2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Chiefland Elementary School

1205 NW 4TH AVE

Chiefland, FL 32626

352-493-6040

http://chiefes.levyschools.org/r/home

School Demographics

School Type	Title I	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
Elementary School	Yes	39%

Alternative/ESE Center	Charter School	Minority Rate
No	No	28%

School Grades History

2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11
D	D	C	B

SIP Authority and Template

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

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

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: Current School Status

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

Part II: Expected Improvements

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

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

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

Part III: Coordination and Integration

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

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

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

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

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

Differentiated Accountability

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

DA Regions

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

DA Categories

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

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

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

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

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

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Focus Year 1	2	Wayne Green

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

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School
Chiefland Elementary School

Principal
Angelita Thomas

School Advisory Council chair
Pam Hatch

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

Name	Title
Angelita Thomas	Principal
Danielle Rosson	Assistant Principal
Aaron Haldeman	Dean of Students

District-Level Information

District
Levy

Superintendent
Mr. Robert O Hastings

Date of school board approval of SIP
10/8/2013

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

Membership of the SAC

Rebecca Lloyd- SAC President, Pam Hatch-SAC faculty member, Angelita Thomas-Principal, Danielle Rosson-Assistant Principal, Aaron Haldeman- Dean of Students, Nina Hudson-SAC co-chair. New members will be determined at the SAC meeting on October 8, 2013.

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

In the 2012-2013 school year the SAC team met to review the SIP goals. On September 3, 2013, copies of the SIP were provided to members present to review and provide input as a collaborative effort. Feedback was documented and later the revisions were incorporated into the SIP. The Principal-Teacher-Student-Parent Compact was presented to parents as well.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

The SAC committee will provide monetary opportunities for classroom "mini-grants".

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

N/A

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
2

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

Administrator Information:

Angelita Thomas		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 4	Years at Current School: 1

Credentials	Bachelor's Degree: Jacksonville University Master's Degree: Saint Leo University Educational Leadership (K-12) Certification: Elementary 1-6, Middle Education 6-12, Educational Leadership, ESOL, Reading Endorsement (all grades)
Performance Record	2012-2013 Chiefland Elementary, Principal; Grade: D; Score: 400; AYP: No Level 3 or higher in Reading, 49%; Level 3 or higher in Math, 47%; Meeting the Writing standard, 42%; Level 3 or higher in Science, 58%; Making learning gains in Reading, 52%; Making learning gains in Math, 53%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading, 53%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Math, 43% 2011-2012 Williston Elementary, Assistant Principal Grade: C; Score: 482; AYP: No Level 3 or higher in Reading, 53%; Level 3 or higher in Math, 53%; Meeting the Writing standard, 75%; Level 3 or higher in Science, 43%; Making learning gains in Reading, 70%; Making learning gains in Math, 64%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading, 70%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Math, 62% 2010-2011 Williston Elementary, Assistant Principal Grade: B; Score: 508; AYP: No Level 3 or higher in Reading, 74%; Level 3 or higher in Math, 73%; Meeting the Writing standard, 85%; Level 3 or higher in Science, 50%; Making learning gains in Reading, 58%; Making learning gains in Math, 57%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading, 52%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Math, 59% 2009-2010 Old Town Elementary Grade: A; Score: 581; AYP: Yes Level 3 or higher in Reading, 80%; Level 3 or higher in Math, 89%; Meeting the Writing standard, 75%; Level 3 or higher in Science, 60%; Making learning gains in Reading, 67%; Making learning gains in Math, 71%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading, 65%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Math, 74%

Danielle Rosson		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 2	Years at Current School: 0

Credentials	Bachelor's Degree: Florida Southern College International Business Master's Degree: Argosy University Educational Leadership Certification: Elementary Education K-6, Educational Leadership
Performance Record	2012-2013 Bronson Elementary, Assistant Principal Grade: C; Score:472; AYP: No Level 3 or higher in Reading, 47%; Level 3 or higher in Math, 56%; Meeting the Writing Standard, 46%; Level 3 or higher in Science, 55%; Making learning gains in Reading, 64%; Making learning gains in Math, 66%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading, 67%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Math, 73%

Instructional Coaches

# of instructional coaches

1

 # receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Sandra Roberts		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 9	Years at Current School: 21

Areas	Reading/Literacy
Credentials	Bachelor's Degree: Elementary Education 1-6 Master's Degree: Reading K-12
Performance Record	2012-2013: Grade: D; Score: 400; AYP: No Level 3 or higher in Reading, 49%; Level 3 or higher in Math, 47%; Meeting the Writing standard, 42%; Level 3 or higher in Science, 58%; Making learning gains in Reading, 52%; Making learning gains in Math, 53%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading, 53%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Math, 43% 2011-2012: Grade C; Score: 433; AYP: NO Level 3 or higher in Reading, 50%; Level 3 or higher in Math, 45%; Meeting the Writing standard, 71%; Level 3 or higher in Science, 45%; Making learning gains in Reading, 65%; Making learning gains in Math, 51%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading, 69%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Math, 36% 2010-2011: Grade B; Score: 513; AYP: NO Level 3 or higher in Reading, 76%; Level 3 or higher in Math, 77%; Meeting the Writing standard, 92%; Level 3 or higher in Science, 45%; Making learning gains in Reading, 64%; Making learning gains in Math, 56%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading, 55%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Math, 41% 2009-2010: Grade A; Score: 561; AYP: YES Level 3 or higher in Reading, 78%; Level 3 or higher in Math, 83%; Meeting the Writing standard, 77%; Level 3 or higher in Science, 63%; Making learning gains in Reading, 67%; Making learning gains in Math, 71%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading, 51%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Math, 71%

Tammy Crosby		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 0	Years at Current School: 28

Areas	RtI/MTSS
Credentials	Bachelor's Degree Master's Degree Elementary Education 1-6, Reading K-12, ESOL Endorsement
Performance Record	2012-2013: Grade: D; Score: 400; AYP: No Level 3 or higher in Reading, 49%; Level 3 or higher in Math, 47%; Meeting the Writing standard, 42%; Level 3 or higher in Science, 58%; Making learning gains in Reading, 52%; Making learning gains in Math, 53%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading, 53%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Math, 43% 2011-2012: Grade C; Score: 433; AYP: NO Level 3 or higher in Reading, 50%; Level 3 or higher in Math, 45%; Meeting the Writing standard, 71%; Level 3 or higher in Science, 45%; Making learning gains in Reading, 65%; Making learning gains in Math, 51%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading, 69%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Math, 36% 2010-2011: Grade B; Score: 513; AYP: NO Level 3 or higher in Reading, 76%; Level 3 or higher in Math, 77%; Meeting the Writing standard, 92%; Level 3 or higher in Science, 45%; Making learning gains in Reading, 64%; Making learning gains in Math, 56%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading, 55%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Math, 41% 2009-2010: Grade A; Score: 561; AYP: YES Level 3 or higher in Reading, 78%; Level 3 or higher in Math, 83%; Meeting the Writing standard, 77%; Level 3 or higher in Science, 63%; Making learning gains in Reading, 67%; Making learning gains in Math, 71%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading, 51%; Lowest 25% making learning gains in Math, 71%

Classroom Teachers

# of classroom teachers

52

 # receiving effective rating or higher

51, 98%

 # Highly Qualified Teachers

98%

 # certified in-field

51, 98%

 # ESOL endorsed
30, 58%

 # reading endorsed
20, 38%

 # with advanced degrees
20, 38%

 # National Board Certified
2, 4%

 # first-year teachers
3, 6%

 # with 1-5 years of experience
9, 17%

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

 # with 15 or more years of experience
26, 50%

Education Paraprofessionals

# of paraprofessionals
17

 # Highly Qualified
16, 94%

Other Instructional Personnel

# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above
1

 # 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

Our school will rely on information provided to the district office from FLDOE regarding vacancy information within and outside the state of Florida. We will also use informational and recruiting tools such as participating in job and career fairs, utilizing the internet, and networking with other local districts to recruit highly qualified, certified, effective teachers. Teachers will be provided professional development opportunities, and a teacher mentoring program will be used to help retain these teachers. The principal will be responsible for recruiting and retaining 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 teachers will be assigned mentors during their first two years of teaching. These mentors will be teachers who have shown effective instructional strategies and student progress; and they must have Clinical Educator Training.

A teacher induction training was provided by the district for first year, second year, and Alternative Certification teachers. The emphasis was to give them insight into building classroom procedures that minimize behavior and discipline issues and make the most effective use of instructional time by designing a classroom environment that is conducive to learning.

The mentors also received training in communicating with their beginning teachers in order to help them become reflective practitioners. Mentors use a checklist of items that is reviewed each month with their beginning teacher. This ensures that teachers are provided with timely support throughout the school year. Topics are divided into the four domains based upon Charlotte Danielson's work, which is our evaluation system.

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

CES created a Problem Solving Team to take the key leadership role in the MTSS process. The team members are Tammy Crosby (RtI specialist), Sandra Roberts (Reading Coach), Michelle Barron, Julie Goeckel (Guidance Counselors), and the CES instructional staff involved with individual students. Monthly Problem Solving Team (PST) meetings are held to review and discuss individual student progress. The MTSS is a fluid system of intervening and monitoring for students based on individual student needs with feedback to teachers and parents.

Tier I: Core Instruction and its effectiveness for all students is the focus of Tier I. It includes all students in a 120 minute block for English/Language Arts and 60 minutes block for Mathematics. Differentiated instruction is a part of Tier I Core instruction. All students participate in progress monitoring assessments three times per year using FAIR, Levy Interim Assessments (LIA), as well as outcome assessments SAT-10 and FCAT.

Tier II: Students who are not successful in Tier I, even after general interventions through differentiation and show a gap in learning between them and their grade level peers and the expected benchmark receive an additional 30 minutes of small group instruction. Progress is monitored on a more consistent basis (every 10 days) using both formal and informal assessments.

Tier III: This is the highest level of intervention and includes an additional 60 minutes of instruction beyond the Tier I classroom. Highly qualified instructors are used to serve the students at the Tier III level. Individual student progress is monitored every 5 days.

Staffing and funding: MTSS staff is made up of all instructional staff, Para-professionals, special area teachers, and OPS (Other Personnel Services) positions.

Teacher Support System- The PST team serves as a teacher support as well as ongoing professional development and one-on-one coaching.

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

The CES Leadership Team will meet monthly with the purpose of keeping all lines of communication open between administration and staff and for reviewing all administration/district goals. This forum will also review the effectiveness of Core Instruction (SIP goals and MTSS plan) and review the implementation and coordination of the MTSS and SIP goals. Discussions may include curriculum,

resources, staffing, and necessary changes. Each member will represent their grade level at each Leadership Team meeting with input from their team concerning the focus of each meeting. They, in turn, will communicate the information and/or plan developed at meeting to their grade level teams.

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

CES analyzes student data approximately every twenty (20) school days during PST meetings. Student data from Performance Matters (the district's data processing warehouse) is considered a device for monitoring the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP. The LLT monitors MTSS fidelity on a monthly basis during regularly scheduled meetings using the Performance Matters data along with the considerations of the PST's findings. The administration conducts classroom walkthroughs to ensure the fidelity of instruction during interventions.
All CES staff participate on the SIP committee. They are responsible for reporting updates and progress from their committees to the Leadership Team.

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

CES utilizes student data gathered from FCIM, FAIR, LIA, WriteScore reports, and Skyward behavior and attendance reports to determine the effectiveness of the overall core curriculum. Data sources used to monitor effectiveness of Tier II and Tier III are Fast ForWord, Reading Assistant, Lexia, LIPs, DIPs, Moby Math, and Accelerated Reader/Star. Performance Matters reports supply triangulated data for individual students, teachers, classes, and grade levels and provides an effective system for monitoring student progress.

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

CES staff members are supported in their efforts to monitor student progress and effectively provide interventions through ongoing professional development and regular PST meetings. Administration will meet with grade level teams to review student progress on a monthly basis. This ongoing progress monitoring will enable teachers to analyze the effectiveness of interventions and respond to each student's needs. The district's Coordinator of RtI directly supports the school's MTSS process by providing support to the school's administration and coaching for the RtI teacher.
For parents, the district is providing an informational brochure to explain the MTSS process. CES will host Parent Conference Nights for individual parent meetings in October 2013 and March 2014 to discuss student progress. Parents are notified and receive updates on their child's progress in the RtI program at the end of each grading period and are invited to attend and initiate scheduled conferences/ PST 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: 2,400

CES provides an after-school tutoring program to students who are scoring below proficiency on FCAT in reading and mathematics. This program allows certified instructional personnel the opportunity to assist students who are struggling in specific areas of need. This will allow the school to help close the academic gaps.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education

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

The use of built-in progress monitoring will be used for programs such as Moby Math, Reading Assistant, and FastForWord. We will also monitor progress through school assessments.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Sandra Roberts, Tammy Crosby, and Administration

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

Name	Title
Angelita Thomas	Principal
Danielle Rosson	Assistant Principal
Sandra Roberts	Reading Coach
Tammy Crosby	RTI Coordinator
Denise Cowart	Teacher
Jane Mitchell	Teacher
Pam Hatch	Teacher
Tammy Arrington	Teacher
Deborah Hudson	Teacher
Lean Weatherford	Teacher
Aimee Watkins	Teacher

How the school-based LLT functions

The LLT has scheduled monthly meetings to discuss the school's literacy progress. The team reviews the implementation of RtI, FCIM, Explicit Teaching Model, Junior Great Books, Max Thompson's Strategies for 90, 90, 90 Schools, and Lesson Study and examines each literacy model for its effectiveness. The LLT then provides input and suggestions in how to most effectively make adjustments to these models to promote the highest level of academic success for all students while maintaining fidelity.

Major initiatives of the LLT

The major initiatives of the LLT will be to promote Literacy Week in January, proceed with full implementation of the BRIDGES program (a STEM awareness project that connects business partners and exposes career opportunities), ensure school wide implementation of writing using Core Connections, and monitor 100% of classroom teacher participation in Lesson Study that crosses all academic disciplines (reading, writing, science, math, and fine arts).

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

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

Teachers will provide documentation, in the form of lesson plans in Dropbox, regarding the implementation of Common Core State Standards for each lesson. Each lesson plan will be submitted electronically to be monitored by the Principal and the Assistant Principal. The Principal and Assistant Principal will conduct CWT's and observations while providing feedback to the teachers to ensure that teachers are meeting the set standards in all levels of reading. Classroom teachers are expected to differentiate instruction during center times in reading, implement DBQ's, and increase higher level questioning in instruction and student discussions, and include written responses in all subject areas. Non-classroom teachers have been trained along side classroom teachers in the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and are including mini vocabulary lessons when appropriate and requiring students to speak in complete sentences.

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

Early childhood teachers will be more involved with professional development opportunities. The administration will develop a plan to allow time for the early childhood teachers to meet with the kindergarten teachers to discuss vertical alignment and expectations. Our school administrators communicate with the local day care centers sharing our school's expectations with their staffs. Learning strategies and activities will be sent to any parent in the community who has a four year old child providing information for the parent to use with their child prior to enrollment in our school for the following school year. Students in our VPK program will receive an explicit curriculum supplied by the district coordinator, Laura Brown. FLKRS is administered to all kindergarten students to evaluate the VPK students and determine their readiness for beginning kindergarten. This is also used as a progress monitoring tool by the program to determine the success of the "early readiness curriculum" being delivered. VPK students participate in our kindergarten "Round Up" for early screening to determine placement needs for the upcoming school year for kindergarten.

Expected Improvements

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	61%	49%	No	65%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	42%	26%	No	48%
Hispanic	56%	50%	No	60%
White	65%	53%	No	69%
English language learners	58%	53%	No	63%
Students with disabilities	36%	27%	No	42%
Economically disadvantaged	54%	44%	No	59%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	96	27%	30%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	79	22%	25%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		60%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		0%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	188	52%	56%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	192	53%	57%

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)	17	45%	50%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		29%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	11	28%	33%

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	120	42%	50%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	48	13%	15%

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	60%	47%	No	64%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	48%	30%	No	53%
Hispanic	56%	58%	Yes	60%
White	63%	49%	No	66%
English language learners	70%	60%	No	73%
Students with disabilities	28%	27%	No	35%
Economically disadvantaged	53%	42%	No	58%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	138	47%	50%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	39	11%	16%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		75%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		100%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	193	53%	56%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	157	43%	46%

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	31	27%	30%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	36	31%	35%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

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

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)	4		9
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	500	59%	100%

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	192	24%	20%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	47	5%	3%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	53	43%	40%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	102	12%	10%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	61	7%	5%

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

See Parent Involvement Plan at https://app1.fldoe.org/bsa/parentInvolvementPlan/Default.aspx.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %

Goals Summary

G1. Increase number of students scoring proficient on state assessments in reading, math and science.

G2. Increase the learning gains of the students in the lowest 25%.

G3. Increase the student learning gains for all students.

G4. By June 30th, 2014 the percentage of 4th grade students who are proficient in writing will increase from 42% to 50%.

Goals Detail

G1. Increase number of students scoring proficient on state assessments in reading, math and science.

Targets Supported
- Science - Elementary School

Resources Available to Support the Goal
- Reading Assistant, Fastforward, afterschool tutoring, Moby Math, I-Ready Math, and Discovery Ed Science

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal
- Lack of teacher background knowledge in content area

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

LIA, FAIR and CIM checks

Person or Persons Responsible
Administration and teachers

Target Dates or Schedule:
CIM checks a minimum of every 6 weeks. LIA and FAIR data reviewed three times per year.

Evidence of Completion:
FCAT data

G2. Increase the learning gains of the students in the lowest 25%.

Targets Supported
- EWS - Elementary School

Resources Available to Support the Goal
- Supplemental materials in new core ELA textbook Scott Foresman Reading Street, Reading Assistant, FastForWord, after school tutoring, mentoring, PBS, and BRIDGES program

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal
- Lack of targeted instruction to student needs

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

FAIR, LIA, and CIM checks

Person or Persons Responsible
Administration and teachers

Target Dates or Schedule:
As assessments are given throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion:
FCAT scores

G3. Increase the student learning gains for all students.

Targets Supported

Resources Available to Support the Goal
- BRIDGES, Reading Assistant, I-Ready Math, FastForWord, and Moby Math

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal
- Differentiated instruction for all levels

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Data chats, CWT's, lesson plans

Person or Persons Responsible
Administration

Target Dates or Schedule:
Throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion:
Schoolwide data

G4. By June 30th, 2014 the percentage of 4th grade students who are proficient in writing will increase from 42% to 50%.

Targets Supported
- Writing

Resources Available to Support the Goal
- Writing resources that will be utilized to achieve our goal will include professional development, Writers in Control, and Razzle Dazzle.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal
- Lack of professional development in writing for teachers

- Students are not writing enough during the school day.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Writing score, writing folders, lesson plans, CWT data

Person or Persons Responsible
Administration, Reading Coach, Team Facilitators

Target Dates or Schedule:
Student progress will be monitored throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion:
Write Score data and FCAT 2.0 Writes

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

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

G1. Increase number of students scoring proficient on state assessments in reading, math and science.

G1.B5 Lack of teacher background knowledge in content area

G1.B5.S2 Implementation of BRIDGES program

Action Step 1

Participate in professional development provided by BRIDGES and implement through lesson study a cross curricular plan that includes math, science, and reading content with STEM opportunities.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and BRIDGES team

Target Dates or Schedule

Plan submitted in November 2013. Plan implemented November 2013 through May 2014.

Evidence of Completion

BODLDP plan submitted to NEFEC

Facilitator:

District staff, NEFEC staff

Participants:

Teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B5.S2

Lesson study documentation, lesson plans, observations and project update meetings with NEFEC

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and BRIDGES team

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Observations, agendas and CWT's

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B5.S2

Student work and projects linked to STEM opportunities

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and BRIDGES team

Target Dates or Schedule

At the end of the school year

Evidence of Completion

FCAT data

G2. Increase the learning gains of the students in the lowest 25%.

G2.B3 Lack of targeted instruction to student needs

G2.B3.S1 All students in the lower 25% will be assigned a mentor.

Action Step 1

Staff members will be assigned a student in the lower 25% to check in with those students to monitor the students grades, behavior, and build rapport with the student.

Person or Persons Responsible

All staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion

Completion of mentoring progress forms

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B3.S1

Monitoring tracking sheets, referral data (Skyward), student interviews

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Guidance

Target Dates or Schedule

Throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion

Skyward data and progress sheets

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B3.S1

Student interviews, teacher interviews, behavior progress monitoring data

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and Guidance

Target Dates or Schedule

Throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion

Schoolwide data

G2.B3.S2 Implement a robust intervention schedule.

Action Step 1

Use progress monitoring tools to determine students areas for improvement and center instruction around findings.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

As progress monitoring assessments are given throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion

Assessment results

Facilitator:

Administration

Participants:

Administration and teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B3.S2

CWT's,observations, lesson plans and data chats

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Periodically throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans, CWT's and assessments

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B3.S2

Increase in learning gains for the bottom 25%

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

April

Evidence of Completion

FCAT scores

G3. Increase the student learning gains for all students.

G3.B1 Differentiated instruction for all levels

G3.B1.S1 Increase learning centers for all students and small group instruction for the lower 25%.

Action Step 1

Targeted and rigorous instruction for all students

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers and administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Throughout the school year.

Evidence of Completion

Daily schedules, CWT's, and lesson plans

Facilitator:

Reading Coach and BRIDGES support personnel

Participants:

Teachers and administration

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B1.S1

CWT's and observations

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and Reading Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion

Progress monitoring data and course grades

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B1.S1

Looking for student work samples and student achievement data

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion

Schoolwide data

G4. By June 30th, 2014 the percentage of 4th grade students who are proficient in writing will increase from 42% to 50%.

G4.B5 Lack of professional development in writing for teachers

G4.B5.S1 Provide professional development opportunities in writing for teachers.

Action Step 1

Participate in Core Connections Writing training

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Reading Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Four times throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion

Sign in rosters and follow up completion

Facilitator:

Core Connections Trainer

Participants:

Administration, Reading Coach, Teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G4.B5.S1

Student work and lesson plans

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and Reading Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion

CWT's, observations, and team meeting discussions

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G4.B5.S1

Student work and lesson plans

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and Reading Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion

CWT's, observations, and team meeting discussions

G4.B6 Students are not writing enough during the school day.

G4.B6.S1 Writing will be included in all content areas.

Action Step 1

Use of DBQ's, extended responses, journaling, and response to text

Person or Persons Responsible

Classroom teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

All day

Evidence of Completion

CWT's, observations, and work samples

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G4.B6.S1

Work samples will be reviewed at team meetings.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrators, Reading Coach, RtI teacher, and classroom teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion

CWT's, observations, and work samples

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G4.B6.S1

Writing folders

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrators and Reading Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Periodically (3 times) throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion

CWT's, observations, and work samples

Coordination and Integration

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

How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Title I, Part A: Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school programs. The school ensures the use of Title I, Part A funds are used in school wide programs for the benefit of all students and subgroups. The school uses the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process in the spring to determine the needs and budget for the upcoming year. Once FCAT scores are released, the administration and staff review the decisions made in the spring to determine what changes, if any, need to be made to assist student's academic achievement. The district coordinates Title II and Title III funds to ensure staff development needs are provided.

Title I, Part C Migrant: The Migrant Liaison provides services and support to student and parents. The Liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure student needs are met.

Title I, Part D: These funds support the Forestry Youth Development Center. Levy no longer receives these funds.

Title II: The first subpart is technology, while the second part is professional development for principals and teachers.

Title III: Services are provided through the district for education materials and (ELL) district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title VI, Part B:

Title X Homeless: The district social worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI):

Violence Prevention Programs:N/A

Nutrition Programs: The district provides a Wellness Plan that guides the school in developing their Wellness Plan.

Housing Programs: N/A

Head Start: The school supports a Head Start program by providing space and services.

Adult Education: N/A

CTE:N/A

Job Training: N/A

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. Increase number of students scoring proficient on state assessments in reading, math and science.

G1.B5 Lack of teacher background knowledge in content area

G1.B5.S2 Implementation of BRIDGES program

PD Opportunity 1

Participate in professional development provided by BRIDGES and implement through lesson study a cross curricular plan that includes math, science, and reading content with STEM opportunities.

Facilitator

District staff, NEFEC staff

Participants

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Plan submitted in November 2013. Plan implemented November 2013 through May 2014.

Evidence of Completion

BODLDP plan submitted to NEFEC

G2. Increase the learning gains of the students in the lowest 25%.

G2.B3 Lack of targeted instruction to student needs

G2.B3.S2 Implement a robust intervention schedule.

PD Opportunity 1

Use progress monitoring tools to determine students areas for improvement and center instruction around findings.

Facilitator

Administration

Participants

Administration and teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

As progress monitoring assessments are given throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion

Assessment results

G3. Increase the student learning gains for all students.

G3.B1 Differentiated instruction for all levels

G3.B1.S1 Increase learning centers for all students and small group instruction for the lower 25%.

PD Opportunity 1

Targeted and rigorous instruction for all students

Facilitator

Reading Coach and BRIDGES support personnel

Participants

Teachers and administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Throughout the school year.

Evidence of Completion

Daily schedules, CWT's, and lesson plans

G4. By June 30th, 2014 the percentage of 4th grade students who are proficient in writing will increase from 42% to 50%.

G4.B5 Lack of professional development in writing for teachers

G4.B5.S1 Provide professional development opportunities in writing for teachers.

PD Opportunity 1

Participate in Core Connections Writing training

Facilitator

Core Connections Trainer

Participants

Administration, Reading Coach, Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Four times throughout the school year

Evidence of Completion

Sign in rosters and follow up completion

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals