



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

James W. Sikes Elementary School

2727 SHEPHERD RD

Lakeland, FL 33811

863-648-3525

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/sikes>

School Demographics

School Type
Elementary School

Title I
No

Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
61%

Alternative/ESE Center
No

Charter School
No

Minority Rate
46%

School Grades History

2013-14
D

2012-13
C

2011-12
B

2010-11
A

SIP Authority and Template

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

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

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
Differentiated Accountability	5
Part I: Current School Status	6
Part II: Expected Improvements	15
Goals Summary	21
Goals Detail	21
Action Plan for Improvement	22
Part III: Coordination and Integration	25
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	26
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	27

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

James W. Sikes Elementary Schl

Principal

Laura Starner

School Advisory Council chair

Todd Wallin

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

Name	Title
Laura Starner	Principal
Kerry Chapman	Assistant Principal
Meggan Burgess	ESE Facilitator
Shakira Grier	Guidance
Kathleen Driver	Guidance
Linda Hughes	Academic Support

District-Level Information

District

Polk

Superintendent

Mrs. Kathryn Leroy

Date of school board approval of SIP

10/22/2013

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

The School Advisory Council is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced team of people with parents, teachers, students, administrators, support staff, business and community members that mirror the ethnic, racial and economic makeup of the school community. The officers include Todd Wallin-SAC Chair and Heidi Kindle- SAC secretary. Our SAC Membership percentages are approximately Community 52.94% and School based personnel 47.06%.

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

Todd Wallin, SAC Chair and Shakira Grier, SAC member were involved in the writing process. A plan was presented to the School Advisory Council at the first meeting of the year for discussion, editing, and approval. The SAC will analyze relevant data to determine the goals in the plan and how progress toward the goals will be measured.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

Sikes Elementary SAC will:

- operate within the boundaries of School Board policy and State legislation
- analyze School Grade and AMO Reports
- review all funds reported in School Improvement Plan
- support school improvement implementation
- publicize the School Improvement Plan effectively
- provide ongoing evaluations of school improvement progress

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

N/A

Highly Qualified Staff

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

Administrators

of administrators

2

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Laura Starner

Principal

Years as Administrator: 10

Years at Current School: 4

Credentials

BA in Elementary Education

MA in Educational Leadership

Certification: Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Educational Leadership

Performance Record

2012-2013: Grade C: Reading Mastery 58%, Math Mastery 55%, Writing Mastery 59%, Science Mastery 36%

2011-2012: Grade B: Reading Mastery 59%, Math Mastery 53%, Writing Mastery 86%, and Science Mastery 49%

2010-2011: Grade A: Reading Mastery: 78%, Math Mastery 77%, Writing Mastery 80%, and Science Mastery: 63%. AYP 82%, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged Subgroups did not make AYP in Reading and Math. White subgroup did not make AYP in Math.

2009-2010: Grade B: Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery 79%, Writing Mastery: 81%, Science Mastery: 44%, AYP 90%

Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading and Math

2004- February 2010 Assistant Principal, Wagner Elementary

2008-2009: Grade: B, Reading Mastery: 76%, Math Mastery 73%, Writing Mastery: 85%, and Science Mastery: 47%, AYP 92%,

Hispanic did not make AYP in reading, and Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Math

2007-2008: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 77%, Math Mastery: 74%, Writing Mastery: 91%, Science Mastery: 40 %, AYP: 100%

2006-2007: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 75%, Math Mastery: 70%, Writing Mastery: 91%, Science Mastery: 45%, AYP: 100%

2005-2006: Grade B, Reading Mastery: 74%, Math Mastery: 69%, Writing Mastery: 88%, AYP: 100%

2004-2005: Grade A, , Reading Mastery: 73%, Math Mastery: 69%, Writing Mastery: 91%, AYP: PRO

Kerry Chapman

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 8

Years at Current School: 4

Credentials

BA in Elementary Education
 MA in Elementary Education
 MA in Education Leadership

Performance Record

2012-2013: Grade C: Reading Mastery 58%, Math Mastery 55%, Writing Mastery 59%, Science Mastery 36%
 2011-2012: Grade B: Reading Mastery 59%, Math Mastery 53%, Writing Mastery 86%, and Science Mastery 49%
 2010-2011: Grade A: Reading Mastery: 78%, Math Mastery 77%, Writing Mastery 80%, and Science Mastery: 63%. AYP 82%, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged Subgroups did not make AYP in Reading and Math. White subgroup did not make AYP in Math.
 2006-2010, Assistant Principal, Crystal Lake Elementary
 2009-2010: Grade: C: Reading Mastery: 60%, Math Mastery: 71%, Writing Master: 89%, Science Mastery: 33%. AYP 87%. Black and White students did not make AYP in Reading and Math
 2008-2009: Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 58%, Math Mastery: 64%, Writing Master: 92%, Science Mastery 23%, AYP: 90%, Black and econ. Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading. Hispanic subgroup did not make AYP in Math.
 2007-2008: Grade C, Reading Mastery: 55%, Math Mastery: 64%, Writing Mastery: 81%, Science Mastery: 19%, AYP: 74%, White, Black, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading. Black, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in Math.
 2006-2007: Grade: B, Reading Mastery: 48%, Math Mastery: 59%, Writing Mastery: 87%, Science Mastery: 22%, AYP: 62%, White, Black, Hispanic, ELL, SWD and Economically Disadvantage subgroups did not make AYP in Reading. White, Black, Hispanic, ELL, SWD and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in Math.

Instructional Coaches**# of instructional coaches**

0

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Part-time / District-based

Years as Coach:

Years at Current School:

Areas

[none selected]

Credentials**Performance Record**

Classroom Teachers**# of classroom teachers**

59

receiving effective rating or higher

0, 0%

Highly Qualified Teachers

0%

certified in-field

0, 0%

ESOL endorsed

45, 76%

reading endorsed

4, 7%

with advanced degrees

15, 25%

National Board Certified

0, 0%

first-year teachers

1, 2%

with 1-5 years of experience

17, 29%

with 6-14 years of experience

22, 37%

with 15 or more years of experience

19, 32%

Education Paraprofessionals**# of paraprofessionals**

17

Highly Qualified

17, 100%

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

- Coordinate with Quality Counts Office to recruit highly qualified minority teachers to ensure a diverse staff
- New teachers to Sikes are assigned a mentor to assist with the transition
- Our Academic Resource Teacher meets weekly with new teachers to conduct collaboration meetings and trainings

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

- New teachers are paired with a teacher with experience
- Planned mentoring activities are as follows: meet weekly to collaborate and train, models instructional strategies in the classroom, assists with lesson planning, observes instruction as requested, provides feedback, and assists with multiple assessments

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI)

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

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

The MTSS Leadership Team will focus meetings on how to improve school/teacher effectiveness and student achievement using the Problem Solving Model.

The MTSS Leadership Team will meet at least once per month (or more frequently as needed) to engage in the following activities:

- *Review school-wide, grade level, and teacher data to problem solve needed interventions on a systemic level and identify students meeting/exceeding benchmarks as well as those at moderate or high risk for not meeting benchmarks.
- *Help referring teachers design feasible strategies and interventions for struggling students by collaborating regularly, problem solving, sharing effective practices, evaluating implementation, assist in making decisions for school, teacher, student improvement.
- *Facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.
- *Focus on improving student achievement outcomes with evidence based interventions implemented with fidelity and frequent progress monitoring.
- *Intervention teams also foster a sense of collegiality and mutual support among educators, promote the use of evidence-based interventions, and support teachers in carrying out intervention plans, and make recommendation for implementation of new programs.

The MTSS Leadership Team will write, monitor and revise the SIP during the 2013-2014 school year.

The SIP is a reflection of the problem-solving process: data analysis; goal setting; areas of weakness are identified; barriers are analyzed; strategies are selected, implemented and monitored during the school year.

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

Laura Starner, Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implement and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.

Kerry Chapman, Assistant Principal: Provides information on school-wide discipline data, ensures that school-based team is implementing MTSS, participates in implementation of intervention support and documentation and ensures adequate professional development to support assessment of MTSS knowledge and skills of staff.

Shakira Grier, Guidance Counselor: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. Communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavior and social success.

Kathleen Driver, PBS Team Leader/Guidance Counselor: Supports Tier 1 school-wide initiatives; participates in the development and coordination of 2/3 behavior intervention programs.

Meggan Burgess, ESE Facilitator: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials/instruction in tiered interventions; collaborates with general education teachers.

Susan Barnhill, School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical evaluation; assists in facilitation of data-based decision making activities.

Lauren Peavy, Speech and Language: Participates in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; supports implementation of tiered invention programs.

Linda Hughes, Academic Resource Teacher: Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2/3 intervention and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

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

Mrs. Grier, Guidance Counselor and Mrs. Driver Guidance Counselor met with all teachers at in August, to inform teachers of the transition from RtI to MTSS. Guidance Counselors met with all grade levels to discuss students needing Tier 2/3 services during the previous school year. Mrs. Barnhill, School Psychologist and Mrs. Burgess, ESE Facilitator will assists Guidance Counselors in meeting with grade levels monthly to review and ensure fidelity with student intervention plans. Mrs. Starner, Principal and Mrs. Chapman, Assistant Principal will meet with MTSS Team at least monthly to provide feedback and support.

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

Baseline data is gathered through August and September. First and Second Grade instructional data is gathered from the previous year. Third through Fifth Grade instructional data is gathered from the previous year's FCAT scores.

Progress Monitoring data is gathered three times a year. Other Progress Monitoring data is collected as needed for classroom or student progress. This information may be obtained by probes, Quick Reads, Fluency checks, etc.

Diagnostic Assessment data is gathered through ERDA, DAR, STAR Early Literacy or other appropriate tools.

End of Year data is gathered through SAT 10, FCAT, Discovery, and FAIR.

Data is discussed and analyzed at least monthly at the MTSS Leadership Team Meetings.

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

A PLC was held with all grade levels to review MTSS forms and procedures. The Guidance Counselors will meet with the teachers monthly to review and ensure fidelity with MTSS student plans. The teachers will inform parents about grading and progress monitoring during the Parent Information Night in September. Teachers will conference with parents each nine weeks if a MTSS plan is developed for the student. The MTSS team will provide support to teachers and parents throughout the process as needed.

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: 150

Based upon FCAT 2013 scores, students in the lowest 25% were identified. These students will meet daily for 30 minutes before school. During that time, student will practice using effective reading and comprehension skills. Students will read books on or above their level, participate in questioning activities, and complete a comprehension quiz using the Accelerated Reader Program. Students' progress will be monitored using the the STAR Literacy and Accelerated Reader Program.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

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

N/A

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

N/A

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

Name	Title
Laura Starner	Principal
Kerry Chapman	Assistant Principal
Meggan Burgess	ESE Facilitator
Lauren Peavy	Speech and Language
Shakira Grier	Guidance Counselor
Kathy Driver	Guidance Counselor
Linda Hughes	Academic Resource Teacher

How the school-based LLT functions

The Literacy Leadership Team will focus meetings on how to improve school/teacher effectiveness and student achievement using the Problem Solving Model.

The Literacy Leadership Team will meet at least once per month (or more frequently as needed) to engage in the following activities:

- Review school-wide, grade level, and teacher data to problem solve needed interventions on a systemic level and identify students meeting/exceeding benchmarks as well as those at moderate or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. This will be done at least three times per year or more frequently if new data is available.
- Assist teachers design feasible strategies and interventions for struggling students by collaborating regularly, problem solving, sharing effective practices, evaluating implementation, assist in making decisions for school, teacher and student improvement.
- Focus on improving student achievement outcomes with evidence based interventions implemented with fidelity and frequent progress monitoring.
- Intervention teams also foster a sense of collegiality and mutual support among educators, promote the use of evidence-based interventions, and support teachers in carrying out intervention plans.

Major initiatives of the LLT

- Training and continued support of the district's progress monitoring tool (FAIR Assessments)
- Facilitating the data analysis from progress monitoring assessments
- Continued training and implementation of FCIM
- Monitor the progress of students in the bottom 25%

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

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

NA

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

The district provides VPK at specific locations.

College and Career Readiness

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future

NA

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

NA

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

NA

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	65%	58%	No	69%
American Indian				
Asian		64%		
Black/African American	52%	58%	Yes	57%
Hispanic	53%	47%	No	57%
White	73%	63%	No	75%
English language learners	35%	26%	No	42%
Students with disabilities	24%	9%	No	32%
Economically disadvantaged	53%	48%	No	57%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	109	26%	32%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	141	32%	38%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

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

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	171	61%	68%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	143	51%	65%

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)	53	46%	53%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	25	22%	40%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	26	23%	40%

Postsecondary Readiness

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

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	84	59%	70%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4			

Area 3: Mathematics**Elementary and Middle School Mathematics****Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 and EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA**

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	64%	55%	No	68%
American Indian				
Asian		73%		
Black/African American	53%	51%	No	58%
Hispanic	54%	41%	No	59%
White	69%	64%	No	72%
English language learners	40%	30%	No	46%
Students with disabilities	31%	9%	No	38%
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	116	27%	32%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	117	28%	33%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

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

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	163	58%	65%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	132	47%	65%

Middle School Acceleration

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Middle school participation in high school EOC and industry certifications			
Middle school performance on high school EOC and industry certifications			

Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

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	24%	29%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	16	12%	19%

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			

Middle School Science**Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

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)	7		10
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	635	71%	80%

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

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

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	76	8%	5%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	5	3%	0%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	64	41%	31%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	22	2%	1%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	14	1%	0%

Middle School Indicators

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

Area 9: Parent Involvement

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

Parental involvement targets for the school

We offered the following parent involvement opportunities: Orientation, Open House, Parent Night (FCAT/SBAR), Hispanic Heritage Celebration, Black History Night, Science Fair & Fine Arts Night, & Talent Show

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Our target was 85% attendance	581	65%	80%

Area 10: Additional Targets**Additional targets for the school**

NA

Specific Additional Targets

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

Goals Summary

- G1.** By implementing effective core instruction and consistent progress monitoring, students will be successful in all grade levels

Goals Detail

G1. By implementing effective core instruction and consistent progress monitoring, students will be successful in all grade levels

Targets Supported

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

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- -Implement Reading Wonders, Go Math, Learning Schedules -utilize Science Lab
- -Train staff to implement Common Core State Standard K-5
- -Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- lack of collaborative planning and effective delivery of rigorous instruction

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Review of student interactive journals, targeted student data, discuss progress monitor data

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers, Leadership team, Administration

Target Dates or Schedule:

monthly/quarterly (as progress monitoring data is available)

Evidence of Completion:

documentation of data chats, feedback regarding interactive journals, documentation of student conversation, Documentation of student engagement per Journey

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. By implementing effective core instruction and consistent progress monitoring, students will be successful in all grade levels

G1.B1 lack of collaborative planning and effective delivery of rigorous instruction

G1.B1.S1 develop and deliver instructional plans that reflect rigor and relevance

Action Step 1

-implement student collaborative structures -more student talk, less teacher talk

Person or Persons Responsible

Classroom teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

daily

Evidence of Completion

-classroom observations -CWTs -conversations with students

Facilitator:

Starnier

Participants:

Classroom teachers

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

-Leadership attends grade level PLC meetings -review of grade level reflection sheets -review of completed lesson plans

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

weekly

Evidence of Completion

-PLC notes

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

-Teachers will keep progress monitoring profiles -monthly data chats

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers, leadership team, administration

Target Dates or Schedule

weekly, throughout the year

Evidence of Completion

-Review of progress monitoring documentation -updated data wall

G1.B1.S2 increase student engagement

Action Step 1

-implement student collaborative structures -more student talk, less teacher talk

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

daily

Evidence of Completion

-documentation in lesson plans

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

-classroom observations -CWTs -student conversations

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrators

Target Dates or Schedule

bi-weekly

Evidence of Completion

scripting notes, documentation in Journey

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S2

-classroom observations -CWTs -conversation with students

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

bi-weekly

Evidence of Completion

-scripting notes -conversations

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

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. By implementing effective core instruction and consistent progress monitoring, students will be successful in all grade levels

G1.B1 lack of collaborative planning and effective delivery of rigorous instruction

G1.B1.S1 develop and deliver instructional plans that reflect rigor and relevance

PD Opportunity 1

-implement student collaborative structures -more student talk, less teacher talk

Facilitator

Starnier

Participants

Classroom teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

daily

Evidence of Completion

-classroom observations -CWTs -conversations with students

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals