| District VMV Goals | School Improvement Information | Data & Information Sources | AdvancED |
|--------------------------|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Vision | 100% Student Success | Narrative | Standard 1-1.1, 1.2: Purpose |
| Mission | Oldsmar Elementary School will provide a safe learning environment, while educating and inspiring each student to reach their maximum potential and become lifelong learners and responsible citizens. | Narrative | Standard 1-1.2: Purpose |
| Values | Values -We value and believe that learning is a Family Affair -We believe that all students can learn -We value professionalism and a willingness to collaborate and support one another - We will continue to find meaning and joy in our work and promote fun in our workplace -We value a willingness to embrace change -We will continue to hold ourselves as well as students accountable -We value building and maintain positive relationships | Narrative | Standard 1-1.3: Purpose |
| | Part I: Current School Status | | |
| | A. School Information | | |
| | 1. School-Level Information | | |
| | □ School | Narrative | |
| | Oldsmar Elementary | | |
| | ☐ Principal's name | Narrative | |
| | Michael J. Feeney | | |
| | School Advisory Council chair's name Cortney King | Narrative | |
| | 2. District-Level Information | | |

| | District | ✓ | |
|---|---|-----------|---|
| | Pinellas County | | |
| | ☐ Superintendent's name | ✓ | |
| | Michael A. Grego Ed.D. | | |
| | ☐ Date of school board approval of SIP | √ | |
| | September 24, 2013 | | |
| | B. School Advisory Council (SAC) | | |
| 3 | Describe the involvement of the SAC in the development of this school improvement plan. Administration met and presented students data and sought input to address student's needs. Discussed and developed strategies to communicate SIP to parents/families and community members. | Narrative | Standard 2-2.4, 2.5: Governance and Leadership |
| 3 | 2. Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year. Meet monthly to reflect and discuss most recent student data. Involved SAC members in the decision making process to address needs throughout the school year | Narrative | |
| 4 | 3. Describe the projected use of school improvement funds and include the amount allocated to each project. TDEs (\$1,211.00) Annual subscription (planbook.com) \$200.00 Multimedia Professional Learning Resource - (Seeing Math Discussions in Action) \$150.00 Math Intervention Materials - \$979 (Do The Math Intervention Materials) | Narrative | |
| 3 | 4. Verify that your school is in compliance with Section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the School Advisory Council by selecting one of the boxes below: XYes, we are in compliance. No, we are not in compliance. | Narrative | |
| | 5. If no, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements. | Narrative | |

| | C. Highly Qualified Staff | | |
|-------|--|--------------|------------------------------|
| | 1. Administrators | | |
| | For each of your school's administrators (principal and all assistant principals), complete the following fields: | | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | a) Name | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | Michael J. Feeney, Ann Welsh | | |
| 3 | b) Credentials (degrees and certifications) | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | B.S. Elementary Education, M.S. Educational Leadership | | |
| 3 | c) Number of years as an administrator | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | 7,2 | | |
| 3 | d) Number of years at the current school; | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | 4,2 | | |
| 1,2,3 | e) With a first year Principal and Assistant Principal at Oldsmar Elementary, the percentage of students scoring level 3+ in reading as measured by FCAT 2.0 was 59% (AMO – 68%). Annual Learning gains in reading for all students was 61% and the Annual Learning gains for the lowest 25% of students in reading was 65%. In mathematics as measured by FACT 2.0, the percentage of students scoring at a Level 3+ was 52% (AMO-61%). Annual Learning gains in mathematics were 60% and the Annual Learning gains for the lowest 25% of students in mathematics were 63%. | DecisonEd/DW | |
| | | | |

| | 2. Instructional Coaches | | Executive Summary: Section |
|-----|--|---------------|------------------------------|
| | | | 1 |
| | For each of your school's instructional coaches, complete the following fields | | Executive Summary: Section |
| | Shelley Pompei Holder | | 1 |
| | Name: Shelley Pompei Holder | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | b) Subject area: Reading | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | c) Credentials (degrees and certifications): B.S Degree Elementary Education 1-6 | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section |
| | Masters Curriculum and Instruction through Interdisciplinary Studies | | 1 |
| | d) Number of years as an instructional coach: 1 | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | e) Number of years at the current school: 1 | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | f) Oldsmar-C | DecisionEd/DW | |
| | Reading: 59% meeting standards Writing: | | |
| | 55% meeting standards | | |
| | Reading Gains:61% | | |
| 1,2 | Lowest 25 % making gains: 65% | | |
| , | g) Full-time | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | h) District-based | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | 3. Instructional Staff | | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | a) # of instructional employees | DecisionEd/DW | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | 40 | | |
| 3 | b) % receiving effective rating or higher | Narrative | |
| | Waiting for value-added data | | |

| 3 | c) % Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT), as defined in NCLB through a High, Objective, Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE)99 | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
|---|--|---------------|------------------------------|
| | d) % certified in-field, pursuant to Section 1012.2315(2), F.S. 99 | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| 2 | e) % ESOL endorsed | DecisonED/DW | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | 60% | | |
| 2 | f) % reading endorsed | DecisionED/DW | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | 2.5% | | |
| 3 | g) % with advanced degrees | DecisionED/DW | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | 37.5% | | |
| 3 | h) % National Board Certified | DecisionED/DW | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | 5% | | |
| | i) % first-year teachers | DecisionED/DW | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | 5% | | |
| | j) % with 1-5 years of experience | DecisionED/DW | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | 7.5% | | |
| | k) % with 6-14 years of experience | DecisionED/DW | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | 25% | | |
| | l) % with 15 or more years of experience | DecisionED/DW | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | 62.5% | | |
| | 4. Paraprofessionals | | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| | a) # of paraprofessionals 0 | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |

| b) % Highly Qualified Teacher, as defined in NCLB through a High, Objective, Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) 100% | Narrative | Executive Summary: Sectio |
|---|-----------|--|
| 5. Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies | | |
| a) Describe your school's strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-infield, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible. Highly qualified teachers are recruited via internship opportunities, partnering with local colleges and universities, and networking within the district to identify talented teachers. Highly qualified teachers are retained by providing school based support through staff professional development, mentoring and meaningful teacher recognition. | Narrative | Standard 2: Governance and Leadership |
| 6. Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan | | |
| a) Describe your school's teacher mentoring program/plan including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities. Teachers new to Oldsmar Elementary will be assigned trained mentors to assist with acclimating to the school, its cultures and processes. Holly Huey (new teacher mentee) partnered with Kim Ring (Lead Mentor) | Narrative | Standard 3-3.3, 3.7,3.12: Teaching and Assessing for Learning Standard 5-5.2,5.5Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| Fran Neugebauer (new teacher mentee) partnered with Kris Dam (Mentor) Rationale – New incoming teachers are former instructional coaches who require mentoring as needed to assimilate and become familiar with school processes, personnel and culture. Mentors will meet monthly with their mentees to offer support and guidance. | | |
| | | |

| 4 | 1. Describe your school's data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of your SIP and MTSS structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs. The MTSS leadership team will be responsible for: establishing and monitoring the school wide learning and development of SIP; implementing instructional/intervention plans (Core and Supplemental) developed to achieve goals; and allocating the resources needed to fully implement instructional/intervention plans with fidelity. The MTSS leadership team will coordinate the efforts between all school teams as well as review and revise the School Improvement Plan as needed. Using multiple data sources the MTSS leadership team will identify barriers and possible strategies to overcome these barriers. The MTSS leadership team will analyze school academic data three times a year to identify students needing additional supplemental instruction (Tier 2). Students requiring supplemental instruction will be progressed monitored bi-weekly and instruction will be adjusted accordingly. The MTSS leadership team will analyze school wide behavior data monthly to identify students requiring additional behavioral support. In addition, Hourly ERELM teachers and other resources will be aligned to address the needs of struggling students. | Narrative | Standard 3-3.7: Teaching and Assessing for Learning |
|---|---|-----------|---|
| 4 | Identify the names and position titles of the members of your school-based leadership team. What is the function and responsibility of each team member as it relates to MTSS and the SIP? Principal – Michael Feeney (MTSS/SIP leadership) Assistant Principal – Ann Welsh (MTSS/SIP leadership) School Counselor – Deborah Manning (facilitates MTSS/coordinates. Tier II and Tier III interventions) Social Worker – Jennifer Cohen (assists with analyzing attendance and behavioral data) School Psychologist – Janelle Willett (assists with analyzing academic and behavioral data/writes PSW/FBA's and identifies appropriate interventions) Educational Diagnostician – Janice Szablewski (assists in analyzing academic data/writing | Narrative | Standard 2-2.4: Governance and Leadership |

| | | 1 | <u></u> |
|-----|--|-----------|---|
| | PSW's and identifies appropriate academic interventions) | | |
| | Behavior Specialist – Jennifer Goza (assists in analyzing behavior data/writes FBA's and | | |
| | identifies appropriate behavioral interventions) | | |
| | Grade Level Team Leaders – Corrine Murray, Kathy Dupuis, Selene Hove, Kris Dam, Jackie | | |
| | Giddings, Rebecca Courtney, Melanie Mazirow, Terri Mullin, Beth Burton (analyze school | | |
| | wide data/shares information with grade level PLC's) | | |
| | 3. Describe the systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the | Narrative | Standard 2-2.3,2.4: |
| | school's MTSS and SIP. | | Governance and Leadership |
| | The MTSS team meets on a weekly basis to monitor, reflect and act on needs based on | | |
| | school wide data. The MTSS will use the problem solving process identified above to | | |
| | identify areas of need and allocate resources. The MTSS leadership team will be using | | |
| 4 | SAPSI to identify areas of need for further professional development | | |
| | 4. Describe the data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze | Narrative | Standard 5-5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4: |
| | data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in | | Using Results for |
| | reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement (e.g., behavior, | | Continuous Improvement |
| | attendance). | | |
| | Tier 1data sources include PMRN, FAIR, FCAT, Pinellas Common Assessments Math, | | |
| | Science, Writing and office discipline referrals. In addition to Tier 1 data sources, Tier 2 | | |
| | supplemental data sources include DIBELS probes. Data will be entered into excel | | |
| | spreadsheets and graphed data will be shared during data review meetings in order to | | |
| | | | |
| | assess student growth. In addition to Tier 1 and Tier 2 data, Tier 3 intensive data sources | | |
| | include AIMS web probes. Data will be entered into AIMS web and graphed weekly. Data | | |
| | will be reviewed with the PSW team every 6 weeks in order to assess student growth. The | | |
| | CST will meet bimonthly to analyze attendance data and this information will be shared | | |
| | with MTSS and PLC's. | | |
| 5 | | | |
| | 5. Describe the plan to support staff's understanding of MTSS and build capacity in | Narrative | Standard 3-3.11, 3.12: |
| | data-based problem solving. | | Teaching and Assessing for |
| | | | Learning |
| | During weekly MTSS leadership meetings, grade level teacher representatives are trained | | Standard 5-5.3:Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 4,5 | in the process of MTSS and are responsible for delivering this training to their grade level | | loi continuous improvement |

| 2 | teams during PLCs. In addition other school wide MTSS leadership team members attend PLCs to assist and deliver training to teachers. Oldsmar Staff development Moodle site also has many resources that teachers can reference regarding. Data-based problem solving. As needed monthly school wide trainings can be utilized to support this as needed. E. Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities Describe research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum (e.g., lengthening the school day, week, or year; providing before, after, Saturday, or summer school programs; implementing enrichment programs and activities; allowing teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development). • Utilizing a block schedule for every grade level, teachers have additional time during each school day to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development. In addition a portion of SIP funds are allocated to provide TDEs for teachers allowing additional time for professional development and collaboration. • Using funds allocated for ELP/ERELM purposes, students in grades 3-5 will be targeted according to their FCAT scores and will be invited to attend tutoring after school twice weekly for mathematics and reading support. In addition students in grades 3-5 will be targeted for enrichment opportunities in the area of science/math and will meet after school hours weekly with sponsoring teacher and partnering high school mentors. • Partnering with local organization identified students in 4 th and 5 th grade are targeted for remediation in the areas of mathematics and reading. | Narrative | Standard 3-3.1, 3.12: Teaching and Assessing for Learning |
|---|--|-----------|---|
| | F. Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) | | |
| 2 | 1. Identify the names and positions titles of the members of your school-based LLT. Ann Welsh (Assistant Principal), Shelly Holder (Reading Coach), Jessica Putnam (Media Specialist), Marilyn Strouse (Speech Therapist), Caitlin Jones (Speech Therapist), Karen Dutter (Classroom Teacher), Sally Hamilton (Classroom Teacher), Vickie Wilhelmi (Classroom Teacher), Nicole Schellhammer (Classroom Teacher), Jackie Giddings | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |

| | (Classroom Teacher), Bridget Behrmann (Classroom Teacher), Susan Brelsford (Classroom Teacher), Kim Ring (Classroom Teacher) | | |
|---|--|-----------|--|
| | 2. Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes, roles, functions). Literacy Leadership Teams create capacity of reading knowledge within the school by focusing on the following areas of literacy concern: Support for text complexity Support for instructional skills to improve reading comprehension Ensuring that text complexity, along with close reading and rereading of texts is central to lessons Providing scaffolding that does not preempt or replace the text reading by students Developing and asking text dependent questions from a range of question types Emphasizing students supporting their answers based upon evidence from the text Providing extensive research and writing opportunities (claims and evidence) Support for Implementation of the Common Core Standards for Literacy in Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects (a focus on text, task, and instruction) Meetings occur monthly with facilitator roles and responsibilities rotating throughout the | Narrative | Executive Summary: Section 1 |
| 2 | year. | | |
| 2 | 3. What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? o Continued Common Core Professional Development o Communicating and educating families on the changing student expectations as Common Core implementation continues. G. Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Improvement | Narrative | Standard 3-3.1 thru 3.7: Teaching and Assessing for Learning |
| | This section is required for schools with grades 6-12, per Section 1003.413(2)(b), F.S. | | |

| | 1. Describe how the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student. | Narrative | Standard 3-3.1 thru 3.7: Teaching and Assessing for |
|-------------|--|-----------|---|
| 2 | mprovement of every stadents | | Learning |
| | H. Preschool Transition | | |
| | This section is required for schools with grades K-2. | | |
| | Describe strategies for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs, as applicable. | Narrative | Standard 3-3.1 thru 3.7: Teaching and Assessing for Learning |
| | Family and Community/Volunteer Liaison schedules and facilitates ½ day orientation targeted toward pre-school providers serving rising Kindergarten students. Pre- | | |
| | Kindergarten and Kindergarten orientation occurs prior to school year for all incoming Kindergarten students and their families. | | |
| | Open line of communication and collaboration between early education teachers and | | |
| | Kindergarten teachers is ongoing throughout the school year. | | |
| | I. College and Career Readiness | | |
| | This section is required for secondary schools, per Sections 1003.413(2)(g)-(j) and 1008.37(4), F.S. | | |
| | 1. How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future? | Narrative | Standard 3-3.5: Teaching and Assessing for Learning |
| | 2. How does the school promote academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful? | Narrative | Standard 3-3.8, 3.9, 3.12: Teaching and Assessing for Learning. Standard 4-4.6,4.8: Resources and Support |
| 1 | 2. Describe description for the standard standar | Marratica | Systems |
| | 3. Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level | Narrative | Standard 5-5.4: Using Results for Continuous |
| | based on annual analysis of the <u>High School Feedback Report</u> , which is maintained by the Department of Education, pursuant to Rule 6A-10.038, F.A.C. | | Improvement |
| | Part II: Expected Improvements | | ļ |

| For each data point below, unless otherwise directed list the current year status (number | | |
|--|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| and percentage) and the target (percentage) for next year. These are schoolwide data, not | | |
| disaggregated by grade level. FAA and CELLA data shall be considered by schools with 10 | | |
| or more students taking the assessment. | | |
| A. Area 1: Reading | | |
| a) Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) | | |
| ☐ Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| 77 students, 30.4% | | |
| ☐ Students scoring at or aboveAchievement Level 4 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| 70 students, 27.7% | | |
| b) Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) | | Assessment Matrix |
| ☐ Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| ☐ Students scoring at or above Level 7 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| c) Learning Gains | | |
| ☐ Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA) | DecisionED/DW FCAT 2.0 only | Assessment Matrix |
| 61% | TCAT 2.0 OTTY | |
| ☐ Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0) | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| 65% | | |
| d) Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) | | |
| Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| Listening 10/15 66.7% | | |
| Speaking 10/15 66.7% | | |

| 1 | ☐ Students scoring proficient in reading (students read gradelevel text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
|-----|--|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| _ + | 5/15 33.3% | | |
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| | 9/15 60% | | |
| | e) Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) | | |
| 1 | ☐ Student subgroups (i.e.American Indian, Asian, black, Hispanic, white, English language learners, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged) scoring at level 3 or higher on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at level 4 or higher on the FAA | DecisionED/DW FCAT 2.0 only | Assessment Matrix |
| | Asian: 12/15 80% Black or African American: 4/14 28.6% Hispanic: 24/47 51.1% White: 105/174 60.3% ESE: 11/41 26.8% Economically Disadvantaged: 58/118 49.2% | | |
| | f) Postsecondary readiness | | |
| | The following data shall be considered by high schools. | | |
| | 4-year graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C. | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| | Goal 1 to support target(s): | Narrative | |
| | Increase the percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher based on FCAT 2.0 by 12%. | | |
| | Increase the overall school learning gains from 61% to 80%. | | |
| | Per Bradley MOU: Increase the percentage of African American students scoring level 3 or higher by 11%. to meet target AMO – 39% | | |

| Increase the percentage of ESE students scoring level 3 or higher by 27%. | | | | |
|--|-----------|------|----------|---------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Possible Data Sources to Measure Goal 1: | Narrative | 2 | | |
| | Decision | D | | |
| FAIR, Running Record, FCAT 2.0, Florida Achieves, Conferring Notebooks | | | | |
| Data Indicator(a) corresponding to SID Dart II A 1 (SID Targets) | 2012 | 12 | 2012 141 | Tougete |
| Data Indicator(s) –corresponding to SIP Part II A-J (SIP Targets) | Acti | | 2013-14 | rargets |
| 1. Percentage of students scoring proficient level 3 on Reading FCAT 2.0. | # | % | # | 9/ |
| | 77 | 30.4 | 91 | 30 |
| 2. Percentage of students scoring proficient level 4+ on Reading FCAT 2.0 | # | % | # | 9/ |
| | | 27.7 | 84 | 33 |
| | 70 | 27.7 | | |
| 3. Percentage of students scoring proficient of FAIR AP 3 grades 3-5 | # | % | # | % |
| | 170 | 69.1 | 189 | 7. |
| Action Plans (strategies) to Accomplish Goal 1 (reduce or eliminate barriers) | | | | |
| Action 1- All teachers grades Pre-K through 5 th grade will receive Common Core training to gain a deeper | Narrative | 2 | | |
| understanding of unpacking the reading standards and choosing appropriate resources to meet individual | | | | |
| student needs. | | | | |
| Action 2- Create collaborative PLC's focusing on planning and effective instruction | Narrative | ? | | |
| Action 3- Provide instructional support biweekly with district reading coach to all instructional staff. | Narrative | 2 | | |
| Action 4- Provide training to teachers to utilize effective technology that will support the Core Reading | Narrative | 2 | | |
| curriculum and allow for differentiation specific to sub groups. | | | | |
| Plan to Implement Action 1: Training will be provided by staff leaders, reading coach and DWT to further | | | | |

| | develop teachers understanding of the Common Core standards. | | |
|---|--|---------------|-------------------|
| | Plan to Implement Action 2: School leaders will provide training in effective collaborative PLCs | Narrative | |
| | Provide guiding questions to focus PLC discussions. | | |
| | Provide resources related to effective core instruction focused on best practices. | | |
| | Plan to Implement Action 3: Create a focused schedule to support reading instructional based on need from | Narrative | |
| | data, walkthroughs, SBLT discussion, etc. Provide TDE's for staff to observe others, work with district coach and plan/collaborate with peers. | | |
| | Plan to Implement Action 4: Through staff curriculum meetings, PLC's and individual training staff will receive monthly technology training related to the differentiation of reading. | Narrative | |
| | B. Area 2: Writing | | |
| | a) Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring at or above 3.5 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| _ | 42 students, 54.5% | | |
| | b) Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) | | |
| 1 | \$\tag{\tag{tudents scoring at or above Level 4}} | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| | Goal 2 to support target(s): | Narrative | |
| | Increase the number of students scoring 3.5 on FCAT Writing assessment by 10% | | |
| | Per Bradley MOU : Increase the number fo African American students scoring level 3.5+ on Florida Writing Assessment | | |

| Possible Data Sources to Measure Goal 2: Students Writing Common Assessment Scores, Student writter | n Narrativ | /e | | |
|---|--------------|--------|---------|---------|
| responses to text dependent questions as measured by rubrics | Decision | nED/DW | | |
| Data Indicator(s) –corresponding to SIP Part II A-J (SIP Targets) | 201 | 12-13 | 2013-14 | Targets |
| | Act | tuals | | _ |
| Percentage of students scoring proficient level 3.5 on Florida Writes assessment. | 42 | 54.5% | 59# | 66% |
| | # | % | # | % |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Action Plans (strategies) to Accomplish Goal 2 (reduce or eliminate barriers) | | | | |
| Action 1- All teachers in grades 3-5 will integrate writing into all curriculum areas | Narrativ | /e | | |
| Action 2- Teachers will utilize collaborative planning time to plan for writing instruction and target | Narrativ | /e | | |
| learning needs of students in all subgroups | | | | |
| Action 3- All teachers will utilize rubrics as a strategy to assess students writing and plan for further | Narrativ | /e | | |
| instruction. | | | | |
| Action 4- | Narrativ | /e | | |
| Plan to Implement Action 1: Teachers in all grades will receive training on integrating writing througho | out Narrativ | /e | | |
| all curriculum using text based questions and student journaling | | | | |
| Plan to Implement Action 2: Teachers will be provided guided questions to assist in identifying the | Narrativ | /e | | |
| learning needs of students in the area of writing and use collaborative planning time to develop mini- | | | | |
| lessons in writing which address student learning needs. | | | | |
| Plan to Implement Action 3:. School Leaders will provide training and support in the use of rubrics as a | a Narrativ | /e | | |
| | | | | |

| | way for teachers to continuously assess students' progress in writing. | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| | Plan to Implement Action 4: | Narrative | |
| | C. Area 3: Mathematics | | |
| | 1. Elementary and Middle School Mathematics | | |
| | The following data shall be considered by elementary and middle schools. | | |
| | a) Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| | 86 students, 34.1% | | |
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| | 44 students, 17.5% | | |
| | b) Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) | | |
| 1 | Students scoring Levels 4, 5, and 6 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring at or above Level 7 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| | c) Learning Gains | | |
| 1 | ☐ Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0, EOC, and FAA) | DecisionED/DW FCAT 2.0 only | Assessment Matrix |
| | 60% | | |
| 1 | ☐ Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC) | DecisionED/DW FCAT 2.0 only | Assessment Matrix |
| | 63% | | |
| | d) Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) | | |

| 1 | ☐ Student subgroups (i.e., American Indian, Asian, blackHispanic, white, English language learners, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged) scoring at level 3 or higher on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at level 4 or higher on the FAA | DecisionED/DW FCAT 2.0 only | Assessment Matrix |
|---|--|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| | Asian 14/15 93% | | |
| | Black or African American 5/14 35.7% | | |
| | Hispanic 20/47 42.6 | | |
| | White 90/173 33.3% | | |
| | ESE 12/40 30.0% | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged 52/117 44.4% | | |
| | 2. High School Mathematics | | |
| | The following data shall be considered by high schools. | | |
| | a) Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) | | |
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring at or above Level 7 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| | b) Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) | | |
| | ☐ Student subgroup{i.e., American Indian, Asian, black, Hispanic, white, English language | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| | learners, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged) scoring at level 3 or | FCAT 2.0 only | |
| 1 | higher on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at level 4 or higher on the FAA | | |
| | c) Learning Gains | | |
| 1 | ☐ Students making learning gains (EOC and FAA) | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| | d) Postsecondary readiness | | |
| | 4-year graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| | (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A010.0315, F.A.C. | | |
| 1 | | | |
| | 3. Middle School Acceleration | | |
| | The following data shall be considered by middle schools. | | |

| 2. Telechtage of stadents scoring level 3 on Matti Levi 2.0 | # 86 | % 34.1 | 103 | % 41 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------------|---------|
| Percentage of students scoring level 3 on Math FCAT 2.0 | Acti | | 44 | 0/ |
| Data Indicator(s) – corresponding to SIP Part II A-J (SIP Targets) | 2012-13 | | 2013-14 Targets | |
| Possible Data Sources to Measure Goal 3: FCAT 2.0, Common Assessment and Math Formative Assessment | Decision | ED/DW | | |
| Per Bradley MOU requirement: Increase the percentage of students in the African American sub groups scoring level 3+ on FCAT 2.0 to AMO target of 25% | | | | |
| Increase the percentage of students making annual learning gains from 60% to 80% as measured by FCAT 2.0. | | | | |
| Goal 3 to support target(s): Increase the percentage of students scoring level 3+ on FCAT 2.0 from 52% to 61%. | Narrative | 9 | | |
| ☐ Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | Decision | ED/DW | Assessment Ma | atrix |
| ☐ Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | Decision | ED/DW | Assessment Ma | atrix |
| The following data shall be considered for schools with students taking the Geometry EOC. | | | | |
| 5. Geometry End-of-Course Assessment (EOC) | | | | |
| ☐ Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | Decision | ED/DW | Assessment Ma | atrix |
| ☐ Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | Decision | ED/DW | Assessment Ma | atrix |
| The following data shall be considered for schools with students taking the Algebra I EOC. | | | | |
| 4. Algebra 1 End-of-Course Assessment (EOC) | | | | |
| ☐ Middle school performance on high school EOC | Decision | ED/DW | Assessment Ma | atrix |
| ☐ Middle school participation inhigh school EOC | Decision | ED/DW | Assessment Ma | atrix |

| 2. Percentage of students scoring level 4+ on Math FCAT 2.0 | # | % | # | % |
|---|-------------|----------|--------------|--------|
| | 44 | 17.5 | 50 | 20 |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Action Plans (strategies) to Accomplish Goal 3 (reduce or eliminate barriers) | | | | |
| Action 1- Develop a deeper understanding of the CCSS as well as providing training to develop a deeper understanding of content knowledge. | Narrative | : | | |
| Action 2- Increase the amount of time and provide guiding questions for grade level PLC's to collaborate in the effective planning of instruction. | n Narrative | | | |
| Action 3- Provide instructional support related to formative assessment and data driven decision making related to supplementing the core instruction and differentiating instruction to target specific sub-groups | Narrative | ! | | |
| Plan to Implement Action 1: Staff will be given monthly training by staff leaders or at DWT to support their understanding and implementation of CCSS through PLC's and curriculum meetings | r Narrative | ! | | |
| Plan to Implement Action 2: Provide training in effective/collaborative PLC's. | Narrative | <u> </u> | | |
| Provide guiding questions to focus and deepen PLC discussions. | | | | |
| Provide guided questions which allow for teachers to target specific areas in math to support the learning | | | | |
| gains of African American students based on Common Assessment data. | | | | |
| Plan to Implement Action 3: Staff curriculum leaders will provide training and resources related to | Narrative | ! | | |
| formative assessments and resources related to supplementing the core curriculum. | | | | |
| D. Area 4: Science | | | | |
| 1. Elementary and Middle School Science | | | | |
| The following data shall be considered by elementary and middle schools. | | | | |
| a) Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) | | | Assessment M | latrix |
| ☐ Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | Decision | D/DW | Assessment M | latrix |

| | 20 students, 24.1% | | |
|---|---|---------------|--|
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| _ | 13 students, 15.7% | | |
| | b) Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) | | |
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| 1 | ☐ Students scoringet or above Level 7 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| _ | 2. High School Science | | |
| | The following data shall be considered by high schools. | | |
| | a) Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) | | |
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring at or above Level 7 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| | 3. Biology 1 End-of-Course Assessment (EOC) | | |
| | The following data shall be considered for schools with students taking the Biology 1 EOC. | | |
| 1 | □\$tudents scoring at Achievement Level 3 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| _ | E. Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) | | |
| 1 | # of TEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs) | Narrative | Standard 3-3.12: Teaching and Assessing for Learning |
| 1 | ☐ Participation in STEMrelated experiences provided for students | Narrative | Standard 3-3.1: Teaching and Assessing for Learning |
| | The following data shall be considered by high schools. | | |
| 1 | ☐ Students enrolling in one or moreaccelerated STEM-related courses | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |

| 1 | Completion rate (%) for students enrolled inaccelerated STEM-related courses | Decision | ED/DW | Assessment Ma | atrix |
|---|--|----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| 1 | ☐ Students taking one or more advanced placement exams for STEMrelated courses | Decision | D/DW | Assessment Ma | atrix |
| 1 | Passing rate (%) fostudents who take advanced placement exams for STEM-related courses | Decision | ED/DW | Assessment Ma | atrix |
| 1 | ☐ CTISTEM program concentrators | Decision | ED/DW | Assessment Ma | atrix |
| 1 | ☐ Students taking CTFSTEM industry certification exams | Decision | ED/DW | Assessment Ma | atrix |
| 1 | ☐ Passing rate (%) for students who take CT BTEM industry certification exams | Decision | ED/DW | Assessment Ma | atrix |
| | Goal 4 to support target(s): | | | | |
| | Increase the percentage of 5 th grade students scoring level 3 or higher from 41% to 51%. | | | | |
| | Possible Data Sources to Measure Goal 4: 5 th Grade Science FCAT | Decision | ED/DW | | |
| | Data Indicator(s) – corresponding to SIP Part II A-J (SIP Targets) | 2012-13 | | 2013-14 Targets | |
| | | Actu | ıals | | |
| | Percentage of students scoring level 3 on FCAT Science | # | % | # | % |
| | | 20 | 24.1 | 26 | 31.3 |
| | 2. December of developes and a selection level As of FCAT Colors | ш. | 0/ | | 0/ |
| | 2. Percentage of students scoring level 4+ of FCAT Science | # 13 | % 15.7 | # 16 | % 19.2 |
| | | # | % | # | % |
| | Action Plans (strategies) to Accomplish Goal 3 (reduce or eliminate barriers) | | | | |
| | Action 1- Teachers in all grades will implement daily/weekly opportunities for students to engage in writing | | | | |
| | in science through the use of science journals as a strategy to continuously monitor students understanding | | | | |
| | Action 2- Teachers in all grade levels will use a variety of formative assessments to continually check for | | | | |
| | students understanding during science instruction. Assessments include but are not limited to the use of | | | | |

| | science probes, exit slips, student conversations during science lessons, and writing samples | | |
|---|--|---------------|---|
| | Plan to Implement Action 1: Teachers will receive on-going training and feedback related to the use of | | |
| | student journals in science and the rubrics used to assess student growth. | | |
| | Plan to Implement Action 2: During PLCs teachers will receive additional trainings on formative assessment | | |
| | strategies to use during science instruction. | | |
| | The following data shall be considered by middle and high schools. | | |
| 1 | ☐ Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses | DecisionED/DW | |
| 1 | ☐ Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses | DecisionED/DW | |
| 1 | Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in accelerated courses | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| 1 | ☐ Students taking CTEndustry certification exams | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| 1 | ☐ Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| 1 | ☐ CIE program concentrators | DecisionED/DW | |
| 3 | ☐ CTE teachers holding ppropriate industry certifications | Narrative | Standard 3-3.11: Teaching and Assessing for Learning; Standard 4-1: Resources and Support Systems |
| | G. Area 7: Social Studies | | , , |
| | 1. Civics End-of-Course Assessment (EOC) | | |
| | The following data shall be considered for schools with students taking the Civics EOC. | | |
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | DecisionED/DW | Assessment Matrix |
| | 2. U.S. History End-of-Course Assessment (EOC) | | |
| | The following data shall be considered for schools with students taking the U.S. History | | |

| | EOC. | | | | |
|-------|---|--------------|----|--------------|---------|
| 1 | ☐ Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | DecisionED/I | DW | Assessment M | atrix |
| 1 | Students scoring at or aboveAchievement Level 4 | DecisionED/ | DW | Assessment M | atrix |
| _ | Goal 5 (add other goals as needed) to support target(s): | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Possible Data Sources to Measure Goal 5: | DecisionED/I | DW | | |
| | Data Indicator(s) – corresponding to SIP Part II A-J (SIP Targets) | 2012-13 | | 2013-14 | Targets |
| | 1. | Actuals # | % | # | % |
| | 2. | # | % | # | % |
| | 3. | # | % | # | % |
| | Action Plans (strategies) to Accomplish Goal 3 (reduce or eliminate barriers) | <u>_</u> | | | |
| | Action 1- | | | | |
| | Action 2- | | | | |
| | Action 3- | | | | |
| | Action 4- | | | | |
| | Plan to Implement Action 1: | | | | |
| | Plan to Implement Action 2: | | | | |
| | Plan to Implement Action 3: | | | | |
| | Plan to Implement Action 4: | | | | |

| | H. Area 8: Early Warning Systems | | |
|---|---|---------------|---|
| | 1. Attendance | | |
| 3 | ☐ Students tardy 10 percent or more, as defined by district attendance policy | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5-5.2 Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 3 | ☐ Students absent 10 percent or more, as defined by district attendance policy- 13.6% | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5-5.2 Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| | 2. Suspension | | |
| 3 | ☐ Student with one or more referrals – 20 students | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 3 | ☐ Students with five or more referrak 0 students | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 3 | ☐ Students with one or more inschool suspension days, as defined in s.1003.01(5)(b), F.S 9 students | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 3 | ☐ Students with five or more inschool suspension days, as defined in s.1003.01(5)(b), F.S. 0 students | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 3 | ☐ Students with one or more outof-school suspension days, as defined in s.1003.01(5)(a), F.S. – 4 students | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 3 | ☐ Students with five or more outof-school suspension days, as defined in s.1003.01(5)(a), F.S. – 1 student | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 3 | Students with ten or more inschool or out-of-school suspension days – 1 student | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 3 | ☐ Students referred for alternative school placement— 0 students | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 3 | students expelled -0 students | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| | 3. Retention | | |
| 1 | ☐ Students retained-8 students | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 1 | ☐ Students with one or morecourse failures on first attempt in core-curricula courses, as defined in s. 1003.01(14), F.S. | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |

| | o Students in 3rd grade with one or more course failures on first attempt in core-curricula courses o Students in 6th grade with one or more course failures on first attempt in core-curricula courses o Students in 9th grade with one or more course failures on first attempt in core-curricula courses | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | Number of students retained in 3 rd grade = 2 | | |
| 1 | ☐ Students off track for graduation based on credits required to date for their cohort | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| | 4. Dropout Prevention | | |
| | The following data shall be considered by high schools, per Section 1003.53, F.S. If a school has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate, that school's improvement plan is required to include strategies for improving these results, pursuant to Section 1001.42(18), F.S. Graduation rates for the state, district, and school by subgroup are available in the AMO Outcomes Report at http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/ . | DecisionED/DW assuming drop out codes are W22 and w15 | |
| 1 | ☐ Students dropping out of school, as defined in s.1003.01(9), F.S. | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 1 | ☐ Students graduating in 4 years, using criteria for the federal uniform graduation rate defined in the Code of Federal Regulations at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 1 | Academically atrisk students graduating in 4 years, as defined in Rule 6A-1.09981, F.A.C. | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 1 | ☐ Students graduating in 5 years, using criteria defined at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) | DecisionED/DW | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| | I. Area 9: Parent Involvement | | |
| | Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, Codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b). | Narrative | |

Consider the level of parental involvement at your school (this may include, but is not limited to, number of parent engagement opportunities offered in the school year; average number of parents in attendance at parent engagement opportunities; percent of parents who participated in parent engagement opportunities; percent of students in lowest performing quartile or subgroups not meeting AMOs whose parent(s) participated in one or more parent engagement opportunities).

34 parent engagement opportunities are currently offered during the school year. Examples of these opportunities include but not limited to the following: Open House, monthly SAC and PTA meetings, Family Literacy education night, math night, curriculum fair, City of Oldsmar Art Exhibit evening, monthly Spirit nights at neighborhood restaurants, school celebrations such as the Snowflake Ball, Grandparents Breakfasts, and family dinners as well as wellness activities such as the Annual Fun run. As a 5-star school, parent engagement is consistently at least 60% with the percentage of families attending engagement opportunities at any given event/activity ranging from 15% – 90%

Teachers utilize student planner daily to inform parents of students progress in class, upcoming events as well as other information pertinent to school and class happenings. Parents utilize the planners daily to check on their child's progress, and as the first prefferd method to maintain regular communication with their child's teacher.

Schools office staff will:

- -Greet visitors to the school in a positive and professional manner.
- -Maintain a main office that is clean and tidy, demonstrating a focus on students and families
- -Provide regular and predictable, high value School Messenger calls to the whole school or subgroup as appropriate.
- -Provide a high quality up-to-date website that includes:

School name, mascot, and logo

School mission statement

Office hours, bell schedule, dress code, attendance requirements

Telephone, fax, and email contact information

3,4

| | Links for: | | |
|-----|--|-----------|--|
| | Directions to the school | | |
| | Pcsb.org | | |
| | rcsb.org | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | J. Area 10: Additional Targets | | |
| | | | |
| 1-5 | | | |
| 1-3 | K. Problem-Solving | | |
| | Based on the targets set for your school in each required Area, engage in a problem- | Narrative | |
| | solving process using the following questions. Goals shall specifically address any | | |
| | subgroup not meeting its AMO targets for 2012-2013. The special needs of subgroups not | | |
| | addressed in the AMO report (e.g., migrant, homeless, neglected and delinquent) shall | | |
| | also be considered during this process. Operational data such as climate surveys and | | |
| 1-5 | classroom walkthroughs may also be used as available and relevant. | | |
| | ☐ Step 1: Identify goal(s) to help you achieve your targets. Select one or more Areas each | Narrative | |
| | goal addresses. | | |
| | Reading: Increase the percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher based on FCAT 2.0 by 12%. | | |
| | | | |
| | Increase the overall school learning gains from 61% to 80%. | | |
| | Per Bradley MOU: Increase the percentage of African American students scoring level 3 or higher by 11%. to | | |
| | meet target AMO – 39% | | |
| | | | |
| | Increase the percentage of ESE students scoring level 3 or higher by 27%. | | |
| | Math: Increase the percentage of students scoring level 3+ on FCAT 2.0 from 52% to 61%. | | |
| | Increase the percentage of students making annual learning gains from 60% to 80% as measured by FCAT | | |
| | 2.0. | | |
| 1-5 | Per Bradley MOU requirement: Increase the percentage of students in the African American sub groups | | |

| | scoring level 3+ on FCAT 2.0 to AMO target of 25% | |
|-----|--|-----------|
| | | |
| | ☐ Step 2: Brainstorm barriers that could prevent the school from achieving each goal. Utilization of time | Narrative |
| | Core Instruction/Lack of Professional Development/Content Knowledge | |
| 1-5 | Accountability | |
| 1-3 | ☐ Step 3: Prioritize targeted barriers based on alterable elements of curriculum, | Narrative |
| | instruction, environment, and organizational systems (e.g., those which have the most | |
| | impact on the goal if removed or are immediately actionable). | |
| 1-5 | 1. Content Knowledge, P.D., Core Instruction, Time | |
| | ☐ Step 4: Brainstorm which resources are available that could be used to address each | Narrative |
| | targeted barrier. | |
| | Purposeful professional development calendar addressing the needs based on data. | |
| | Utilization of reading coach and instructional leaders to provide support and P.D. for staff | |
| 1-5 | members with the integration of common core and new curriculum adoptions. | |
| | ☐ Step 5: Brainstorm and prioritize strategies that could be used to eliminate or reduce | Narrative |
| 4.5 | each targeted barrier. | |
| 1-5 | Strategies listed under individual curriculum goals. | Narrative |
| | ☐ Step 6Identify action steps (including who, what, where, when) that will need to be | Narrative |
| 1-5 | taken to implement the identified strategies. Listed under individual curriculum goals | |
| 1-3 | Step 7: Determine how strategies will be monitored for effectivenes and fidelity of | Narrative |
| | implementation (including who, what, where, when). Monitoring will take place by | |
| 1-5 | instructional leaders, SBLT and administration biweekly. | |
| | Step 8: Determine how progress towards each goal will be monitored (including who, | Narrative |
| | what, where, when). Reflect on formative and summative data through PLCS, SBLT and | |
| 1-5 | walkthroughs. | |
| | Part III: Professional Development | |
| | For all professional development identified in Part II as a strategy to eliminate or reduce a | Narrative |
| | barrier to a goal, provide the following information for each activity. | |

| | ☐ Related goal: Reading | Narrative | |
|-----|--|-----------|--|
| | a. Increase the percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher based on FCAT 2.0 by 12%.b. Increase the overall school learning gains from 61% to 80%. | | |
| | c. Increase the percentage of African American students scoring level 3 or higher by 11%. | | |
| | d. Increase the percentage of African American students scoring level 3 or higher by 11%. | | |
| | Related goal: Math | | |
| | a. Increase the percentage of students making annual learning gains from 60% to 80% as | | |
| | measured by FCAT 2.0. | | |
| | , and the second | | |
| | Related Goal: Science | | |
| 1-5 | a. Increase the percentage of 5 th grade students scoring level 3 or higher from 41% to 51% | | |
| 1-3 | ☐ Topic, focus, and content Common Core Standards, Text Complexity, and developing | Narrative | |
| | and utilizing text dependent questions (Reading, Science) | | |
| | Common Core Standards, integrating Mathematical Practices throughout lessons, | | |
| | deliberate and collaborative lesson planning (mathematics) | | |
| | Formative assessment, writing/journaling (Science) | | |
| | | | |
| | Facilitator or leader: | Narrative | |
| | LLC Team & Assistant Principal & Reading Coach (reading) | | |
| | LLC & Principal, Assistant Principal (math) Assistant Principal (Science) | | |
| | Participants: Instructional staff- PD via curriculum meetings, weekly PLCs and targeted | Narrative | |
| | TDE days, additional (Reading, Math, Science)) | runane | |
| | Target dates or schedule (e.g., professional development day, once a month) | Narrative | |
| | Target dates of senedale (e.g., professional de velopment day, once a month) | | |
| | PD provided monthly curriculum meeting, weekly on designated PLC days and on specific | | |
| | TDE dates during school year & via DWT. (Reading, Math) | | |
| | | | |
| | PD provided monthly curriculum meeting, weekly on designated PLC days & via DWT | | |
| | (Science) | | |

| | ☐ Strategies for followup and monitoring – Administrative observations and walk | During Narrative |
|---|--|------------------|
| | throughs data, weekly PLC minutes, student data (Reading, Math, Science) | |
| | Person responsible for monitoring- Principal and Assistant Principal (Reading, Math), | Narrative |
| | Teacher Leaders | |
| | Part IV: Coordination and Integration | |
| 4 | Describe how federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include Title I, Part A; Title I, Part C- Migrant; Title I, Part D; Title II; Title VI, Part B; Title X- Homeless; Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI); violence prevention programs; nutrition programs; housing programs; Head Start; adult education; CTE; and job training, as applicable to your school. | Narrative |
| | Part V: Budget | |
| | Based on the strategies identified during the problem-solving process, create a budget for each school-funded activity including: | Narrative |
| | Related goal Reading Math | Narrative |
| 4 | \$trategy | Narrative |
| | a.Providing additional collaborative opportunities for effective teacher planning (TDE for peer planning and observation) b.Providing additional resources for effective instructional planning (planbook.com) c.Book study & DVD (Classroom Discussions – (Seeing Math Discussions in Action) | Narrative |
| 4 | c.book study & DVD (Classicotti Discussions – (Seeing Matri Discussions in Action) | |
| | ☐ Type of resource (i.e., evidencebased programs or materials, professional development, technology, or other) Professional Development (TDEs) On-Line resources for effective planning (planbook.com) Professional Resources (Materials/books) | Narrative |
| 4 | | |

| | ☐ Description of resources | Narrative | |
|-----|--|-------------------------|--|
| | TDEs (\$1,211.00) | | |
| | Annual subscription (planbook.com) \$200.00 | | |
| | Multimedia Professional Learning Resource - (Seeing Math Discussions in Action) \$150.00 | | |
| 4 | Math Intervention Materials - \$979 (Do The Math Intervention Materials) | | |
| | ☐ Funding source | Narrative | |
| 4 | SIP funds – 2,540.00 | | |
| | ☐ Amount needed | Narrative | |
| 4 | | | |
| | Part VI: Mid-Year Reflection | | |
| | This section is to be completed after mid-year assessment data is available. Reflect on the | | |
| | plan created through the problem-solving process at the beginning of the year and answer | | |
| | the following questions for each created in Part IIK. | | |
| | ☐ Has the goal been achieved? | Narrative | Standard 5: Using Results for |
| 1-5 | | | Continuous Improvement |
| 1-5 | o If yes, what evidence do you see to indicate you have achieved the goal? | Narrative DecisionED | Standard 5: Using Results for |
| 1-5 | a If no is desired progress being made to assemblish the goal? | Narrative | Continuous Improvement |
| 1-5 | o If no, is desired progress being made to accomplish the goal? | DecisionED | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| | ☐ If yes, what evidence do you see to indicate desired progress has been made to | Narrative | Standard 5: Using Results for |
| 1-5 | accomplish the goal? | DecisionED | Continuous Improvement |
| | ☐ If no, have the originally targeted barriers been eliminated or reduced? | Narrative | Standard 5: Using Results for |
| 1-5 | | | Continuous Improvement |
| | ☐ If yes, what evidence do you see to indicat barriers have been eliminated or reduced? | Narrative | Standard 5: Using Results for |
| 1-5 | | DecisionED | Continuous Improvement |
| 1-5 | ☐ If no, are the original strategies being implemented with fidelity as designed? | Narrative | Standard 5: Using Results for |
| 1-2 | o If yes, re-engage the problem solving process at Step 5, making edits as needed to Part II | Narrative | Continuous Improvement Standard 5: Using Results for |
| 1 [| of the SIP. | - Namative | Continuous Improvement |
| 1-5 | | | · |
| 4 - | o If no, engage in a problem solving process around implementation fidelity of the original | | Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement |
| 1-5 | plan, and make edits as desired to Part II of the SIP. | | Continuous improvement |