87% met high standards in writing; 76% met high standards in science; 74% made learning gains in reading; 70% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%
2007-2008: A grade; 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
2006-2007: A grade; 92% met high standards in reading,92% 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

Page 2 of 54
2/11/2013
the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%
1999-2006 refer to FLDOE School Accountability Report

Instructional Coaches

of instructional coaches

4

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Kimberlee Smirti		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 12	Years at Current School: 16
Areas	Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, Science, Data	
Credentials	Bachelors Degree / Elementary Education 1-6	
Performance Record	<p>2012-2013: B grade; 73% met high standards in reading, 69% met high standards in math, 64% met high standards in writing; 72% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 83% made learning gains in math; 45% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>2011-2012: A grade; 85% met high standards in reading, 81% met high standards in math, 92% met high standards in writing; 81% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 83% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 72% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>2010-2011: A grade; 91% met high standards in reading, 92% met high standards in math 91% met high standards in writing; 81% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 74% made learning gains in math; 67% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 70% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%</p> <p>2009-2010: A grade; 91% met high standards in reading, 91% met high standards in math 91% met high standards in writing; 74% met high standards in science; 60% made learning gains in reading; 66% made learning gains in math; 60% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 76% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%</p> <p>2008-2009: A grade; 93% met high standards in reading, 91% met high standards in math 87% met high</p>	

standards in writing; 76% met high standards in science; 74% made learning gains in reading; 70% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%

2008-2009: A grade; 93% met high standards in reading, 91% met high standards in math 87% met high standards in writing; 76% met high standards in science; 74% made learning gains in reading; 70% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%

2007-2008: A grade; 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

2006-2007: A grade; 92% met high standards in reading, 92% 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%

1999-2006 refer to FLDOE School Accountability Report

Shannon Ross		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 2	Years at Current School: 4
Areas	Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, Science, Data	
Credentials	Masters Degree; History Certification in History and Elementary Education/ Bachelors Degree; History	
Performance Record	<p>2012-2013: B grade; 73% met high standards in reading, 69% met high standards in math, 64% met high standards in writing; 72% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 83% made learning gains in math; 45% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>2011-2012: A grade; 85% met high standards in reading, 81% met high standards in math, 92% met high standards in writing; 81% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 83% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 72% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>2010-2011: A grade; 91% met high standards in reading, 92% met high standards in math 91% met high standards in writing; 81% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 74% made learning gains in math; 67% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 70% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%</p> <p>2009-2010: A grade; 91% met high standards in reading, 91% met high standards in math 91% met high standards in writing; 74% met high standards in science; 60% made learning gains in reading; 66% made learning gains in math; 60% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 76% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%</p>	

Nancy Dedek

Part-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 2

Years at Current School: 10

Areas

Reading/Literacy, RtI/MTSS

Credentials

Masters Degree; Elementary Education
 Reading Endorsed
 ESOL Endorsed

Performance Record

2012-2013: B grade; 73% met high standards in reading, 69% met high standards in math, 64% met high standards in writing; 72% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 83% made learning gains in math; 45% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

2011-2012: A grade; 85% met high standards in reading, 81% met high standards in math, 92% met high standards in writing; 81% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 83% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 72% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

2010-2011: A grade; 91% met high standards in reading, 92% met high standards in math 91% met high standards in writing; 81% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 74% made learning gains in math; 67% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 70% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%

2009-2010: A grade; 91% met high standards in reading, 91% met high standards in math 91% met high standards in writing; 74% met high standards in science; 60% made learning gains in reading; 66% made learning gains in math; 60% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 76% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%

2008-2009: A grade; 93% met high standards in reading, 91% met high standards in math 87% met high

standards in writing; 76% met high standards in science; 74% made learning gains in reading; 70% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%

2008-2009: A grade; 93% met high standards in reading,91% met high standards in math 87% met high standards in writing; 76% met high standards in science; 74% made learning gains in reading; 70% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%

2007-2008: A grade; 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

2006-2007: A grade; 92% met high standards in reading,92% 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%

1999-2006 refer to FLDOE School Accountability Report

Tiffany Wilhite Stalvey

Part-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 0

Years at Current School: 0

Areas

Mathematics, RtI/MTSS

Credentials

Bachelors Degree; Elementary Education
ESOL Endorsed

Performance Record

Classroom Teachers

of classroom teachers

48

receiving effective rating or higher

48, 100%

Highly Qualified Teachers

100%

certified in-field

48, 100%

ESOL endorsed

32, 67%

reading endorsed

4, 8%

with advanced degrees

19, 40%

National Board Certified

0, 0%

first-year teachers

0, 0%

with 1-5 years of experience

10, 21%

with 6-14 years of experience

23, 48%

with 15 or more years of experience

15, 31%

Education Paraprofessionals

of paraprofessionals

5

Highly Qualified

5, 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

Lake Whitney Elementary operates as a Professional Learning Community.

To retain highly qualified teachers, we have have teachers assist with the interviewing and selection of candidates.

A mentoring program and staff development also supports new teachers.

Persons in charge include: Principal CRT, Instructional Support Teachers, and Grade Level Teachers

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's mentoring program includes Induction meetings, Clinical Education Class, classroom management overviews, lesson plans guides, technology assistance, weekly meetings with the mentees and any other issues that may arise. The rationale for pairing teachers is to establish collaboration. Experienced teachers are paired with new teachers to provide support of school and district initiatives.

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 established MTSS team provides information about progress monitoring and intervention strategies for struggling students.
- Teachers meet regularly with the MTSS team to identify and monitor progress of students who are in need of interventions in the classrooms.
- The MTSS team along with the classroom teachers prescribes interventions and conducts progress monitoring of the interventions to determine success.

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

Selected members of the MTSS Leadership Team assisted with the development of the school improvement plan. The school improvement plan incorporates the core principles of MTSS, which include early intervention; using scientific, research-based materials; using data to make decisions; and monitoring student progress to inform instruction.

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

Selected members of the MTSS Leadership Team monitor the effectiveness of the MTSS process with students. The Leadership team meets weekly with teachers to determine the effectiveness of the interventions through progress monitoring. Changes to the interventions are made if deemed necessary.

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

In order to increase areas of identified deficiencies in Reading, Math, Science, Writing and Behavior, FCAT

scores, benchmark Data, FAIR and schoolwide discipline referrals will be analyzed by the Principal, CRT, grade levels, and the school's MTSS team at the beginning of the school year. Based upon the success of the plan that was implemented in the 2010-2011 school year, we will continue with the following MTSS plan.

The following actions were taken:

- The third through fifth grades analyzed FCAT and FAIR data, as well as school based assessments to determine student reading levels.
- Grade level reading groups were created within the 90 minute reading block.
- The established MTSS team provided information about progress monitoring and intervention strategies for struggling students.
- Teachers met regularly with the MTSS team to identify and monitor progress of students who were in need of interventions in the classrooms.
- The MTSS team along with the classroom teachers prescribed interventions and conducted progress monitoring of the interventions to determine success. This process is designed to decrease any disproportionate classification in Special Education.
- The lowest 5% of fourth graders received intensive remedial writing instruction given by the principal.
- Additional support via the Read 180 program was provided to identified students in fourth and fifth grades.
- One-on-one support was provided to identified students in all grade level K-5.
- Vertical dialog of data sharing was facilitated periodically throughout the year.
- Grade levels met weekly to facilitate instruction.

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

Our MTSS team meets weekly to follow up with the progress monitoring of students needing additional support with academics or behavior. In addition, a staff member is charged with monitoring all students identified as a MTSS student and oversee the fidelity of interventions in the classroom. Ongoing professional development during faculty meetings is provided to all staff members. Parents are made aware of the MTSS process during conferences with staff.

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: 1,800

Teachers will use Thinking Maps and technology to increase student achievement. Teachers will analyze student data to ensure that students are instructed in deficient areas.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

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

Teachers will assess the progress of each student by completing an assessment after each skill taught. Data will be collected and analyzed during PLCs. Students will continue to be monitored based on the data.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Principal, CRT, Reading Coach, Classroom teachers

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

Name	Title
Elizabeth Prince	Principal
Jennifer Birk	Staffing Coordinator
Kimberlee Smirti	Curriculum Resource Teacher
Nancy Dudek	Resource Teacher, Reading
Tiffany Wilhite Stalvey	Resource Teacher, Math
Teresa McGrew	Media Specialist

How the school-based LLT functions

The LLT team meets to analyze data and to provide teachers with support for the implementation of the Common Core Standards. An instructional support teacher is assigned to assist teachers in with materials, strategies, and other support in order for them to collaborate through their Professional Learning Communities for the implementation of the Common Core.

Major initiatives of the LLT

The major initiative of the LLT this year will be the implementation and preparation for the Common Core Curriculum as well as the integration of the high effect size strategies.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

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

N/A

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

Prior to the beginning of the school year, our kindergarten teachers hosted a kindergarten orientation for parents which included the following tips:

Take time to listen to your child and discuss aspects of the new school that he or she is worried about.

Remember to let your child know that it's normal to feel nervous about the start of school.

Take a family photo or special object to school to make his or her surroundings more comfortable.

In addition to our Open House, our kindergarten teachers hosted a Curriculum Night for parents to learn about the kindergarten curriculum and ways to help their students transition from prekindergarten to kindergarten. Teachers administered the FLKRS/ECHOs during the first 30 days of school. This assessment identifies students' readiness for school.

Teachers encourage parents to spend time each day talking to their child about what happened in school. A school agenda is used for daily communication between school and home. Parents are suggested to give their child positive feedback about his or her new experiences.

Parents are requested to attend school functions and stay involved in their child's education. Children whose

parents are more involved with their education have higher achievement, are better adjusted and are less likely to drop out of school.

We encourage parents to make a point to learn about how your child develops not just physically, but socially and emotionally, as well. If you are aware of what's typical behavior and thoughts for your child's stage of life, you will more readily be able to tell when things may not be right.

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

N/A

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

N/A

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

N/A

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	87%	82%	No	88%
American Indian				
Asian	90%	83%	No	91%
Black/African American	63%	57%	No	67%
Hispanic	86%	68%	No	87%
White	89%	88%	No	90%
English language learners	69%	57%	No	72%
Students with disabilities	38%	33%	No	44%
Economically disadvantaged	68%	63%	No	72%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	80	25%	30%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	189	57%	58%

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>		0%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		0%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	146	73%	76%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	13	45%	55%

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)	14	70%	73%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		38%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		43%

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.	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		

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	69%	73%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		0%

Area 3: Mathematics

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics

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

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	86%	81%	No	87%
American Indian				
Asian	95%	93%	No	96%
Black/African American	56%	54%	No	60%
Hispanic	82%	76%	No	84%
White	90%	84%	No	91%
English language learners	76%	63%	No	78%
Students with disabilities	48%	43%	No	54%
Economically disadvantaged	71%	55%	No	74%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	98	37%	40%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	144	44%	47%

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>		0%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		0%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	139	69%	72%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	22	63%	66%

Middle School Acceleration

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

Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

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

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		0%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		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	21	23%	24%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	56	55%	56%

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>		0%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		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	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		0%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		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)	3		4
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	117	98%	100%

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 <i>accelerated</i> courses	0	0%	0%
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> 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	38	5%	4%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	4	0%	0%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	21	20%	18%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	3	0%	0%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	2	0%	0%

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

We expect to have 33% of parents attend the FCAT 2.0 parent night during the 2013-2014 school year.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Parents of third, fourth and/or fifth graders	60	30%	50%

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

N/A

Specific Additional Targets

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

Goals Summary

G1. Students in the lowest quartile will make sufficient learning gains in reading.

Goals Detail

G1. Students in the lowest quartile will make sufficient learning gains in reading.

Targets Supported

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

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Journeys Reading Series, Thinking Maps, iReady, Read 180, and FCAT Explorer

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- The students lack motivation due to lack of success in reading.
- Teachers lack knowledge of the new reading series and the alignment with the scope and sequence of the targeted skills.
- Teachers have limited understanding of analyzing and dis aggregating data.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Student progress will be monitored to ensure that students make learning gains.

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, CRT, Classroom Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule:

Monthly

Evidence of Completion:

Data meetings, benchmark testing, iReady diagnostic tools will be used through out the year to determine progress toward our goal.

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. Students in the lowest quartile will make sufficient learning gains in reading.

G1.B1 The students lack motivation due to lack of success in reading.

G1.B1.S1 Provide tutoring for Level 1 and Level 2 students in reading.

Action Step 1

Provide tutoring for Level 1 and Level 2 students in reading.

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, CRT, Classroom teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

From September 2013 - March 2014.

Evidence of Completion

Students will improve their reading scores on the FCAT by a minimum of 12 points by June 2014.

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

After school tutoring will be monitored by attendance and specific skills diagnostic data.

Person or Persons Responsible

Patricia Sullivan, fourth and fifth grade teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Eighteen session offered between September 2013 - March 2014

Evidence of Completion

Students will be in attendance 80% (18) of the 22 sessions offered.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

All level 1 and Level 2 students will have access to iReady.

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, CRT, and Classroom teachers..

Target Dates or Schedule

Four times per week.

Evidence of Completion

Student access to the iReady program will be monitored by the classroom teachers.

G1.B1.S2 Utilize iReady for all Level 1 and Level 2 students in reading which will correlate with leveled incentives. Teachers will utilize the iReady computer program that assesses student reading quartile level and provides skill specific practice at all levels. iReady consultant will provide professional development for teachers on how to utilize reports and provide differentiated instruction and skill specific practice.

Action Step 1

Purchase iReady as a diagnostic tool with embedded instruction in reading (N)

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, CRT, Classroom teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

By October 2013.

Evidence of Completion

Students will improve their reading scores on the FCAT by a minimum of 12 points by June 2014.

Facilitator:

Curriculum Associates facilitator

Participants:

Principal and all instructional personnel

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

After school tutoring will be monitored by attendance.

Person or Persons Responsible

Patricia Sullivan

Target Dates or Schedule

Monday afternoons

Evidence of Completion

Students will be in attendance 80% (18) of the 22 sessions offered.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S2

All level 1 and Level 2 students will have access to iReady.

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, CRT, and Classroom teachers..

Target Dates or Schedule

Four times per week.

Evidence of Completion

Student access to the iReady program will be monitored by the classroom teachers.

G1.B2 Teachers lack knowledge of the new reading series and the alignment with the scope and sequence of the targeted skills.

G1.B2.S1 Teachers will be provided professional development with the implementation of the new core reading program and the supplemental materials as it aligns with the scope and sequence.

Action Step 1

Teachers will be provided with professional development

Person or Persons Responsible

All teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Teachers are able to implement the new core reading program with fidelity.

Facilitator:

Nancy Dudek, Kimberlee Smirti

Participants:

All teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B2.S1

Teachers will collaborate through PLCs.

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, CRT, Reading Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Teachers will implement quality instruction based upon the new core series.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S1

PLC notes, Lesson plans, Assessment Data, Classroom observation

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, CRT, Reading Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Student data

G1.B3 Teachers have limited understanding of analyzing and dis aggregating data.

G1.B3.S1 Provided professional development on dis aggregating data.

Action Step 1

Analyze data effectively

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, CRT, Reading Coach, all teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Assessment data

Facilitator:

Kimberlee Smirti

Participants:

All teacher

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B3.S1

Data meetings

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, CRT, All teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Assessment data

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B3.S1

Data Meetings

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, CRT, Reading Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Assessment data

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 II funds will be allocated to enhancing teacher effectiveness. iReady consultant fees will be paid for through Title II. Teachers will be provided substitutes to attend the training.

In addition, teachers will be afforded the opportunities to attend conferences to improve their abilities to deliver instruction to students in the areas of reading and/or math. Conference fees, as well as the cost of substitutes, will be paid for through Title II funds.

School improvement funds will be used to provide compensation for tutoring Level 1 and Level 2 students in reading. In addition to the partial funding for a reading and math resource teacher, SAI funds will be used to provide teachers with financial compensation for before and/or after school tutoring.

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. Students in the lowest quartile will make sufficient learning gains in reading.

G1.B1 The students lack motivation due to lack of success in reading.

G1.B1.S2 Utilize iReady for all Level 1 and Level 2 students in reading which will correlate with leveled incentives. Teachers will utilize the iReady computer program that assesses student reading quartile level and provides skill specific practice at all levels. iReady consultant will provide professional development for teachers on how to utilize reports and provide differentiated instruction and skill specific practice.

PD Opportunity 1

Purchase iReady as a diagnostic tool with embedded instruction in reading (N)

Facilitator

Curriculum Associates facilitator

Participants

Principal and all instructional personnel

Target Dates or Schedule

By October 2013.

Evidence of Completion

Students will improve their reading scores on the FCAT by a minimum of 12 points by June 2014.

G1.B2 Teachers lack knowledge of the new reading series and the alignment with the scope and sequence of the targeted skills.

G1.B2.S1 Teachers will be provided professional development with the implementation of the new core reading program and the supplemental materials as it aligns with the scope and sequence.

PD Opportunity 1

Teachers will be provided with professional development

Facilitator

Nancy Dudek, Kimberlee Smirti

Participants

All teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Teachers are able to implement the new core reading program with fidelity.

G1.B3 Teachers have limited understanding of analyzing and dis aggregating data.

G1.B3.S1 Provided professional development on dis aggregating data.

PD Opportunity 1

Analyze data effectively

Facilitator

Kimberlee Smirti

Participants

All teacher

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Assessment data

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G1.	Students in the lowest quartile will make sufficient learning gains in reading.	\$5,600
Total		\$5,600

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Personnel	Evidence-Based Materials	Total
SAI	\$3,500	\$0	\$3,500
Title II	\$0	\$2,100	\$2,100
Total	\$3,500	\$2,100	\$5,600

Budget Details

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

G1. Students in the lowest quartile will make sufficient learning gains in reading.

G1.B1 The students lack motivation due to lack of success in reading.

G1.B1.S1 Provide tutoring for Level 1 and Level 2 students in reading.

Action Step 1

Provide tutoring for Level 1 and Level 2 students in reading.

Resource Type

Personnel

Resource

Classroom teachers

Funding Source

SAI

Amount Needed

\$3,500

G1.B1.S2 Utilize iReady for all Level 1 and Level 2 students in reading which will correlate with leveled incentives. Teachers will utilize the iReady computer program that assesses student reading quartile level and provides skill specific practice at all levels. iReady consultant will provide professional development for teachers on how to utilize reports and provide differentiated instruction and skill specific practice.

Action Step 1

Purchase iReady as a diagnostic tool with embedded instruction in reading (N)

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Materials

Resource

iReady consultant

Funding Source

Title II

Amount Needed

\$2,100