



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

## 2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

---

---

Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary School

610 CHARLESTON AVE S

Fort Meade, FL 33841

863-285-1133

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

---

## School Demographics

---

<b>School Type</b> Elementary School	<b>Title I</b> Yes	<b>Free and Reduced Lunch Rate</b> 64%
<b>Alternative/ESE Center</b> No	<b>Charter School</b> No	<b>Minority Rate</b> 68%

---

## School Grades History

---

<b>2013-14</b> D	<b>2012-13</b> D	<b>2011-12</b> C	<b>2010-11</b> C
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

---

## 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**

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Differentiated Accountability</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Part I: Current School Status</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Part II: Expected Improvements</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Goals Summary</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Goals Detail</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Action Plan for Improvement</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Part III: Coordination and Integration</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>45</b>

---

## **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	3	Ella Thompson

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

## Current School Status

### School Information

#### School-Level Information

**School**

Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary School

**Principal**

Sue Bizerra

**School Advisory Council chair**

Clinton Cornelius

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

Name	Title
Dana Bakos	Assistant Principal Lewis
Alex Wise	Assistant Principal Anna Woodbury
Kathy Belcher	Title 1 Facilitator
Cassie Avellaneda	Math Coach
Stephanie Southwell	Reading Coach
Jennifer Hubbard	Guidance Counselor
Louria Macon	Network Manager
Totsie Martin	ESE Coordinator
Lina West	ESOL Coordinator
Sheri New	Media Specialist
Sandra Hart	Gifted/STEM Teacher

#### District-Level Information

**District**

Polk

**Superintendent**

Dr. Kathryn Leroy

**Date of school board approval of SIP**

Pending

### 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

Pastor Clinton Cornelius, community member, serves as the Chair of the Lewis Anna Woodbury School Advisory Council (SAC), and Esperanza Nunez, paraprofessional educator at the school, will serve as the Secretary of the SAC for the upcoming year. 52% of the SAC is comprised of parents and community members and the demographics fully match the demographics of the school population.

### **Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP**

One of the School Advisory Council's (SAC) main initiatives was to bring back a Pre-Kindergarten program to Lewis Anna Woodbury to increase school readiness of our children. For the upcoming year we have one School Readiness class and two Head Start classes. The SAC supported other academic initiatives detailed in this plan, such as the Reading Pals program and Teen Trendsetters. They also voted to approve the Watch Dog Dads program for the upcoming year.

### **Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year**

The SAC has an important function for the success of Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary School. Our SAC has been especially involved in looking for ways to increase parent and community involvement in the school. Listed below are some of the activities projected for the SAC.

- Reach out to community to obtain more partners
- Work to increase parent involvement
- Assist the school in analyzing school climate surveys for parents and students
- Review progress on School Improvement Plan goals
- Assist with preparation of Parent Involvement Plan

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

If school improvement funds are allocated, the SAC approved using the money for the purchase of ink to maintain printers around the school.

### **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**

3

#### **# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 10)

#### **Administrator Information:**

**Sue Bizerra**

Principal

Years as Administrator: 7

Years at Current School: 1

**Credentials**

BA Portuguese and Spanish from Georgetown University; M.Ed Administration and Supervision from University of Oklahoma; Educational Leadership Certification, Principal Certification -State of Florida; Certified K-12 Spanish, K-12 ESOL.

**Performance Record**

Principal at Lewis Anna Woodbury

2012-2013:

Grade: D-Reading 37% of students reading at or above grade level; 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 65% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math-25% of students at or above grade level; 46% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 53% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing: 51% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science: 16% of students at or above grade level in Science.

Assistant Principal at Jesse Keen Elementary

2011-2012:

Grade: C-Reading 40% of students reading at or above grade level; 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 72% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math-41% of students at or above grade level; 52% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 54% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing: 77% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science: 41% of students at or above grade level in Science.

2010-2011:

Grade: C, Reading Learning Gains: 54%, Lowest 25%: 54%, Math Learning Gains: 49%, Lowest 25%: 63%. AYP: 69%, Reading Mastery:47%, Math Mastery: 51%, Science Mastery: 26%.

2009-2010:

Grade: C, Reading Learning Gains: 66%, Lowest 25%: 53%, Math Learning Gains: 53%, Lowest 25%:59%. AYP: 77%, Reading Mastery: 59%, Math Mastery: 56%, Science Mastery: 37%. Made AYP for White and ELL Reading.

2008-2009:

Grade: A, Reading Learning Gains: 69%, Lowest 25%: 71%, Math Learning Gains: 72%, Lowest 25%:74%. AYP: 92%, Reading Mastery: 59%, Math mastery: 66%, Science Mastery: 51%. Only ELL and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Only SWD did not make AYP in math.

Assistant Principal at Eastside Elementary:

2007-2008:

School Grade: B, Reading Mastery: 58%, Math Mastery: 63%. AYP: YES.

2006-2007:



School Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 57%, Math Mastery: 63%.  
 AYP: YES.

**Alexandra Wise**

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 1

Years at Current School: 1

**Credentials**

BA - Elementary Education - University of Florida  
 MA - Educational Leadership -  
 University of South Florida

**Performance Record**

Assistant Principal-Anna Woodbury Elementary  
 2012-2013:  
 Grade: D-Reading 37% of students reading at or above grade level; 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 65% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math-25% of students at or above grade level; 46% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 53% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing: 51% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science: 16% of students at or above grade level in Science.  
 No data available.  
 I was previously the Title I Facilitator at Frostproof Elementary, which is a primary school that serves students in grades K-2.

**Dana Bakos**

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 5

Years at Current School: 5

**Credentials**

BA-English Literature-University of Central Florida, Masters-Reading, Masters-Educational Leadership, University of South Florida

Assistant Principal: Lewis Elementary  
2012-2013:

Grade: D-Reading 37% of students reading at or above grade level; 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 65% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math-25% of students at or above grade level; 46% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 53% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing: 51% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science: 16% of students at or above grade level in Science.

2011-2012:

Grade: C-Reading 39% of students reading at or above grade level; 60% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 79% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math-35% of students at or above grade level; 52% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 56% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing: 78% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science: 30% of students at or above grade level in Science.

2010-2011:

Grade: C-Reading 55% of students reading at or above grade level; 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 55% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math-60% of students at or above grade level; 51% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 58% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing: 94% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science: 41% of students at or above grade level in Science. AYP: 69% of criteria satisfied. White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading or Math.

2009-2010:

Grade: B-Reading-65%-students reading at or above grade level, 56% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 52% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math -73% of students at or above grade level in math; 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in math, 56% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing -90% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science-40% of students at or above grade level in Science. AYP: 77% of criteria satisfied. Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and English Language Learners (ELL) did not make AYP in Math.

**Performance Record**

Only Whites made AYP in Math. White, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners (ELL) did not make AYP in Reading.

2008-2009 Grade:

A-Reading-70%-students reading at or above grade level, 62% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 63% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math -76% of students at or above grade level in math; 62% of students making a year's worth of progress in math, 77% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing -91% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science-46% of students at or above grade level in Science. AYP: 90% of criteria satisfied. Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and English Language Learners (ELL) did not make AYP in Math. Only Whites made AYP in Math. English Language Learners (ELL) did not make AYP in Reading. Whites, Hispanic, and Economic Disadvantaged made AYP in Reading.

2007-2008:

Reading Coach-Westwood Middle School: Grade: B- Reading-52%-students reading at or above grade level, 61% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 66% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math -57% of students at or above grade level in math; 71% of students making a year's worth of progress in math, 71% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing -90% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science-28% of students at or above grade level in Science. AYP-72% of criteria satisfied. Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Reading or Math.

2006-2007: Reading Coach at Loughman Oaks Elementary. Grade: B-Reading-64%-students reading at or above grade level, 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 70% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math -59% of students at or above grade level in math; 68% of students making a year's worth of progress in math, 68% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing -83% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science-30% of students at or above grade level in Science. AYP-92% of criteria satisfied. Black students did not make AYP in Reading and Black and Hispanic students did not make AYP in Math.

## Instructional Coaches

### # of instructional coaches

2

### # receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

### Instructional Coach Information:

<b>Stephanie Southwell</b>		
<b>Full-time / School-based</b>	<b>Years as Coach: 1</b>	<b>Years at Current School: 8</b>
<b>Areas</b>	Reading/Literacy	
<b>Credentials</b>	Elementary Education 1-6 from University of South Florida, Specific Learning Disabilities K-12, Reading Endorsement and ESOL Endorsement.	
<b>Performance Record</b>	<p>Reading Coach at Lewis Anna Woodbury: 2012-2013: Grade: D-Reading 37% of students reading at or above grade level; 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 65% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math-25% of students at or above grade level; 46% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 53% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing: 51% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science: 16% of students at or above grade level in Science.</p> <p>3rd Grade Teacher at Lewis Anna Woodbury: 2011-2012: Grade: C-Reading 39% of students reading at or above grade level; 60% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 79% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math-35% of students at or above grade level; 52% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 56% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing: 78% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science: 30% of students at or above grade level in Science.</p> <p>2010-2011: Grade: C-Reading 55% of students reading at or above grade level; 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 55% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math-60% of students at or above grade level; 51% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 58% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing: 94% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science: 41% of students at or above grade level in Science. AYP: 69% of criteria satisfied. White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading or Math.</p> <p>2009-2010: Grade: B-Reading-65%-students reading at or above grade level, 56% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 52% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math -73% of students at or above grade level in math; 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in math, 56% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing -90% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science-40% of students at or above grade level in Science. AYP:</p>	

77% of criteria satisfied. Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and English Language Learners (ELL) did not make AYP in Math. Only Whites made AYP in Math. White, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners (ELL) did not make AYP in Reading.

2008-2009:

Grade: A-Reading-70%-students reading at or above grade level, 62% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 63% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math -76% of students at or above grade level in math; 62% of students making a year's worth of progress in math, 77% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing -91% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science-46% of students at or above grade level in Science. AYP: 90% of criteria satisfied. Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and English Language Learners (ELL) did not make AYP in Math. Only Whites made AYP in Math. English Language Learners (ELL) did not make AYP in Reading. Whites, Hispanic, and Economic Disadvantaged made AYP in Reading.

<b>Cassie Avellaneda</b>		
<b>Full-time / School-based</b>	<b>Years as Coach: 0</b>	<b>Years at Current School: 4</b>
<b>Areas</b>	Mathematics	
<b>Credentials</b>	BA Elementary Education, Warner University; Certified K-6 Elementary, K-12 Physical Education, K-12 ESOL.	
	4th Grade Teacher at Lewis Anna Woodbury: 2012-2013: Grade: D-Reading 37% of students reading at or above grade level; 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 65% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math-25% of students at or above grade level; 46% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 53% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing: 51% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science: 16% of students at or above grade level in Science. 2011-2012: Grade: C-Reading 39% of students reading at or above grade level; 60% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 79% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math-35% of students at or above grade level; 52% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 56% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing: 78% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science: 30% of students at or above grade level in Science. 2010-2011: Grade: C-Reading 55% of students reading at or above grade level; 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 55% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math-60% of students at or above grade level; 51% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 58% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing: 94% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science: 41% of students at or above grade level in Science. AYP: 69% of criteria satisfied. White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading or Math. 2009-2010: Grade: B-Reading-65%-students reading at or above grade level, 56% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 52% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math -73% of students at or above grade level in math; 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in math, 56% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing -90% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science-40% of students at or above grade level in Science. AYP: 77% of criteria satisfied. Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and English Language Learners (ELL) did not make AYP in Math.	
<b>Performance Record</b>		

Only Whites made AYP in Math. White, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners (ELL) did not make AYP in Reading.

2008-2009:

Grade: A-Reading-70%-students reading at or above grade level, 62% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 63% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading. Math -76% of students at or above grade level in math; 62% of students making a year's worth of progress in math, 77% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math. Writing -91% of students are meeting state standards in writing. Science-46% of students at or above grade level in Science. AYP: 90% of criteria satisfied. Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and English Language Learners (ELL) did not make AYP in Math. Only Whites made AYP in Math. English Language Learners (ELL) did not make AYP in Reading. Whites, Hispanic, and Economic Disadvantaged made AYP in Reading.

**Classroom Teachers**

**# of classroom teachers**

50

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

50, 100%

**# Highly Qualified Teachers**

98%

**# certified in-field**

39, 78%

**# ESOL endorsed**

30, 60%

**# reading endorsed**

3, 6%

**# with advanced degrees**

15, 30%

**# National Board Certified**

0, 0%

**# first-year teachers**

2, 4%

**# with 1-5 years of experience**

12, 24%

**# with 6-14 years of experience**

22, 44%



**# with 15 or more years of experience**

14, 28%

**Education Paraprofessionals****# of paraprofessionals**

16

**# Highly Qualified**

16, 100%

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

0

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is &lt; 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****Recruitment:**

Administration - All applicants are screened through the school district's Recruitment and Hiring System, interviews are conducted with an interview team and candidates are ranked by the team, and finally references are checked before offering a position to any applicant.

**Retention:**

Administration and Title 1 Facilitator - New teachers are partnered with a veteran teacher at the grade level, usually the grade chair. The Title 1 Facilitator assists the new teacher in settling into the work environment, including making sure she/he has all necessary texts and materials, and reviewing local policies and procedures in more detail such as the Lewis Anna Woodbury Staff Handbook and the school's Positive Behavior Support (PBS) program. The new teachers are invited to join a non-grade level team such as PBS, Sunshine Team, etc. to help them feel a part of their new school community. When a new teacher would benefit from observing other teachers, those arrangements are made.

**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****Teachers New to Grade Level:**

Grade Chairs, Resource Teachers - Grade Chairs are most knowledgeable about grade level curriculum issues and can also advise regarding classroom management concerns.

The Resource Teachers are most qualified to share research-based strategies and classroom management techniques. The mentors and mentees meet to discuss evidence-based strategies. The mentor will provide support in the form of planning, modeling, coaching, and performance feedback.

**Struggling Teachers:**

Administration, Resource Teachers - The Resource Teachers are most qualified to mentor struggling teachers. The mentor and mentees will meet in a professional learning community to discuss evidence-based strategies for each area of weakness. The process will involve the clinical educator



cycle which includes using: observation, planning, modeling, coaching, and post observation feedback.

## **Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (Rtl)**

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

### **Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs**

The School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) will meet once a week to review student data. Students who are not showing progress will be referred to the MTSS team. The team will study data to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. MTSS team members will meet weekly with selected classroom teachers and family members through Response to Intervention (Rtl) meetings to provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 assistance with struggling students. The MTSS and SBLT Teams help to write, monitor and revise the SIP throughout the school year based on data collection.

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

**Principal/Assistant Principals:** Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensure that the school staff is implementing Rtl, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, provide adequate professional development to support Rtl implementation, and communicate with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities.

**Guidance Counselor / Social Worker:** Provide services to individual students that range from program design to assessment and intervention. They connect students and families to local community agencies. This connection helps promote the academic, behavior, emotional and social success of each student within the school setting.

**School Psychologist:** Assists in the development of intervention plans through the use of data collection, interpretation and analysis. Our school's psychologist promotes the importance of fidelity and documentation when implementing the Response to Intervention process and provides professional development and technical assistance. Once this process is implemented correctly, then the decision making process is utilized for educational decisions for students. Additionally, in collaboration with the Guidance Counselor, they provide small group instruction on social skills to targeted students.

**Speech/Language Pathologist:** Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction; assists in the selection of screening; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

**Exceptional Student Education Teachers:** Participate in collecting student data, integrate core instructional activities into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborate with general education teachers through inclusion.

**Title I Facilitator/ ESOL Teacher / Academic Coaches:** Provide guidance on literacy and math/science initiatives, facilitate and support data collection activities, provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers and staff, provide support for assessment and monitoring for children to be considered "At-risk" or students who may have bilingual needs.

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

The SBLT will meet weekly to analyze progress monitoring data and the implementation of the SIP's goals and strategies.

**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**

Sources of data include monthly progress monitoring data, FAIR results, Discovery Data, Early Warning System data, and Genesis discipline and attendance reports.

The data used to identify students in need of interventions or acceleration is organized through grade level spreadsheets that include all Tier 1 progress monitoring data along with support systems being provided to individual students. These grade level spreadsheets are housed on Google Apps and are accessible to SBLT members and grade level teachers for review and updates.

The data used to track progress of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students is organized on monthly progress monitoring spreadsheets that are updated by teachers and reviewed by the SBLT to decide if interventions are successful or in need of modifications.

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

Professional development will be provided for staff. Support will be provided to teachers to assist with the PS/Rtl process. Parents will be invited to attend PS/Rtl meetings to assist in the decision making process.

**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:** 4,000

Open computer lab before school for 30 minutes each day for students to practice math fluency and build higher level skills via several online formats (Xtra Math, Khan Academy, Math Facts in a Flash).

**Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Instruction in core academic subjects

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

Progress through the levels is tracked on each of the programs. Discovery Math scores are also used to determine overall proficiency gains.

**Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?**

Cassie Avellaneda, Math Coach

**Strategy:** Before or After School Program

**Minutes added to school year:** 8,280

21st Century Grant pending approval / In-house after school tutoring.  
 21st Century grant would be 12 hours a week (5 days for 2.5 hours) after school from October through May. In-house tutoring will be 6 hours a week (3 days/week for 2 hours) after school from October through April.

**Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education

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

Pre and post tests, as well as Discovery scores.

**Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?**

Leadership Team

**Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)**

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

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
Sue Bizerra	Principal
Dana Bakos	Assistant Principal
Alexandra Wise	Assistant Principal
Totsie Martin	ESE Teacher
Mary Villarreal	ESE Teacher
Sheri New	Media Specialist
Angelina West	ESOL Teacher
Katherine Belcher	Title I Facilitator
Stephanie Southwell	Reading Coach
Jennifer Hubbard	Guidance Counselor
Cassie Avellaneda	Math Coach
Sandra Hart	Gifted/STEM Teacher

**How the school-based LLT functions**

The LLT serves as the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) and meets every week to review grade level, classroom level, and individual student progress monitoring data to ensure the success of all students. The team will study data to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Professional development and resources will be determined by the results of this data. In addition, the team will collaborate, evaluate implementation, share best practices, and facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and

making decisions about implementation. The LLT will plan and deliver the majority of professional development, as well as monitoring the follow-up processes. They will also work together to assist any new or struggling teachers.

Principal/Assistant Principals: Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, provide professional development to support implementation of standards based teaching paired with effective use of high yield strategies..

They communicate with teachers and parents regarding school-based LLT initiatives,

Exceptional Student Education Teachers: Participate in collecting student data, integrate core instructional activities into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborate with general education teachers through inclusion.

Academic Coaches / ESOL and Gifted/STEM Teachers / Guidance Counselor / Media Specialist / Title I Facilitator: Provide guidance on literacy and math/science curriculum initiatives, facilitate and support data collection activities, provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers and staff, provide support for assessment and monitoring for children to be considered "At-risk" or students who may have bilingual needs.

### **Major initiatives of the LLT**

The LLT will focus on ensuring that standards based instruction is effectively implemented through the use of high yield strategies. Our primary initiative is to increase students' reading, math, science and writing proficiency at or above grade level to meet or exceed our established targets. To accomplish this goal the team will monitor struggling students' progress at all grade levels, monitor students' participation in the tutorial services before, during and after school, and communicate with all parents bi-weekly about their students' progress. Monthly progress monitoring, Discovery and FAIR assessment data, Early Warning System data, and Genesis discipline and attendance reports will be analyzed to direct instruction and ensure supports are provided to meet the needs of students. There will be a strong initiative to increase math scores by promoting math fluency at all grade levels and incorporate the Math Practices with fidelity. In addition, weekly STEM classes for all 4th and 5th grade students will promote the development of problem solving and higher order thinking skills. Third grade students and teachers will also participate in classes with the Gifted/STEM Teacher.

### **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**

Lewis Anna Woodbury has a School Readiness and two Head Start programs. Pre-K teachers are invited to all professional development and training offered by the school. Local Pre-K programs are invited to observe classrooms and come for orientation walk-throughs with their students each spring. Our Pre-K teachers and our neighboring teachers at the Child Development Center coordinate with our kindergarten teachers to facilitate a smooth transition from Pre-K to Kindergarten. In Pre-K, students are taught appropriate academics in the area of language arts and math. Pre-K students are also taught school-wide procedures for managing student behavior. This combination of academic and school-wide procedures prepares our students for a smooth transition to Kindergarten.

Pre-School parents have the opportunity to attend all school-wide functions. Daily communication is conducted between teacher and parent through a daily letter home. Monthly newsletters are sent to parents reviewing the past month's activities and informing parents of the upcoming month.

New Kindergarten students can enroll beginning in March and all summer long, and the school secretary sets up a night enrollment date in the spring to accommodate working parents. Kindergarten students are assessed at the beginning of each school year using the FLKRS assessment tool. The disaggregated data from the FLKRS assessment helps the kindergarten teachers determine students'

acquisition of specific skills and knowledge. The quality and effectiveness of the programs are evaluated as data from the FLKRS becomes available.

## Expected Improvements

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

### Area 1: Reading

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

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	48%	37%	No	54%
American Indian		0%		
Asian		0%		
Black/African American	36%	18%	No	42%
Hispanic	46%	34%	No	51%
White	59%	54%	No	63%
English language learners	36%	24%	No	42%
Students with disabilities	28%	0%	No	36%
Economically disadvantaged	44%	32%	No	50%

#### Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	70	23%	33%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	41	14%	21%

#### 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>		100%

#### Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	162	54%	65%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	49	65%	75%

**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)	99	46%	51%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	44	21%	28%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	51	24%	31%

**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	53	51%	75%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		100%

**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	47%	25%	No	52%
American Indian		0%		
Asian		0%		
Black/African American	31%	10%	No	38%
Hispanic	46%	25%	No	51%
White	54%	33%	No	59%
English language learners	33%	19%	No	40%
Students with disabilities	30%	6%	No	37%
Economically disadvantaged	43%	20%	No	49%

**Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	48	16%	31%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	26	9%	21%

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		0%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		100%

**Learning Gains**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	138	46%	65%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	40	53%	75%

**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	10	10%	25%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		15%

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

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

**Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)**

**All Levels**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	1		3
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	6	2%	10%

**Area 8: Early Warning Systems**



**Elementary School Indicators**

	<b>2013 Actual #</b>	<b>2013 Actual %</b>	<b>2014 Target %</b>
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	51	8%	6%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	46	7%	5%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	77	66%	50%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	26	4%	3%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	32	5%	4%

## Goals Summary

- G1.** Students will be able to comprehend rigorous text across content areas, and respond to the text both orally and in writing.
- G2.** Students regularly engage in the scientific process, are able to solve complex math and science problems, and are able to explain the problem solving process using the eight Mathematical Practices..

## Goals Detail

**G1.** Students will be able to comprehend rigorous text across content areas, and respond to the text both orally and in writing.

### Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA)
- Writing
- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains)
- Social Studies
- Science
- Science - Elementary School
- STEM
- STEM - All Levels
- Parental Involvement

### Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Professional Development on Close Reading, Authentic Literacy Strategies, Higher Order Thinking, Lesson Study, and Vocabulary Strategies
- Individualized tutoring through Americorps, Reading Pals, and Teen Trendsetters, and small group tutoring during iii using resource teachers and paraprofessionals
- Third grade focused reading group for ELL students.
- New Reading Wonders and GO Math programs tied to Core Curriculum, along with Polk Writes curriculum
- District support.

### Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Core instruction is lacking in rigor and differentiation due to inconsistent implementation of standards, lack of content knowledge, inconsistent use of instructional best practices, and inconsistent use of data to drive instruction.
- Implementation of small group instruction is not consistently effective due to tutor absences and limited teacher use of tutor assistance.

## Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Analyze student data in weekly Leadership Team meetings, using findings along with classroom observations to guide professional development.

### Person or Persons Responsible

Leadership Team

### Target Dates or Schedule:

Ongoing

### Evidence of Completion:

Standards based lessons consistently evidenced in all classrooms. Increased scores on progress monitoring. Opportunities for student discussions of texts and learning. Evidence of increased proficiency with grade level writing.

**G2.** Students regularly engage in the scientific process, are able to solve complex math and science problems, and are able to explain the problem solving process using the eight Mathematical Practices..

### Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA)
- Writing
- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains)
- Science
- Science - Elementary School
- STEM
- STEM - All Levels

### Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Math Coach and District Science Coach to provide focused professional development and support for teachers
- Full Time Gifted/STEM Teacher
- New GO Math program tied to Common Core State Standards
- Supplemental math and science resources for remediation and acceleration.

### Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Core instruction is lacking in rigor and differentiation due to inconsistent implementation of standards and lack of content knowledge.
- High level inquiry strategies and activities to challenge students and address student misconceptions are not being implemented consistently

## Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Analyze student data in weekly Leadership Team meetings using findings, along with classroom observations, to guide professional development. Science Showcase projects.

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Math Coach Gifted/STEM Teacher, and Leadership Team

### **Target Dates or Schedule:**

Ongoing

### **Evidence of Completion:**

Increased scores on Discovery Benchmark Assessments and ongoing progress monitoring, Journey teacher evaluation rubrics, FCAT Math and Science Assessments.

## Action Plan for Improvement

### Problem Solving Key

**G** = Goal

**B** = Barrier

**S** = Strategy

**G1.** Students will be able to comprehend rigorous text across content areas, and respond to the text both orally and in writing.

**G1.B1** Core instruction is lacking in rigor and differentiation due to inconsistent implementation of standards, lack of content knowledge, inconsistent use of instructional best practices, and inconsistent use of data to drive instruction.

**G1.B1.S1** Provide Professional Development on Instructional Best Practices, Lesson Study, and Differentiated Instruction.

### Action Step 1

Professional Development on Instructional Best Practices and Differentiated Instruction through Guided Groups

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Reading, Math Coach and District Coaches

#### Target Dates or Schedule

#### Evidence of Completion

Professional development agendas and sign-in sheets, and classroom observation of implementation.

#### Facilitator:

Stephanie Southwell, Cassie Avellaneda, Dr. Charlyne Demidovich

#### Participants:

All teachers

## **Action Step 2**

Professional Development on Six-Step Vocabulary strategies, use of Cognates, Roots and Affixes, and Writing Strategies

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

ESOL Teacher and District Personnel

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

### **Evidence of Completion**

Professional development agendas and sign-in sheets, and classroom observation of implementation.

### **Facilitator:**

Lina West, Lourdes Day, Diane Conley

### **Participants:**

All teachers

## **Action Step 3**

Lesson Study observation followed by implementation of three Lesson Study Cycles

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

2nd Grade Team and 4th Grade Team with Facilitators

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Sept. 19, 20, 26, 27 - Oct 21,22 - Other dates to be scheduled for additional Lesson Study cycles.

### **Evidence of Completion**

Effective implementation of learning gained through Lesson Study cycles.

### **Facilitator:**

Cassie Avellaneda, Stephanie Southwell

### **Participants:**

2nd Grade Team and 4th Grade Team with Facilitators

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

Lesson Planning, Classroom Observations, Student Work Samples

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Reading and Math Coaches, ESOL Teacher

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

#### Evidence of Completion

Consistent and pervasive demonstration of instructional best practices, effective differentiated small group instruction and effective content delivery during instruction and in student work samples.

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Analyze progress monitoring results and student writing samples in weekly leadership team meetings.

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Leadership Team

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

#### Evidence of Completion

Data room, progress monitoring results, grade level writing samples, leadership team meeting minutes.

**G1.B1.S2** Standards based collaborative lesson planning with frequent monitoring of instruction with feedback.

#### Action Step 1

Weekly grade level collaborative lesson planning focused on effective implementation of the Common Core State Standards.

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Reading and Math Coaches, Administration

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Every Tuesday

#### Evidence of Completion

Standards based lesson plans

## Action Step 2

Classroom observations to determine if standards based lesson plans are being used effectively. Feedback following observations as needed.

### Person or Persons Responsible

Reading and Math Coaches, Administration

### Target Dates or Schedule

Daily

### Evidence of Completion

Observation and feedback logs, Journey observation records

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

Standards based lesson plans, classroom observations

### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

### Target Dates or Schedule

Daily

### Evidence of Completion

Sign-in sheets, observation and feedback logs, Journey records

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S2

Standards based instruction consistently evident in all classrooms

### Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

### Target Dates or Schedule

Daily

### Evidence of Completion

Data room, progress monitoring results, Leadership Team meeting minutes



**G1.B2** Implementation of small group instruction is not consistently effective due to tutor absences and limited teacher use of tutor assistance.

**G1.B2.S2** Develop collection of leveled tutoring resource materials. Professional development with tutors and teachers to structure small group instruction.

**Action Step 1**

Collect and organize leveled reading resources.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Reading and Math Coaches, Leadership Team

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Completed by October 30

**Evidence of Completion**

Organized collection of resource materials.

**Action Step 2**

Provide professional development on how to utilize leveled reading resources to effectively differentiate small group instruction.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Reading and Math Coaches, Leadership Team

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Sept. 18, 2013

**Evidence of Completion**

Classroom observation of small group instruction. Agendas and sign-in sheets from professional development.

**Facilitator:**

Stephanie Southwell

**Participants:**

Reading and Math Coaches, Leadership Team

### **Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B2.S2**

Verify appropriate leveling of reading resource materials. Participate in professional development and observe implementation in the classroom.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Leadership Team

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Inventory of appropriately leveled materials. Professional development agenda and sign-in sheets. Classroom observations with feedback.

### **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S2**

Analyze progress monitoring results in weekly leadership team meetings.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Leadership Team

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Weekly

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Data room, progress monitoring results, leadership team meeting minutes.

**G2.** Students regularly engage in the scientific process, are able to solve complex math and science problems, and are able to explain the problem solving process using the eight Mathematical Practices..

**G2.B1** Core instruction is lacking in rigor and differentiation due to inconsistent implementation of standards and lack of content knowledge.

**G2.B1.S1** Provide professional development on core Math and Science content, and Math Common Core State Standards.

**Action Step 1**

Professional development on core Math and Science content.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Math Coach, District Science Coach

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Sept. 4 and 11, 2013

**Evidence of Completion**

Professional development agendas and sign-in sheets, and classroom observations of implementation.

**Facilitator:**

Cassie Avellaneda, La-Chaz Harris

**Participants:**

All teachers

**Action Step 2**

Weekly grade level collaborative lesson planning focused on effective implementation of the Common Core State Standards.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Math Coach and Leadership Team

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Every Tuesday

**Evidence of Completion**

Standards based lesson plans.

### **Action Step 3**

Classroom observations to determine if standards based lesson plans are being used effectively. Feedback following observations as needed.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Math Coach and Leadership Team

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Daily

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Observation and feedback logs, Journey observation records.

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

Standards based lesson plans, Leadership Team will participate in professional development, Classroom observations, Student work samples

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Leadership Team

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Professional development agendas and sign-in sheets. Classroom observation and feedback logs. Journey records.

### **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S1**

Analyze progress monitoring results in weekly Leadership Team meetings. Standards based instruction consistently evident in all classrooms.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Leadership Team

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Data room, progress monitoring results, Leadership Team meeting minutes.

**G2.B2** High level inquiry strategies and activities to challenge students and address student misconceptions are not being implemented consistently

**G2.B2.S1** Gifted/STEM teacher will model inquiry-based learning with teachers and students through weekly classes in grades 4 and 5. Third grade students and teachers will also participate in classes with the Gifted/STEM teacher.

**Action Step 1**

Classes are scheduled weekly for Gifted/STEM teacher to co-teach with each classroom teacher in grades 4 and 5. All third grade students and teachers will also participate in classes with the Gifted/STEM teacher.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Gifted/STEM Teacher, Administration, Teachers

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing Weekly

**Evidence of Completion**

Inquiry-based classes and students doing hands-on projects.

**Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B2.S1**

Classroom observations, lesson plan review, established schedule of classes.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Leadership Team

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Start September and then ongoing

**Evidence of Completion**

Observation feedback and student work samples

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B2.S1

Observation of classroom teachers implementing inquiry-based learning strategies throughout the curriculum.

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Leadership Team

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Ongoing

### **Evidence of Completion**

Increased use of inquiry-based learning strategies in all subject areas.

## 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:

Funds school-wide services for Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. Title I, Part A, support provides before and after-school instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents. Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary provides a Parent Resource Center on the Lewis campus that houses materials that can be borrowed and used at home to increase student achievement, parent involvement, and to encourage the love of reading. The Parent Center, Media Center and Computer Lab are open bimonthly from 3:30-6:00 p.m.

#### Title I, Part C- Migrant:

Migrant students enrolled in Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary will be assisted by the school and by the District Migrant Education Program (MEP). Two migrant paraprofessionals, housed on each campus, provide small group assistance to migrant students during their daily instruction. Students will be prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status. MEP Teacher Advocates, assigned to schools with high percentages of migrant students, monitor the progress of these high need students and provide or coordinate supplemental academic support. Migrant Home-School Liaisons identify and recruit migrant students and their families for the MEP. They provide support to both students and parents in locating services necessary to ensure the academic success of these students whose education has been interrupted by numerous moves.

#### Title I, Part D:

Provides Transition Facilitators to assist students with transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school. The Transition Facilitators communicate with the Guidance Counselors at schools to facilitate the transfer of records and appropriate placement.

#### Title II:

Professional Development resources are available to Title I schools through Title II funds. In addition, School Technology Services provide technical support, technology training, and licenses for software programs and web-based access via Title II-D funds. All of the classrooms at Lewis Anna Woodbury have been provided with Smart Boards, Smart Response, Smart Slate, Document Cameras, Projectors, and relevant software. Grades K, 3, 4 and 5 have light speed sound system installed.

#### Title III:

Provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, as well as professional learning opportunities for school staff. Our ESOL teacher provides direct instruction in reading to struggling ELL 3rd grade students. She and the two ESOL paraprofessionals provide small group assistance to ELL students during their daily instruction.

#### Title X- Homeless:

The Hearth program, funded through Title X, provides support for identified homeless students. Title I provides support for this program, and many activities implemented by the Hearth program are carried out in cooperation with the Migrant Education Program (MEP) funded through Title I, Part C.

#### Violence Prevention Programs:

Title IV provides violence and drug prevention programs in schools in order to promote a safe school environment. Examples of violence prevention programs include anti-bullying, gang awareness, gun awareness, etc.

#### Nutrition Programs:

Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary is a pilot school for the Community Eligibility Option Free Meals to all Students. They are also a location for summer feeding program for the community.

#### Head Start:

Two Head Start classes are located on our campus. Resources are provided to the program to assist in the transition of students from pre-K to Kindergarten. Head Start teachers may participate in professional learning opportunities offered to school staff, and the children benefit from weekly story time in the Media Center. Parents of Head Start students are invited to participate in parent workshops and activities provided by the school.



## 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 will be able to comprehend rigorous text across content areas, and respond to the text both orally and in writing.

**G1.B1** Core instruction is lacking in rigor and differentiation due to inconsistent implementation of standards, lack of content knowledge, inconsistent use of instructional best practices, and inconsistent use of data to drive instruction.

**G1.B1.S1** Provide Professional Development on Instructional Best Practices, Lesson Study, and Differentiated Instruction.

### PD Opportunity 1

Professional Development on Instructional Best Practices and Differentiated Instruction through Guided Groups

#### Facilitator

Stephanie Southwell, Cassie Avellaneda, Dr. Charlyne Demidovich

#### Participants

All teachers

#### Target Dates or Schedule

#### Evidence of Completion

Professional development agendas and sign-in sheets, and classroom observation of implementation.

## **PD Opportunity 2**

Professional Development on Six-Step Vocabulary strategies, use of Cognates, Roots and Affixes, and Writing Strategies

### **Facilitator**

Lina West, Lourdes Day, Diane Conley

### **Participants**

All teachers

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

### **Evidence of Completion**

Professional development agendas and sign-in sheets, and classroom observation of implementation.

## **PD Opportunity 3**

Lesson Study observation followed by implementation of three Lesson Study Cycles

### **Facilitator**

Cassie Avellaneda, Stephanie Southwell

### **Participants**

2nd Grade Team and 4th Grade Team with Facilitators

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Sept. 19, 20, 26, 27 - Oct 21,22 - Other dates to be scheduled for additional Lesson Study cycles.

### **Evidence of Completion**

Effective implementation of learning gained through Lesson Study cycles.

**G1.B2** Implementation of small group instruction is not consistently effective due to tutor absences and limited teacher use of tutor assistance.

**G1.B2.S2** Develop collection of leveled tutoring resource materials. Professional development with tutors and teachers to structure small group instruction.

### **PD Opportunity 1**

Provide professional development on how to utilize leveled reading resources to effectively differentiate small group instruction.

#### **Facilitator**

Stephanie Southwell

#### **Participants**

Reading and Math Coaches, Leadership Team

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Sept. 18, 2013

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Classroom observation of small group instruction. Agendas and sign-in sheets from professional development.

**G2.** Students regularly engage in the scientific process, are able to solve complex math and science problems, and are able to explain the problem solving process using the eight Mathematical Practices..

**G2.B1** Core instruction is lacking in rigor and differentiation due to inconsistent implementation of standards and lack of content knowledge.

**G2.B1.S1** Provide professional development on core Math and Science content, and Math Common Core State Standards.

### **PD Opportunity 1**

Professional development on core Math and Science content.

#### **Facilitator**

Cassie Avellaneda, La-Chaz Harris

#### **Participants**

All teachers

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Sept. 4 and 11, 2013

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Professional development agendas and sign-in sheets, and classroom observations of implementation.

## Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

### Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G1.	Students will be able to comprehend rigorous text across content areas, and respond to the text both orally and in writing.	\$5,400
Total		\$5,400

### Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Professional Development	Total
Title 1	\$5,400	\$5,400
Total	\$5,400	\$5,400

### Budget Details

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

**G1.** Students will be able to comprehend rigorous text across content areas, and respond to the text both orally and in writing.

**G1.B1** Core instruction is lacking in rigor and differentiation due to inconsistent implementation of standards, lack of content knowledge, inconsistent use of instructional best practices, and inconsistent use of data to drive instruction.

**G1.B1.S1** Provide Professional Development on Instructional Best Practices, Lesson Study, and Differentiated Instruction.

#### Action Step 3

Lesson Study observation followed by implementation of three Lesson Study Cycles

**Resource Type**

Professional Development

**Resource**

Substitute teachers to cover for classroom teachers as they engage in three Lesson Study cycles

**Funding Source**

Title 1

**Amount Needed**

\$5,400