

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Sunray Elementary	District Name: Pasco
Principal: Lee-Anne Yerkey	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: James Grace	Date of School Board Approval: October 16, 2012

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

[School Grades Trend Data](#) (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

Administrators

List your school’s administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Lee-Anne Yerkey	Degrees: Master of Education, Bachelor of Arts Certifications: School Principal, Educational Leadership K-12, Elementary Education 1-6, ESOL	4	8	11-12: School Grade: C Learning Gains: Reading 62%, Math 58%. Lowest 25% making learning gains: Reading 19%, Math 25% 10-11: School Grade: B AYP: No 79% Criteria Met 09-10: School Grade: B AYP: No 95% Criteria Met 08-09: School Grade: A AYP: No 90% Criteria Met 07-08: School Grade: A AYP: YES 100% Criteria Met 06-07: School Grade: B AYP: No 90% Criteria Met 05-06: School Grade: B AYP: No 92% Criteria Met
Assistant Principal	Heidi Morris	Degrees: Masters of Reading K-12, Educational Leadership Certification, Elementary/Early Childhood K-6	0	14	11-12 School Grade C (Pasco Elementary) 10-11 School Grade C AYP: No, Learning Gains: Reading 57%, Math 62%, Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 57% Math 58% 09-10 School Grade C AYP: No, Learning Gains: Reading 57%, Math 54%, Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 57% Math 54% 08—09 School Grade A AYP : YES Learning Gains in Reading 68%, Math 64%, Lowest 25% making

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

					Learning Gains Reading 68%, Math 64% 07—08 School Grade C AYP: NO, Learning Gains in Reading 65%, Math64%, Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 66%, Math 67%
--	--	--	--	--	---

Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Kimberly Reddish	Degrees: Masters of Curriculum and Instruction, Bachelor of Arts: Elem. Ed 1-6 Certification: Specific Learning Disabilities K-12, Emotional Handicap, Mental Handicap, Reading Specialty	9	9	11-12: School Grade: C Learning Gains: Reading 62%, Math 58%. Lowest 25% making learning gains: Reading 60%, Math 61% 10-11: School Grade: B AYP: No 79% Criteria Met 09-10: School Grade: B AYP: No 95% Criteria Met 08-09: School Grade: C AYP: No 82% Criteria Met 07-08: School Grade: C AYP: No 85% Criteria Met 06-07: School Grade: B AYP: No 92% Criteria Met 05-06: School Grade: B AYP: No 90% Criteria Met

Highly Effective Teachers

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, highly effective teachers to the school.

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. All applicants go through an extensive screening process to ensure that they are the most highly qualified teacher for the position.	District, Principal	Ongoing
2. Each teacher new to the profession is assigned a mentor who is selected based upon demonstration of sustained effective teaching practices. The mentor teacher is trained in Clinical Education. This mentor works side by side with the beginning teacher, providing support, resources, observation and coaching sessions, and technical advice on an ongoing basis.	Mentors, Administration, Team Leaders	June 2013
3. New teacher support groups are provided monthly. Administrators routinely meet with mentors and mentees to provide coaching and support.	Mentors, Administration, Team Leaders	June 2013
4. In addition, all teachers receive support from team members, team leaders, specialists, administrators and district staff.	Mentors, Administration, Team Leaders	June 2013

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
All staff members are highly qualified.	

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
43	0	26% (11)	58% (25)	16% (7)	12% (5)	100% (37)	.5% (2)	0% (0)	80% (24)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school’s teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
No new teachers			

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A In an effort to provide a comprehensible framework of services to better meet the needs of economically disadvantaged children and to give all children a greater chance for academic success, while reducing duplication of services, Sunray Elementary coordinates the utilization of federal, state, and local funds and integrates several programs in compliance with state requirements. Title I funding will be used to provide professional development opportunities to teachers and administrators to address the specific academic achievement needs of the school.
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II Title I and Title II funding will be used to provide professional development opportunities to address specific academic achievement needs of the school. IDEA funding will be used in conjunction with Title II funds to train teachers in the RtI/MTSS strategies that are proven to work with students with disabilities and students with behavior problems.
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for third grade Level 1 readers.
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs Sunray Elementary School offers free breakfast to all students. Sunray Elementary follows the Pasco County Student Wellness Policy and uses the Alliance for a Healthier Generation as a guide when choosing snacks and nutritional prizes for the students.
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school-based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team consists of the school nurse, school psychologist, school social worker, speech language pathologist, literacy coach, guidance counselor, math specialist, administration, general and special education teachers.

Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The MTSS Leadership Team/School Based Intervention Team meets on a weekly basis to discuss concerns and interventions to make students successful. The team problem-solves and reviews practices to assess and assist with skill development. Follow-up regarding interventions occurs approximately 3 weeks after an intervention has been put into place. If successful, the intervention continues; if not, the intervention is changed or adjusted to better meet the needs of the individual students. The MTSS Team also provides technical and professional development to staff to support RtI.

- Review of universal screening data
- Review of progress monitoring data
- Planning for interventions
- Assessment of RtI implementation progress (Self-Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation)
- Assessment of school staff's practices and skill development(RtI Skills and RtI Perception of Practices Surveys)
- Development of professional development/technical assistance plan to support RtI implementation

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The school-based MTSS Leadership Team reviews demographic, academic, and behavioral data to determine programs and school wide needs to be implemented into the School Improvement Plan. They also plan for interventions, develop supports, and follow up on individual student progress. In addition, the team identifies professional development needs in order for RtI interventions to be successful.

- Analysis of relevant demographic/school profile data for the purpose of problem analysis and hypothesis generation.
- Identification of critical RtI infrastructure already established and/or in need of development and provide plan for building capacity
- Analysis of school wide and grade-level data in order to identify student achievement trends
- Analysis of disaggregated data in order to identify trends and groups in need of intervention
- Development of assessment strategies and calendars (i.e., Universal Screening, Progress Monitoring, Diagnostic Assessment)
- Development of data review plans, supports, and calendars
- Development of processes to ensure intervention fidelity
- Review of progress monitoring data
- Planning for interventions (academic and behavioral)
- Assessment of RtI implementation progress (Self- Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI)
- Assessment of school staff's skill development (RtI Skills Survey)
- Development of professional development/technical assistance plan to support RtI implementation that includes Positive Behavior Support (PBS)

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

All student data is housed in our district and school's local electronic warehouse, Pasco Star, eSembler and Filemaker Pro databases. Data is discussed at weekly meetings, datashares, and grade level meetings and the problem-solving method is employed to identify student needs and interventions.

Baseline Data Academics: Progress Monitoring System: PMRN, FCAT

Baseline Data Behavior: TERMS (referral info.) and Minor Incident Reports data collection

Midyear Academics: PMRN, FAIR, DAR

Midyear Behavior: TERMS (referral info.) and Minor Incident Reports data collection

End of Year Academics: FAIR, FCAT

End of Year Behavior: TERMS (referral info.) and Minor Incident Reports data collection

Frequency of Data Days Academic: Student data meetings occur every 6 weeks. Included in those meetings are TBIT, reading unit planning including the research and inquiry plan and math units, using the Guided Math Organizer. Weekly data meetings with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions (SBIT) occur every Wednesday.

Frequency of Data Days Behavior: Minimum monthly during our Professional Learning Communities.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Our district has been piloting the MTSS/RtI framework in several elementary schools. The purpose of this pilot program has been to inform Pasco County regarding the extent to which the framework helps schools evaluate and organize their resources and ultimately leads to improvements in student outcomes and capacity of systems. Sunray Elementary participated in a three-year training program with district level RtI coaches and trainers. This key group of staff members will continue to lead our school in the MTSS/RtI implementation.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Our school consistently supports MTSS by conducting both Teacher Based Intervention Team (TBIT) and School Based Intervention Team (SBIT) meetings weekly. Progress monitoring, data analysis and individual student intervention strategies are developed as a team and support staff members actively assist the classroom teachers with interventions. Support staff members that provide assistance are a Literacy Intervention teacher, Accelerated Learning specialist (ALL), Literacy Coach, Math Resource teacher and a five-member team of instructional assistants. The Instructional Assistants provide classroom coverage and services to students on grade level while the certified teachers provide intervention services to those students that are below

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

grade level and in need of additional tier support. Every six weeks, each grade specific team, along with support staff and administration, meet to discuss all students that are receiving additional interventions and chart current academic levels. Based on progress or lack of, student groups are revised and additional services are planned.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

Teachers chosen to be on the Literacy Team must:

- *Be committed
- *Have a vision for SRES
- *Have a passion to help all of teachers be their best
- *Want to see real positive outcomes
- *Want to inspire others to be their best
- *Be willing to conduct non-judgemental walkthroughs
- *Be on time to meetings
- *Be a leader
- *Be positive and hold high expectations
- *Be willing to attend one monthly

Selected teachers include a representative from each grade level, administration, ALL specialist, literacy coach and the intensive reading teacher.

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

Our LLT will meet monthly. The team members' responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

1. Developing a positive attitude throughout the school concerning teaching the reading series with fidelity
2. Being an agent for change
3. Completing Literacy Scans monthly to help determine professional development needs in the reading block
4. Assisting Literacy Coach with professional development trainings and topics for weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
5. Continue and support school wide initiative of student reading conferences
6. Support and model intervention strategies for all staff members
7. Assisting with the implementation and understanding of the new Common Core Standards
8. Assisting with the reading textbook adoption for the following school year
9. Supporting the strengthening of Core instruction

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

1. Training LLT to conduct school-wide Literacy Scans
2. Using the Literacy Scans to guide our professional development with CORE instruction
3. Promoting the enhancement of Literacy Stations
4. Researching, promoting and including Literature Circles to increase independent reading time
5. Promoting an independent reading time with teacher conferencing
6. Integrating science and social studies into Literacy Stations
7. Implementing research and inquiry projects
8. Building classroom libraries to offer students more selection during independent reading time
9. Continue and support school wide initiative of student reading conferences
10. Assisting grades K and 1 with the implementation of Common Core Standards. Preparing all other grades with the background and understanding of CCSS for future implementation.

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

**Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition*

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

At Sunray Elementary School, all incoming Kindergarten students are assessed prior to or upon entering Kindergarten in order to determine individual and group needs and to assist in the development of effective, rigorous instructional and intervention programs. All students are assessed within the areas of Basic Skills/School Readiness, Oral Language/Syntax, Print/Letter knowledge and Phonological Awareness /Processing. Screening data will be collected and aggregated by the middle of September 2012. Data will be used to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students and for groups or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Core Kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice and independent practice of all academic and/or social emotional skills identified by screening data. In order to help children transition into elementary school from preschool environments, we sent our kindergarten team leader out to preschools to inform parents of our registration days and pre-screen students to better understand their academic abilities. This information was then used to help group children and create class lists that best meet the academic needs of the students. Our literacy coach and a select group of staff conducted an orientation for students and parents during the summer to give them materials and tips for activities to help their children be better prepared for kindergarten. During Eager Explorer Camp (kindergarten readiness camp), teachers had the opportunity to do additional informal assessments and gather parental input. In addition, two types of kindergarten readiness camps were offered this year. A nine-day intensive camp was offered to children with no pre-school experience and the traditional five-day camp was provided for students who attended a pre-school program. Social skills and Positive Behavior Support (PBS) initiatives were included in the curriculum of the camps and taught by our guidance counselor.

**Grades 6-12 Only* Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

**High Schools Only*

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(j) F.S.

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

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#).

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			IA.1. Limited teacher analysis of student’s specific areas of need	IA.1. Teachers will reflect on RtI/TBIT process and determine which area of COILE (Curriculum, Organization, Instruction, Learner, Environment) can be improved.	IA.1. Classroom teacher, RtI/MTSS cadre	IA.1. Weekly study groups will Focus on COILE (Tier 1).	IA.1. Lesson Plans and the number of students referred to SBIT decreases.
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that fifty-six percent (138) of our students are at or above grade level in reading. Forty-nine percent (40) of our third graders scored at an achievement level three or higher. Sixty-seven percent (54) of our fourth graders scored at an achievement level three or higher. Forty-eight percent (44) of our fifth graders scored at an achievement level three or higher.	Fifty-six percent (138) of our students are at or above grade level in reading.	By June 2013, sixty-two percent of all students will achieve a level 3 or higher in reading as measured by the FCAT 2.0.					
			IA.2. Students mastery of complex comprehension standards	IA.2. Teachers will use the CORE comprehension questions embedded throughout the stories. Teachers will design higher order comprehension questions for their guided groups. Teachers will practice having the students answer evidence based questions, using support from text.	IA.2. Literacy coach, Classroom teacher	IA.2. Increased responses both verbally and written in comprehension checks	IA.2. Weekly main lesson Think and Compare Comprehension activity
			IA.3. Teachers guiding their instruction based on data	IA.3. Instructional staff will use a data wall, progress monitoring tools, quarterly data meetings, biweekly RtI data meetings, and weekly SBIT meetings to help guide instruction.	IA.3. Classroom teacher, Literacy Team, Administration	IA.3. Revising lesson plans and strategies based on student needs, determined through data	IA.3. FAIR Assessment, weekly assessments, unit assessments

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			I A. 4. Teachers transitioning into and understanding of Common Core Standards.	I A.4. Teachers will utilize weekly professional learning communities and focus on CCSS for Language Arts and Math.	I A. 4. Classroom teacher, Literacy Team, Administration	IA.4. Walk through data collection, Implementation of CCSS in the classroom	I.A.4. Teacher evaluation, increased student data
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.			2A.1. Limited time spent providing enrichment activities for high performing students.	2A.1. Higher performing students will participate in Literature Circles. Teachers will integrate differentiated enrichment activities throughout all content areas.	2A.1. Classroom Teachers	2A.1. Teachers will collect and review reading formative assessments (comprehension activities within CORE, weekly/unit tests)	2A.1. FAIR assessment, weekly comprehension checks
Reading Goal #2A: Sunray Elementary had twenty-eight percent (70) of all students meeting high standards in reading as measured by the 2012 FCAT 2.0. Twenty-seven percent (22) of third graders achieved high standards in reading. Twenty-nine percent (24) of fourth graders achieved high standards in reading. Twenty-seven (24) percent of fifth graders achieved high standards in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Twenty-eight percent (70) of all students meeting high standards in reading as measured by the 2012 FCAT 2.0.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, thirty-one percent of all students will achieve a level 4 or 5 in reading as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2A.2. Limited use of research and inquiry	2A.2. Teachers will plan and implement unit research and inquiry projects.	2A.2. Classroom teacher, grade level team, Literacy Coach	2A.2. Presentation of projects	2A.2. Rubric developed by teacher and/or CORE
			2A.3. Teachers have limited understanding of available enrichment resources.	2A.3. Professional development of enrichment resources (Literature circles, technology trainings and enrichment ideas) will be provided to staff.	2A.3. Media support/technology Literacy coach support	2A.3. Lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs and observations	2A.3. FAIR assessments, unit tests
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Students not aware of current performance levels in reading	3A.1. Teachers will help students implement individual goal setting based on data.	3A.1. Students, Classroom teacher	3A.1. Students recording academic data levels	3A.1. Graphs, charts, FAIR, unit assessments, FCAT
Reading Goal #3A: The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that, sixty-two percent (96) of all students made a learning gain in Reading. Sixty-seven percent (6) of retained third graders achieved a learning gain in reading. Sixty-four percent (42) of fourth graders achieved a learning gain in reading. Fifty-nine percent (48) of fifth graders achieved a learning gain in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Sixty-two percent (96) of all students made a learning gain in Reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, sixty-eight percent of all students will make a learning gain in reading as measured by the FCAT 2.0.					
			3A.2. Teachers limited understanding of following the CORE thoroughly and consistently	3A.2. Teachers will participate in weekly coaching conferences with their team to determine effectiveness of the CORE instruction. Based on the data, teachers will adjust their instructional routine as needed for the whole group time.	3A.2. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration, Lead Literacy team	3A.2. Walk through data collection, implementation of CORE in classroom	3A.2. Literacy Scan document, Administrative walk through data
			3A.3. Ensuring higher level students are challenged	3A.3. Teachers will implement Literature Circles.	3A.3. Classroom teachers	3A.3. Lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs and observations	3A.3. Culminating projects, written summaries, student conferences
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Motivation of low performing students	4A.1. Classroom and intervention teachers will help students set achievable goals and celebrate student success.	4A.1. Classroom teacher, intervention teachers	4A.1. Classroom walkthroughs and observations	4A.1. Goal charts/graphs
Reading Goal #4A: The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that nineteen percent (6) of the lowest 25% made a learning gain in reading.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Nineteen percent of the lowest 25% made a learning gain in reading, as measured on the 2012 FCAT.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> By June 2013, twenty-one percent of all lowest 25% students will make a learning gain in reading as measured by the FCAT 2.0.					
			4A.2. Providing enough intensive instruction within and beyond the 90 minute block	4A.2. Teachers will enhance the CORE instruction through professional development. Intervention time will be implemented outside the 90 minute reading block. There will be consistent, monthly progress monitoring of the students who receive intensive instruction.	4A.2. Classroom teacher, intervention teachers	4A.2. Increased proficiency on weekly and unit assessments, FAIR	4A.2. Weekly and unit Assessments, FAIR
			4A.3. Students needing more direct small group instruction	4A.3. Reading intervention teachers, ESE support facilitator and the classroom teachers will provide daily intervention groups. These groups will be monitored and adjusted every six weeks.	4A.3. Instructional assistants, Reading intervention teachers, ESE support facilitator, literacy coach	4A.3. Increased proficiency on weekly and unit assessments, FAIR	4A.3. Weekly and unit Assessments, FAIR
			4A.4. Students needing additional instruction in specific reading areas	4A.4. Intervention teachers and student data will determine the specific reading area needs. Students will be placed in groups accordingly and adjusted as needed.	4A.4. Instructional assistants, Reading intervention teachers, ESE support facilitator, literacy coach	4A.4. Increased proficiency on weekly and unit assessments, FAIR	4A.4. Weekly and unit Assessments, FAIR, data monitoring meetings
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Reading Goal #4B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017					
<p>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Baseline data 2010-2011</p> <p style="text-align: center;">28% nonproficient in Reading</p> <p><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that fifty-six percent (138) of our students are at or above grade level in reading. Forty-nine percent (40) of our third graders scored at an achievement level three or higher. Sixty-seven percent (54) of our fourth graders scored at an achievement level three or higher. Forty-eight percent (44) of our fifth graders scored at an achievement level three or higher. By June 2013, sixty-two percent of all students will achieve a level 3 or higher in reading as measured by the FCAT 2.0. Each year, a targeted level of performance will reduce the amount of students achieving a nonproficient level on FCAT by 10%.</p>	44% nonproficient in Reading	40% nonproficient in Reading	36% nonproficient in Reading	32% nonproficient in Reading	29% nonproficient in Reading	26% nonproficient in Reading					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool						
<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 60%;"><u>Reading Goal #5B:</u></th> <th style="width: 20%;"><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></th> <th style="width: 20%;"><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that fifty-six (96) percent of WHITE students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Forty-nine percent (23) of third grade WHITE students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Sixty-nine percent (38) of fourth grade WHITE students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Fifty percent (35) of fifth grade WHITE students scored a level 3 or above in reading.</p> <p>The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that forty-nine (25) percent of HISPANIC</p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that fifty-six (96) percent of WHITE students and forty-nine (25) percent of HISPANIC students scored a level 3 or above in reading.</p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <p>By June 2013, sixty-two percent of all WHITE students will achieve a level 3 or higher in reading as measured by the FCAT 2.0. By June 2013, fifty-four percent of all HISPANIC students will achieve a level 3 or higher as measured by the</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	<p>The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that fifty-six (96) percent of WHITE students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Forty-nine percent (23) of third grade WHITE students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Sixty-nine percent (38) of fourth grade WHITE students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Fifty percent (35) of fifth grade WHITE students scored a level 3 or above in reading.</p> <p>The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that forty-nine (25) percent of HISPANIC</p>	<p>The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that fifty-six (96) percent of WHITE students and forty-nine (25) percent of HISPANIC students scored a level 3 or above in reading.</p>	<p>By June 2013, sixty-two percent of all WHITE students will achieve a level 3 or higher in reading as measured by the FCAT 2.0. By June 2013, fifty-four percent of all HISPANIC students will achieve a level 3 or higher as measured by the</p>	5B.1. Limited background knowledge	5B.1. Teachers will use CORE "Talk About It" strategies along with previewing and meaningful activating strategies weekly.	5B.1. Classroom teacher, Literacy Coach	5B.1. Increased vocabulary achievement and content connections	5B.1. Observation, Literacy Scans
<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>									
<p>The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that fifty-six (96) percent of WHITE students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Forty-nine percent (23) of third grade WHITE students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Sixty-nine percent (38) of fourth grade WHITE students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Fifty percent (35) of fifth grade WHITE students scored a level 3 or above in reading.</p> <p>The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that forty-nine (25) percent of HISPANIC</p>	<p>The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that fifty-six (96) percent of WHITE students and forty-nine (25) percent of HISPANIC students scored a level 3 or above in reading.</p>	<p>By June 2013, sixty-two percent of all WHITE students will achieve a level 3 or higher in reading as measured by the FCAT 2.0. By June 2013, fifty-four percent of all HISPANIC students will achieve a level 3 or higher as measured by the</p>									

**June 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Forty-seven percent (9) of third grade Hispanic students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Forty-seven percent (10) of fourth grade Hispanic students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Fifty-three percent (6) of fifth grade Hispanic students scored a level 3 or above in reading.</p>		<p>FCAT 2.0.</p>					
		<p>5B.2. Limited time for independent reading</p>	<p>5B.2. School wide intervention time will focus on specific individual and small group needs. In addition, teachers will provide time throughout the week for independent reading.</p>	<p>5B.2. Classroom teacher, Literacy Coach</p>	<p>5B.2. Notes from weekly meetings with literacy coach to determine if group restructuring is needed</p>	<p>5B.2. Weekly and unit Assessments, FAIR, data monitoring meetings</p>	
		<p>5B.3. Student mastery of complex comprehension strategies</p>	<p>5B.3. School wide intervention time will focus on specific individual and small group needs. Literacy coach will facilitate weekly coaching sessions with the classroom and ESE teachers to discuss student progress. Professional Development will be designed around the CCSS rigor.</p>	<p>5B.3. Classroom teacher, Literacy Coach</p>	<p>5B.3. Notes from weekly meetings with literacy coach to determine if group restructuring is needed</p>	<p>5B.3. Weekly and unit Assessments, FAIR, data monitoring meetings</p>	
		<p>5B.4. Teachers limited understanding of increased rigor within the Common Core State Standards</p>	<p>5B.4. Teachers will participate in weekly professional learning communities, focusing on increasing the rigor within reading comprehension.</p>	<p>5B.4. Classroom teacher, Literacy Coach</p>	<p>5B.4. Attendance sheets for professional learning communities meetings, classroom walk through data and increased student progress</p>	<p>5B.4. Weekly and unit Assessments, FAIR, data monitoring meetings</p>	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Reading Goal #5C: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. Classroom teachers changing their individual daily schedule	5D.1. School wide reading intervention time is implemented into the master schedule.	5D.1. Classroom teachers, ESE support facilitators	5D.1. Classroom walk throughs, weekly communication and reflection meetings	5D.1. Master schedule, IEP minutes reflect services
Reading Goal #5D: The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that thirty-one percent (12) of all SWD scored a level 3 or above in reading. Thirty-eight percent (5) of third grade SWD scored a level 3 or above in reading. Thirty-eight percent (5) of fourth grade SWD scored a level 3 or above in reading. Fifteen percent (2) of fifth grade SWD scored a level 3 or above in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that thirty-one percent (12) of all SWD scored a level 3 or above in reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, thirty-four percent of students with disabilities will achieve a level 3 or higher in reading as measured by the FCAT 2.0.					
			5D.2. Limited ESE support services	5D.2. Support facilitation teachers will follow the school wide intervention schedule.	5D.2. Classroom teachers, ESE support facilitators	5D.2. Classroom walk throughs, and weekly communication and reflection meetings	5D.2. Master schedule, IEP minutes reflect services
			5D.3. Classroom teachers limited experience in meeting the needs of SWD in the basic education classroom	5D.3. Support facilitation teachers will meet weekly with basic education teachers for collaborative planning.	5D.3. Classroom teachers, ESE support facilitators	5D.3. Weekly communication and data reflection meetings	5D.3. Weekly and unit Assessments, FAIR, data monitoring meetings

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Limited time for independent reading	5E.1. School wide intervention time will focus on specific individual and small group needs. In addition, teachers will provide time throughout the week for independent reading.	5E.1. Classroom teacher	5E.1. Increased reading proficiency on weekly or unit assessments, FAIR	5E.1. Weekly or unit assessments, FAIR
Reading Goal #5E: The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that fifty-two percent (112) of Economically Disadvantaged students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Forty-six percent (33) of third grade ED students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Sixty-three percent (42) of fourth grade ED students scored a level 3 or above in reading. Forty-seven percent (37) of fifth grade ED students scored a level 3 or above in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that fifty-two percent (112) of Economically Disadvantaged students scored a level 3 or above in reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, fifty-seven percent of Economically Disadvantaged students will achieve a level 3 or higher in reading as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	5E.2. Limited background knowledge	5E.2. Teachers will use meaningful activating strategies, preview reading units, and utilize the "Talk About It" section from the reading series.	5E.2. Classroom teacher	5E.2. Increased achievement in vocabulary on formative assessments	5E.2. Weekly or unit assessments, FAIR
			5E.3. Limited availability of home literature selections	5E.3. The school will continue the One Book, One School initiative, we will also provide free books to families during parent events throughout the year.	5E.3. Classroom teachers, literacy coach	5E.3. Increased reading proficiency on weekly or unit assessments, FAIR	5E.3. Weekly or unit assessments, FAIR

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Standards	K-5	Literacy Coach, Literacy Intervention teacher, ALL specialist	K-5 teachers, all special area teachers	Bi-weekly	Observation, implementation of CCSS	Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Administration
Research and Inquiry Projects	K-5	Literacy Coach, Literacy Intervention teacher, ALL specialist	K-5	Quarterly (length of units is approximately 6 weeks)	Observation, lesson plan, student presentations	Literacy Coach, Administration

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Strengthening the CORE	K-5	Literacy Coach, Literacy Intervention teacher, ALL specialist, Administration	K-5	Bi-Weekly through CCSS PLC	Observation, teacher evaluations	Literacy Coach, Administration
------------------------	-----	--	-----	----------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
To provide SWD appropriate reading text and intervention resources	Stevenson workbooks	Title I	\$300
To provide at risk second graders with additional reading interventions	Heinemann Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention	Title I	\$6300
			Subtotal:\$6600
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Intensive Reading teacher Accelerated Literacy Learning teacher	To provide support and interventions to our lowest performing readers	Title I	\$113, 930
			Subtotal: \$113,930
			Total:\$120,530

End of Reading Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1. Students have had limited experience with oral presentations.	1.1. Students will present each research and inquiry project to classmates at the end of each Reading unit.	1.1. Teachers, ESOL teacher, Assistant Principal	1.1. Collaboration between classroom teachers, ESOL teacher and Assistant Principal	1.1. CELLA
CELLA Goal #1:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
At Sunray, 36% (14) students in kindergarten through fifth grade were proficient on the Listening/Speaking portion of the CELLA.	36% of the students in grades kindergarten through fifth were proficient in the Listening/Speaking portion of the CELLA.					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1. Students have had limited exposure with self-selection of literacy books.	2.1. All students will have the opportunity to independent read via the classroom library and check out books from the media center.	2.1. Classroom teachers, ESOL teacher	2.1. Reading assessment results, collaboration between ESOL teacher and classroom teachers.	2.1. CELLA, FAIR test, reading unit assessments
CELLA Goal #2:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
At Sunray, 28% (5) students in kindergarten through fifth grade were proficient on the Reading portion of the CELLA.	28% of the students in kindergarten through fifth grade were proficient on the Reading portion of the CELLA.					
		2.2. Students will receive specific reading interventions based on their instructional level	2.2. All students will receive appropriate Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions from the classroom teachers. Tier 1 students will continue to receive additional support in differentiated centers and from support staff members.	2.2. Classroom teachers, Literacy coach, ALL specialist, Reading Intervention teacher, Instructional Assistants	2.2. Reading assessment results, collaboration between ESOL teacher and classroom teachers.	2.2. CELLA, FAIR test, reading unit assessments
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		2.1. Students have had limited opportunity to practice their craft of Writing.	2.1. Provide students with Writing opportunities across the curriculum areas. Examples include Interactive Science Notebooks, Interactive Math Journals, Writing Journals, Research and Inquiry projects.	2.1. Classroom teachers, ESOL teacher	2.1. Use of writing across the curriculum areas	2.1. CELLA , writing prompts.
CELLA Goal #3: At Sunray, 31 % (7) students in kindergarten through fifth grade were proficient on the writing portion of the CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	31% of the students in Kindergarten through fifth grade were proficient on the Writing portion of the CELLA.					
	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of CELLA Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			IA.1. Limited knowledge on conducting guided math groups	IA.1. The Lead Math Team will conduct walk-throughs and observations to use for staff development. Teacher request forms will be made available for peer modeling on specific lessons and strategies. Math Resource Teacher will be available for modeling/co-teach upon teacher request.	IA.1. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Lead Math Team	IA.1. Classroom walk-throughs/observations, lesson plans, unit pretest graphic organizers	IA.1. Math observation tool
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
#1A: The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that forty-five percent (114) of our students are at or above grade level in math. Forty-three percent (35) of third grade students, fifty-eight percent (47) of fourth grade students, and thirty-five (32) percent of fifth grade students scored at a level 3 or higher.	Forty-five percent (114) of our students are at or above grade level in math.	By June 2013, fifty percent of all students will achieve a level 3 or higher in math as measured by the FCAT 2.0.					
			IA.2. Planning for differentiated instruction	IA.2. The classroom teachers will participate in grade specific planning for each unit with the Math Resource Teacher. Pre and posttest data will be used during planning to make instructional decisions.	IA.2. Administration, Math Resource Teacher	IA.2. Grade specific planning, classroom walk-throughs/observations, unit pretest organizers	IA.2. Unit posttests, CORE K12 Benchmark Assessments, math observation tool
			IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
#1B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			IB.2.	IB.2.	IB.2.	IB.2.	IB.2.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. New resources to enrich higher level performing students	2A.1. Staff development on differentiated instruction will be provided. The Math Resource Teacher will be available for modeling/co-teach upon teacher request. Classroom teachers will have opportunities to observe in model classrooms upon request. Higher order word problems and math activities/projects will be available/created for higher performing students.	2A.1. Math Resource Teacher, Administration, Classroom Teachers	2A.1. Classroom walk throughs/observations, lesson plans, unit pretest graphic organizers, unit pre and posttests, CORE K12 Benchmark Assessments	2A.1. Math observation tool, unit posttests, CORE K12 Benchmark Assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that seventeen percent (44) of our students achieved a level 4 or 5 in math. Ten percent (8) of third grade students, thirty-one percent (25) of fourth grade students, and twelve percent (11) of fifth grade students achieved a level 4 or 5 in math.	The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that seventeen percent (44) of our students achieved a level 4 or 5 in math.	By June 2013, nineteen percent of all students will achieve a level 4 or 5 in math as measured by the FCAT 2.0.					
			2A.2. Higher level performing students do not have opportunities for enrichment activities	2A.2. Enrichment intervention groups will be provided for higher performing students starting the first quarter. Online resources will also be used to make individual assignments to differentiate and meet the needs of higher performing students.	2A.2. Classroom Teachers, Math Resource Teacher	2A.2. Classroom walk throughs/observations, lesson plans, unit pretest graphic organizers, unit pre and posttests, CORE K12 Benchmark Assessments	2A.2. Unit pre and posttests, CORE K12 Benchmark Assessments
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool						
<p>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">Mathematics Goal #3A:</td> <td style="width: 15%;">2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td style="width: 15%;">2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="font-size: small;">Fifty-five percent (85) of all students made learning gains in math, as measured on the 2012 FCAT 2.0. Forty-four percent (4) of retained third graders, sixty-seven percent (44) of fourth grade students, and forty-six percent (37) of fifth grade students made learning gains.</td> <td style="font-size: small;">Fifty-five percent (85) of all students made learning gains in math, as measured by 2012 FCAT 2.0.</td> <td style="font-size: small;">By June 2013, sixty-one percent of all students will make learning gains in math, as measured by FCAT 2.0.</td> </tr> </table>	Mathematics Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Fifty-five percent (85) of all students made learning gains in math, as measured on the 2012 FCAT 2.0. Forty-four percent (4) of retained third graders, sixty-seven percent (44) of fourth grade students, and forty-six percent (37) of fifth grade students made learning gains.	Fifty-five percent (85) of all students made learning gains in math, as measured by 2012 FCAT 2.0.	By June 2013, sixty-one percent of all students will make learning gains in math, as measured by FCAT 2.0.	3A.1. Using data to drive instruction	3A.1. The Math Resource Teacher will update math spreadsheets for all kindergarten-fifth grade teachers after every unit pre and posttest. The math spreadsheets and individual student pre and posttest graphs will be used to track learning gains.	3A.1. Classroom Teachers, Math Resource Teacher, Administration	3A.1. Progress monitoring	3A.1. Unit pre and posttests
Mathematics Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*									
Fifty-five percent (85) of all students made learning gains in math, as measured on the 2012 FCAT 2.0. Forty-four percent (4) of retained third graders, sixty-seven percent (44) of fourth grade students, and forty-six percent (37) of fifth grade students made learning gains.	Fifty-five percent (85) of all students made learning gains in math, as measured by 2012 FCAT 2.0.	By June 2013, sixty-one percent of all students will make learning gains in math, as measured by FCAT 2.0.									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">Mathematics Goal #3B:</td> <td style="width: 15%;">2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td style="width: 15%;">2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="font-size: small;">Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td> <td style="font-size: small;">Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</td> <td style="font-size: small;">Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</td> </tr> </table>	Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.	3A.2. Planning for differentiated instruction	3A.2. The classroom teachers will participate in grade specific collaborative planning with the Math Resource Teacher for each unit. They will use unit pre and posttest data and unit pretest graphic organizers to drive their instruction.	3A.2. Classroom Teacher, Math Resource Teacher	3A.2. Grade specific planning, classroom walk throughs/observations, lesson plans, unit pretest graphic organizers	3A.2. Unit pre and posttests
	Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*								
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.									
3A.3. Higher level performing students do not have opportunities for enrichment activities	3A.3. The classroom teachers will provide enrichment centers and guided groups for higher performing students. The Math Resource Teacher will be available for modeling/co-teach upon teacher request.	3A.3. Classroom Teacher, Math Resource Teacher	3A.3. Unit pretests, guided groups, lesson plans, unit pretest graphic organizers	3A.3. Unit pre and posttests, CORE K12 Benchmark Assessments							
<p>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">Mathematics Goal #3B:</td> <td style="width: 15%;">2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td style="width: 15%;">2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="font-size: small;">Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td> <td style="font-size: small;">Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</td> <td style="font-size: small;">Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</td> </tr> </table>	Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*									
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">Mathematics Goal #3B:</td> <td style="width: 15%;">2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td style="width: 15%;">2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="font-size: small;">Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</td> <td style="font-size: small;">Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</td> <td style="font-size: small;">Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</td> </tr> </table>	Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*									
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.									

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4A: Twenty-five percent (7) of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math, as measured on the 2012 FCAT 2.0. Twenty-seven percent (4) of the lowest 25% of fourth grade students and twenty-three percent (3) of the lowest 25% of fifth grade students made learning gains in math.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Twenty-five percent (7) of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math, as measured on the 2012 FCAT 2.0.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, twenty-eight percent of the lowest 25% will make learning gains in math, as measured on the FCAT 2.0.	4A.1. Classroom Teachers, Math Resource Teacher	4A.1. Unit pre and posttests, math spreadsheets, summarizing/Interactive Math Notebooks	4A.1. Unit pre and posttests	
	4A.1. Low performing students are not receiving intensive math services					4A.1. The classroom teachers will use unit pre and posttest data to differentiate and guide instruction. They will use re-teach activities/materials and online resources based on student need.
	4A.2. Limited comprehension of mathematical word problems and math terminology					4A.2. The classroom teachers will enhance instruction through the use of graphic organizers, online resources, Smartboard lessons, and Interactive Math Notebooks.
4A.3. Limited recall of basic facts		4A.3. Third grade teachers will prioritize addition and subtraction facts. Fourth and fifth grade teachers will focus on multiplication and division facts. Teachers will utilize GO MATH resources and online resources.	4A.3. Classroom Teacher	4A.3. Unit pre/post test, spreadsheet	4A.3. Unit pre/post tests	
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	
	4B.1.					4B.1.
	4B.2.					4B.2.
4B.3.		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 32% nonproficient in Math	55% nonproficient in Math	49% nonproficient in Math	44% nonproficient in Math	40% nonproficient in Math	36% nonproficient in Math	32% nonproficient in Math
	Mathematics Goal #5A: The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that forty-five percent (114) of our students are at or above grade level in math. Forty-three percent (35) of third grade students, fifty-eight percent (47) of fourth grade students, and thirty-five (32) percent of fifth grade students scored at a level 3 or higher. Each year, a targeted level of performance will reduce the amount of students achieving a nonproficient level on FCAT by 10%.						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5B.1. WHITE: Limited knowledge on conducting guided math groups	5B.1. WHITE: The Lead Math Team will conduct walk-throughs and observations to use for staff development. Teacher request forms will be made available for peer modeling on specific lessons and strategies. Math Resource Teacher will be available for modeling/co-teach upon teacher request.	5B.1. WHITE: Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Lead Math Team, Classroom Teachers	5B.1. WHITE: Classroom walk-throughs/observations, lesson plans, unit pretest graphic organizers	5B.1. WHITE: Math observation tool	
Mathematics Goal #5B: WHITE: The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that forty-eight percent (80) of our White students are at or above grade level in math. Forty-nine percent (23) of our third grade White students, sixty-two percent (32) of our fourth grade White students, and thirty-seven percent (25) of our fifth grade White students scored at a level 3 or higher. HISPANIC: The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that forty-two percent (23) of our Hispanic students are at or above grade	2012 Current Level of Performance: * WHITE: The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that forty-eight percent (80) of our White students are at or above grade level in math. HISPANIC: The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that forty-two percent (23) of our Hispanic students are at or above grade	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * WHITE: By June 2013, fifty-three percent of our White students will be at or above grade level in math, as measured on the FCAT 2.0. HISPANIC: By June 2013, forty-six percent of our Hispanic students will be at or above grade level in	Planning for differentiated instruction HISPANIC: Students have limited background knowledge	The classroom teachers will participate in grade specific collaborative planning with the Math Resource Teacher for each unit. They will use unit pre and posttest data and unit pretest graphic organizers to drive their instruction. HISPANIC: The students will use Interactive Math Notebooks to summarize and	Math Resource Teacher, Administration, Classroom Teachers HISPANIC: Math Resource Teacher, Classroom Teachers	Grade specific planning, classroom walk-throughs/observations, lesson plans, unit pretest graphic organizers HISPANIC: Rubrics, classroom walk-throughs/observations	Unit pre and posttests HISPANIC: Interactive Math Notebooks

**June 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>(23) of our Hispanic students are at or above grade level in math. Thirty-three percent (7) of our third grade Hispanic students, fifty-three percent (10) of our fourth grade Hispanic students, and forty percent (6) of our fifth grade Hispanic students scored at a level 3 or higher.</p>	level in math.	math, as measured on the FCAT 2.0.	Limited vocabulary in math	deepen understanding. The classroom teachers will use literature to offer cross curriculum connections. Smartboards and online resources will be used to enhance vocabulary instruction. Classrooms will have math word walls to highlight key math vocabulary. The students will use Interactive Math Notebooks to summarize and deepen understanding. Students and teachers will model correct use of math vocabulary.	Math Resource Teacher, Classroom Teachers	Classroom walk throughs/observations, Interactive Math Notebooks, lesson plans, unit pretest graphic organizers	Interactive Math Notebooks, unit pre and posttests, CORE K12 Benchmark Assessments
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. Limited knowledge on conducting guided math groups	5D.1. The Lead Math Team will conduct walk-throughs and observations to use for staff development. Teacher request forms will be made available for peer modeling on specific lessons and strategies. Math Resource Teacher will be available for modeling/co-teach upon teacher request.	5D.1. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Lead Math Team, Classroom Teachers, ESE teachers	5D.1. Classroom walk-throughs/observations, lesson plans, unit pretest graphic organizers	5D.1. Math observation tool
Mathematics Goal #5D: The 2012 FCAT 2.0 results show that twenty-seven percent (11) of our Students with Disabilities are at or above grade level in math. Thirty-six percent (5) of third grade Students with Disabilities, twenty-nine percent (4) of fourth grade Students with Disabilities, and fourteen percent (2) of fifth grade Students with Disabilities scored at a level 3 or higher.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Twenty-seven percent (11) of all Students with Disabilities scored at or above grade level in math, as measured by the 2012 FCAT 2.0.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, thirty percent of all Students with Disabilities will achieve a Level 3 or higher in math, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	5D.2. Planning for differentiated instruction	5D.2. The classroom teachers will participate in grade specific collaborative planning with the Math Resource Teacher for each unit. They will use unit pre and posttest data and unit pretest graphic organizers to drive their instruction.	5D.2. Math Resource Teacher, Administration, Classroom Teachers, ESE teachers	5D.2. Grade specific planning, classroom walk throughs/observations, lesson plans, unit pretest graphic organizers	5D.2. Unit pre and posttests
			5D.3. Strengthen core instruction	5D.3. The Lead Math Team will conduct walk-throughs and observations to use for staff development. The students will use	5D.3. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Lead Math Team, Classroom Teachers, ESE teachers	5D.3. Grade specific planning, classroom walk throughs/observations, Interactive Math Notebooks, unit	5D.3. Unit pre and posttests, CORE K12 Benchmark Assessments, math observation tool

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			<p>Interactive Math Notebooks to summarize and deepen understanding. Smartboards and online resources will be used in the classroom to enhance instruction. The classroom teachers and ESE teachers will participate in grade specific collaborative planning with the Math Resource Teacher for each unit. They will use unit pre and posttest data and unit pretest graphic organizers to drive their instruction.</p>		<p>pre and posttests, lesson plans, unit pretest graphic organizers</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Implementation of differentiated instruction during guided math groups	5E.1. The Math Resource Teacher will provide staff development on differentiated instruction. Classroom teachers will have opportunities to observe in model classrooms upon request. The Math Resource Teacher will be available for modeling/co-teach upon teacher request.	5E.1. Administration, Math Resource Teacher, Lead Math Team, Classroom Teachers	5E.1. Classroom walk-throughs/observations	5E.1. Math observation tool
Mathematics Goal #5E: Forty-four percent (96) of our Economically Disadvantaged Students scored at or above grade level in math, as measured by the 2012 FCAT 2.0. Forty-four percent (31) of all Economically Disadvantaged third grade students, fifty-seven percent (38) of our Economically Disadvantaged fourth grade students, and thirty-five percent (27) of our Economically Disadvantaged fifth grade students achieved a level 3 or higher in math, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Forty-four percent (96) of our Economically Disadvantaged Students scored at or above grade level in math, as measured by the 2012 FCAT 2.0.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, forty-eight percent of all our Economically Disadvantaged Students will achieve a level 3 or higher in math, as measured by the FCAT 2.0.	5E.2. Students have limited background knowledge	5E.2. The students will use Interactive Math Notebooks to summarize and deepen understanding.	5E.2. Math Resource Teacher, Classroom Teachers	5E.2. Rubrics, classroom walk-throughs/observations	5E.2. Interactive Math Notebooks
			5E.3. Limited vocabulary in math	5E.3. The classroom teachers will use literature to offer cross-curriculum connections. Smartboards and online resources will be used to enhance vocabulary instruction. Classrooms will have math word walls to highlight key math vocabulary. The students will use Interactive Math Notebooks to summarize and deepen understanding. Students and teachers will model correct use of math vocabulary.	5E.3. Math Resource Teacher, Classroom Teachers	5E.3. Classroom walk-throughs/observations, Interactive Math Notebooks, lesson plans, unit pretest graphic organizers	5E.3. Interactive Math Notebooks, unit pre and posttests, CORE K12 Benchmark Assessments

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Middle School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Mathematics Goal #2A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
Mathematics Goal #3A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
Mathematics Goal #4A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Mathematics Goal #4B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	Baseline data 2010-2011							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
Mathematics Goal #5E: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

High School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Mathematics Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Algebra 1 Goal #3A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	Baseline data 2010-2011							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. Algebra 1 Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>			3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:							
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Geometry Goal #3A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	Baseline data 2011-2012						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>			3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:						
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Geometry Goal #3C: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Geometry Goal #3D: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Geometry Goal #3E: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math Common Core Standards PLC	K-5	Math Resource Teacher	All instructional staff members	Monthly	Observation, lesson plans, walk-throughs	Math Resource Teacher, Administration
Interactive Math Notebook	2-5	Math Resource Teachers	Selected 2-5 teachers	Aug. 30	Math Journals with lesson summaries	Classroom teachers, Math Resource Teacher

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Manga High software	Online interactive math software	Title I	\$1,125
			Subtotal:\$1,125
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Mathematician of the Month student incentives	Math games, math tools	Title I	\$300
Math Resource Teacher	Highly qualified math resource teacher to assist teachers with the implementation of math standards, provide professional development and enrich students into higher order mathematical problem solving	Title I	\$58, 289
			Subtotal:\$58,589
			Total:\$59,714

End of Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1. Limited time during instructional day to teach new Science, Technical, Engineering, Mathematics (STEM) initiatives.	1A.1. Teachers will plan together and conduct concept based scientific experiments more frequently and use of the online HMH digital lessons will increase. Integration of Science will be done in all content areas.	1A.1. Administration	1A.1. Observation, classroom walk throughs, lesson plans	1A.1. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Science Assessments, Core K-12, Interactive Notebook, Comprehension checks.
Science Goal #1A: Sunray Elementary had twenty-seven (27) percent of fifth grade students score an achievement level of three or above in Science, as measured by the 2012 FCAT assessment.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	Twenty seven percent (27) of all fifth graders scored a level 3 or above on 2012 FCAT 2.0	By June 2013, thirty-one (15% increase) percent of all fifth graders will achieve a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT 2.0					
			1A.2. Lack of knowledge of science based careers, tools, and technology.	1A.2. Experiments, incorporating reading materials that are science based, meaningful experiences with representatives from the science field.	1A.2. Classroom teacher, Tech specialist, STEM leadership committee	1A.2. Observations, walk throughs, lesson plans	1A.2. Core K-12, Interactive Notebook, Comprehension checks
			1A.3. Limited vocabulary and background knowledge	1A.3. Use of word walls in the classrooms as well as a science vocabulary parade. Morning news, classroom videos, and virtual field trips will also be used to build background knowledge.	1A.3. Classroom teacher, Administration	1A.3. Classroom walk throughs, observation, lesson plans	1A.3. Data, Chapter tests, Core K-12, Comprehension checks
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Science Goal #1B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Limited time during instructional day	2A.1. Collaborative planning to integrate science activities across curriculum such as Research and Inquiry, Math activities, and independent reading selections.	2A.1. Classroom teacher	2A.1. Observation of lesson, classroom walk-throughs	2A.1. Lesson Plans/Unit Plans
Science Goal #2A: Sunray Elementary had ten percent (9) of fifth grade students score an achievement level of 4 or 5 in Science, as measured by 2012 FCAT Assessment.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Sunray Elementary had ten percent (9) of fifth grade students score an achievement level of 4 or 5 in Science, as measured by 2012 FCAT 2.0 Assessment.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> By June 2013, twelve percent (15% increase) of all fifth grade students will score level 4 or 5 in Science, as measured by 2013 FCAT 2.0.					
			2A.2. Limited vocabulary	2A.2. "Science Zone" classroom videos will showcase current science concepts being studied with an emphasis on vocabulary.	2A.2. Media Specialist, classroom teacher, News Crew	2A.2. Observations, classroom walk-throughs, assessments	2A.2. Core K-12, classroom assessments
			2A.3. Summarization of scientific concepts	2A.3. Interactive notebooks	2A.3. Classroom teacher	2A.3. Observations, students use of interactive notebooks	2A.3. Core K-12, classroom assessments, oral comprehension checks
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)*

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology 1 Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology 1 Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Interactive Science Notebooks (Summarizing)	Composition Journals	Title I	\$400
			Subtotal:\$400
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Brain Pop	Online interactive resource used for activating lessons/centers	SAC	\$2,000
			Subtotal:\$2,000
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Hands-on Experiments	Consumable resources	Title I	\$400
			Subtotal:\$400
			Total:\$2,800

End of Science Goals

June 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Writing Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Continued professional development in Writing	1A.1. Offer professional development that includes writing across the curriculum, enhanced conventions, grammar and strengthening Writer's Workshop. Attend Tampa Bay Area Writing Project Conference on September 29, 2012.	1A.1. Administration	1A.1. Lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, observations, monthly demand writing, interactive notebooks	1A.1. Data, teacher evaluation
Writing Goal #1A: Assessment results in Writing indicated that eighty-five percent (68) of all 4 th grade students tested scored 3.0 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Writing. The mean score in narrative writing was a 3.4.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	1A.2. Limited knowledge of key components to conducting student conferences	1A.2. Offer professional development relate to student conferencing	1A.2. Administration, Literacy Coach	1A.2. Lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, observations, monthly demand writing, interactive notebooks	1A.2. Data, teacher evaluation
	Thirty percent (24) of the students achieved a level 4 or higher as measured by 2012 FCAT Writes.	By June 2013, fifty percent of all 4 th grade students will achieve a 4.0 or higher as measured by 2013 FCAT Writing.	1A.3. Limited understanding of Common Core Standards in Writing	1A.3. Attend district trainings offered in CCSS Grade level collaborative planning to implement Writing in CCSS.	1A.3. Teachers, Administration	1A.3. Lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, observations, monthly demand writing, interactive notebooks	1A.3. Data, teacher evaluation
			1A.4. Meeting the needs of all students in Writing	1A.4. Differentiate instruction to remediate and enrich all student writers.	1A.4. Teacher, Administration	1A.4. Lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, observations, monthly demand writing	1A.4. Monthly demand writing, data, teacher evaluation
			1A.5. Including grammar instruction in the core Writing curriculum	1A.5. Daily Oral Language, technology resources, collaborative planning with McMillian McGraw Hill curriculum	1A.5. Teacher, Administration	1A.4. Lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, observations, monthly demand writing	1A.4. Monthly demand writing, data, teacher evaluation
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Integration of Writing Across the Curriculum	K-5	Literacy Coach, District Reading Coach	Selected teachers (K-5)	November 2012	Lesson plans, Observations	Literacy Coach, Administration

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Attend the 2012 Tampa Bay Area Writing project Fall Conference	Selected writing trainings conducted by TBAWP writing teachers	Title I	\$2,000
			Subtotal:\$2,000
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing binders/composition journals	All students will use an organized writing binder in Intermediate and a journal in Primary.	Title I	\$1,000

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	Subtotal:\$1,000
	Total:\$3,000

End of Writing Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2014-2015)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Civics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Civics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

U.S. History EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
U.S. History Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
	Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
U.S. History Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

U.S. History Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of U.S. History Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Attendance Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Excessive Absences	1.1. An Attendance Flow Chart will be followed by all teachers: 1. Teachers will monitor student attendance and call parents when a student has been absent 3 days. 2. If absences continue, teachers will continue to call parent. After at least 2 documented attempts, a referral will be made to the attendance committee. 3. Attendance committee will meet at least once a month to review attendance data and any attendance referrals and assign additional interventions.	1.1. Classroom teacher, Attendance Committee members	1.1. Parent contact logs will be kept by each teacher. Documentation Log will be kept of phone calls and letters.	1.1. Data tracking of student absences and parent phone calls
Attendance Goal #1: While the attendance rate at Sunray Elementary is almost 95%, 282 students had excessive absences of 10 days or more.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	ADM of 540 average rate of attendance 94.7%	The attendance rate at Sunray will improve to 96%.					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	282 students, during the '11-'12 school year, had excessive absences of 10 days or more.	We will decrease the amount of students with excessive absences by 50%. This includes excused and unexcused.					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
79 students had excessive tardies during the 2011-2012 school year.	We expect for no more than 25 students to have excessive tardies during 2012-2013 school year.						
			1.2. Excessive Tardies	1.2. Parents will be required to walk their child in to the office when tardy.	1.2. Attendance Committee	1.2. Attendance data	1.2. Tracking attendance/tardy data

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			After 3 tardies in a calendar month, a phone call will be made reminding parents of the importance of being in class on time.			
		1.3. Excessive Absences	1.3. School wide incentives for attendance; contest between teams, attendance commercials	1.3. Assistant Principal, Media-Tech Department	1.3. Attendance data will be analyzed and monitored for students will excessive absences.	1.3. Attendance data

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Student Absences	K-5	Social Worker	School-wide	First quarter	Student review meetings, meeting with social worker for updates	Administration, Social Worker
Student Absences and Tardies	K-5	Assistant Principal	School-wide	September 20, 2012	Review attendance and tardy policy and procedures for monitoring and reporting.	Administration, Attendance Committee, classroom teachers

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Student incentives for perfect and/or improved attendance	Student Attendance Incentives	Title I	\$400
			Subtotal:\$400

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Total:\$400

End of Attendance Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Suspension Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension								
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool				
1. Suspension			1.1. Understanding and implementation of school-wide Positive Behavior Support (PBS)	1.1. Professional Development/School-wide Kick Off during Preplanning Week	1.1. PBS Task Force (teacher representative from each grade level, Administration, Guidance Department, School Psychologist)	1.1. Common language across school, Observation, Discipline data	1.1. Student discipline referrals				
Suspension Goal #1: During the 2011-2012 school year, we had a total of 2 In-School suspensions and 8 Out of School Suspensions. Students received suspensions due to defying school personal, fighting, and not following the bus rules.	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u> Two students had In-School suspensions.	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u> We will have no more than 2 In-school suspensions for the 2012-2013 school year									
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> Two students had In-School suspensions.	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> We will have no more than 2 In-school suspensions for the 2012-2013 school year									
	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> 8 students were suspended Out- of-School for the 2011-2012 school year.	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> No more than three students will have an Out -of-School suspension during the 2012-2013 school year.									
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School</u> 8 students were suspended Out- of-School for the 2011-2012 school year.	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School</u> No more than three students will have an Out -of-School suspension during the 2012-2013 school year.									
	1.2. Limited bus supervision							1.2. Bus safety trainings with every class, monthly bus driver appreciation meetings, positive bus referrals, assigned bus	1.2. Assistant Principal, Bus Monitors, Selected Bus Buddies (grades 4 and 5)	1.2. Daily communication	1.2. Decrease in bus discipline referrals. Increase in student positive referrals.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			monitors, assigned bus-buddies to selected student riders			
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Strengthening the Core-PBS Style	All staff	PBS Task Force	All staff members	August 17, 2012	Discipline Data	Administration, Guidance counselor

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PBS Materials/Principal 200 Club incentives	Handbooks/Classroom tools for teachers	SAC	\$1,500
			Subtotal:\$1,500
			Total:\$1,500

End of Suspension Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i>					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.

Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: Sunray Elementary had twenty-seven (27) percent of fifth grade students score an achievement level of three or above in Science, as measured by the 2012 FCAT assessment.	1.1. Limited background knowledge of scientific concepts and limited connections made from text-to- self experiences	1.1. Partnership has been developed with the district’s Community, Career and Technical Department (CTE). All fourth and fifth grade students will visit science based community locations that support main scientific concepts taught each quarter (Examples include: Trinity Medical Center during the Human Body unit, Fivay High School and the Pasco Sheriff’s Forensic Departments at the end of the Investigation/Scientific Process unit, etc…) Emphasis will be on visiting the current Career Academies in Pasco and local businesses).	1.1. Administration, CTE district department, Science Task Force	1.1. Observations, walk throughs, participation in field trips	1.1. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Fusion Science Assessments, Core K-12, Interactive Notebook, Comprehension checks.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Educate to Innovate-The STEM Initiative	K-5	Principal, Science Task Force Members	All staff members	September 20, 2012	Lesson Plans	Administration

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Field trip to science based community businesses and/or high school career academies	School bus transportation	Title I	\$1,000
			Subtotal:\$1,000
			Total:\$1,000

End of STEM Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
CTE Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Total:

End of CTE Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level :* <i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level :* <i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Additional Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	\$ 120, 530 Total:
CELLA Budget	Total:
Mathematics Budget	\$ 59, 714 Total:
Science Budget	\$ 2, 800 Total:
Writing Budget	\$3, 000 Total:
Civics Budget	Total:
U.S. History Budget	Total:
Attendance Budget	\$400 Total:
Suspension Budget	\$1,500 Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:
STEM Budget	\$1,000 Total:
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total:
	\$ 188, 944 Grand Total:

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prevent

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community members who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting *Yes* or *No* below.

Yes No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

Review of school-wide data based on 2012 FCAT
Ready, Set, Go....Common Core Standards
STEM initiative
Partnership with the Community, Career and Technical Department/Pasco's Career Academies
Team presentations that showcase each area of the SIP Plan
Teacher Evaluation
Visions of the 21st Century Learner
Being a Positive Behavior School in 2012-2013
Response to Intervention and Positive Behavior Support Implementation
Parent Involvement

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Positive Behavior Support-MTSS/RtI	\$1800