



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Wabasso School
8895 N US HIGHWAY 1
Sebastian, FL 32958
772-978-8000
www.indianriverschool.org

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|
| School Type Combination School | Title I No | Free and Reduced Lunch Rate <i>[Data Not Available]</i> |
| Alternative/ESE Center No | Charter School No | Minority Rate <i>[Data Not Available]</i> |

School Grades History

SIP Authority and Template

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

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

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| Differentiated Accountability | 5 |
| Part I: Current School Status | 6 |
| Part II: Expected Improvements | 12 |
| Goals Summary | 21 |
| Goals Detail | 21 |
| Action Plan for Improvement | 22 |
| Part III: Coordination and Integration | 23 |
| Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals | 24 |
| Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: Current School Status

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

Part II: Expected Improvements

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

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

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

Part III: Coordination and Integration

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

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

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

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

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

Differentiated Accountability

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

DA Regions

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

DA Categories

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

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

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

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

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

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

| DA Category | Region | RED |
|-------------|--------|-----|
| Not in DA | N/A | N/A |

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

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School

Wabasso School

Principal

Thomas Gollery

School Advisory Council chair

Thomas J. Moorehead

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

| Name | Title |
|----------------|---------|
| Shannon Glaser | Teacher |

District-Level Information

District

Indian River

Superintendent

Dr. Frances J Adams

Date of school board approval of SIP

Pending

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

Membership of the SAC

The SAC membership for the 2013-2014 School Year is well within the state board requirements. The team is comprised of the following: 1 administrator; 5 community business partners; 5 parents; 4 teachers; and 4 support staff members (9 School-based members/10 non school employed members-50% +1)

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

Feedback from SAC used in the formulation of the 2013-2014 SIP. Feedback was received through both formal & informal means.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

Staff development; fund raising, in-service.

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

Staff development for support staff, teaching assistants specifically.

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC

In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

N/A

Highly Qualified Staff

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

Administrators

of administrators

1

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Thomas Gollery

Principal

Years as Administrator: 21

Years at Current School: 21

Credentials

Doctorate in educational leadership/special education

Performance Record

Instructional Coaches

of instructional coaches

0

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Part-time / District-based

Years as Coach:

Years at Current School:

Areas

[none selected]

Credentials

Performance Record

Classroom Teachers

of classroom teachers

9

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Highly Qualified Teachers

100%

certified in-field

9, 100%

ESOL endorsed

9, 100%

reading endorsed

0, 0%

with advanced degrees

2, 22%

National Board Certified

1, 11%

first-year teachers

0, 0%

with 1-5 years of experience

0, 0%

with 6-14 years of experience

1, 11%

with 15 or more years of experience

8, 89%

Education Paraprofessionals

of paraprofessionals

9

Highly Qualified

5, 56%

Other Instructional Personnel

of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above

2

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies

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

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

Once recruited, it is our aim to nurture professional growth through access to quality in-service, and by affording them the opportunity to ply their craft in a warm, supportive, intellectually stimulating environment.

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

We continue to utilize teachers on staff as mentors in the areas they are gifted and proficient, one being nationally certified.

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

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

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

The school's Student Support Specialist (Alejandro Remy) coordinates the observation & data collection on all students on a daily basis. Moreover, Mr. Remy works with the principal to analyze the data and report results accordingly.

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

In that Wabasso School is a rather small ESE Center School, only 1 team is necessitated. The principal, SSS, and teachers work cooperatively to ensure progress monitoring on a daily basis.

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

Mr Remy (SSS) supports teachers on a moment to moment basis in the process of monitoring student progress.

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

Mr Remy collects student data, performs initial analyses, and then works with the principal to determine the statistical significance of respective data and progress toward goal/objective achievement. The data results are then relayed to respective instructional teams on campus for evaluative purposes.

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

Regularly scheduled meetings, along with "as needed" meetings are scheduled to fulfill the monitoring process.

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Summer Program

Minutes added to school year: 4,800

ESY is designed to extend educational experiences to the summer months. The focus is on maintenance & fluency of skill development that occurred during the regular school year.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education

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

Student Support Specialist (SSS) collects, analyzes, and reports essential student data. Moreover, our SSS trains instructional staff to fluency in the data collection portion of the process.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Principal; Student Support Specialist

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

| Name | Title |
|--------------------|---------|
| Geraldine Guaragna | Teacher |

How the school-based LLT functions

Monthly meetings on literacy & emergent literacy activity on campus

Major initiatives of the LLT

Implementation of the "Communication MatriX"

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

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

Each teacher enriches classroom instruction in the area of Reading through thematic instruction. The range of instructional activities is commensurate with the diversity of skill/intellectual level of the student body. Additionally, a local librarian visits the campus each week to conduct reading circles with Wabasso School's students.

Preschool Transition

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

Strategies for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs

A small portion of Wabasso School's student body is considered Pre Kindergarten ESE.. Multi disciplinary, team teaching approaches are the platform for enrichment activity.

College and Career Readiness

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

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

Senior high school students are enrolled in career exploration and experiential coursework as listed in the Sunshine State Standards/Common Core (CPALMS)

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

Attention is given to student readiness, intellectual level, and skill set prior to recommendations via the Transition portion of the IEP for students beginning at age 14 and continuing through age 21.

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

career exploration activity on campus & in the community; job shadowing activity; and actual job simulation within the community. Instructional activities center on pre vocational activity and preparation.

Expected Improvements

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

Area 1: Reading

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

| Group | 2013 Target % | 2013 Actual % | Target Met? | 2014 Target % |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| All Students | 39% | 9% | No | 45% |
| American Indian | | | | |
| Asian | | | | |
| Black/African American | | | | |
| Hispanic | | | | |
| White | 39% | 9% | No | 45% |
| English language learners | | | | |
| Students with disabilities | 39% | 9% | No | 45% |
| Economically disadvantaged | 41% | 9% | No | 47% |

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|--|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 0% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 0% |

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|--|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 15% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 5% |

Learning Gains

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|--|---------------|
| Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA) | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 20% |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0) | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 0% |

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | [data excluded for privacy reasons] | | 0% |
| Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | [data excluded for privacy reasons] | | 0% |
| Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | [data excluded for privacy reasons] | | 0% |

Postsecondary Readiness

| | 2012 Actual # | 2012 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C. | [data excluded for privacy reasons] | | 0% |

Area 2: Writing

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5 | [data excluded for privacy reasons] | | 0% |
| Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4 | [data excluded for privacy reasons] | | 25% |

Area 3: Mathematics

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics

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

| Group | 2013 Target % | 2013 Actual % | Target Met? | 2014 Target % |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| All Students | 30% | 14% | No | 37% |
| American Indian | | | | |
| Asian | | | | |
| Black/African American | | | | |
| Hispanic | | | | |
| White | 25% | 7% | No | 33% |
| English language learners | | | | |
| Students with disabilities | 30% | 14% | No | 37% |
| Economically disadvantaged | 33% | | No | 39% |

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|--|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 0% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 0% |

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|--|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 20% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 5% |

Learning Gains

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|--|---------------|
| Learning Gains | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 10% |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC) | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 0% |

Middle School Acceleration

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|--|---------------|
| Middle school participation in high school EOC and industry certifications | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 0% |
| Middle school performance on high school EOC and industry certifications | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 0% |

High School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

| Group | 2013 Target % | 2013 Actual % | Target Met? | 2014 Target % |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| All Students | 30% | 12% | No | 37% |
| American Indian | | | | |
| Asian | | | | |
| Black/African American | | | | |
| Hispanic | | | | |
| White | 25% | 12% | No | 33% |
| English language learners | | | | |
| Students with disabilities | 30% | 12% | No | 37% |
| Economically disadvantaged | 33% | 12% | No | 39% |

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|--|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 15% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 5% |

Learning Gains

| | 2012 Actual # | 2012 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|--|---------------|
| Students making learning gains (EOC and FAA) | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 10% |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (EOC) | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 0% |

Postsecondary Readiness

| | 2012 Actual # | 2012 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|--|---------------|
| On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C. | | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | 0% |

Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 0% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 0% |

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 0% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 0% |

Area 4: Science

Elementary School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 0% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 0% |

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 5% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 5% |

Middle School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 0% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 0% |

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 40% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 5% |

High School Science

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 100% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 5% |

Biology I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 0% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 0% |

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

All Levels

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target |
|--|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| # of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs) | 0 | | 25 |
| Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students | 0 | 0% | 25% |

High Schools

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students enrolling in one or more <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Completion rate (%) for students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses | | 0% | 0% |
| Students taking one or more advanced placement exams for STEM-related courses | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| CTE-STEM program concentrators | 0 | | 0 |
| Students taking CTE-STEM industry certification exams | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE-STEM industry certification exams | | 0% | 0% |

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses | 10 | 20% | 25% |
| Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses | 0 | 0% | 5% |
| Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> courses | | 0% | 0% |
| Students taking CTE industry certification exams | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams | | 0% | 0% |
| CTE program concentrators | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications | 0 | 0% | 0% |

Area 7: Social Studies

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

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

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

Elementary School Indicators

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time | 5 | 10% | 5% |
| Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S. | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Students who receive two or more behavior referrals | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S. | 0 | 0% | 0% |

Middle School Indicators

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time | 2 | 4% | 0% |
| Students who fail a mathematics course | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Students who fail an English Language Arts course | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Students who fail two or more courses in any subject | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Students who receive two or more behavior referrals | 5 | 10% | 5% |
| Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S. | 0 | 0% | 0% |

High School Indicators

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Students in ninth grade with one or more absences within the first 20 days | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Students in ninth grade who fail two or more courses in any subject | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Students with grade point average less than 2.0 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Students who fail to progress on-time to tenth grade | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Students who receive two or more behavior referrals | 5 | 10% | 5% |
| Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S. | 0 | 0% | 0% |

Graduation

| | 2012 Actual # | 2012 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students dropping out of school, as defined in s.1003.01(9), F.S. | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| 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) | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Academically at-risk students graduating in 4 years, as defined in Rule 6A-1.09981, F.A.C. | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Students graduating in 5 years, using criteria defined at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) | 0 | 0% | 0% |

Area 9: Parent Involvement

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

Parental involvement targets for the school

- *SAC membership-improved attendance at meetings
- *Parent attendance at IEP Meetings
- *Increased daily communication through teacher/parent notebooks

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

| Target | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Increased daily communication | 30 | 60% | 75% |

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

Increased achievement with students persistently occupying the Levels 1 & 2 on the FAA. in Reading and Mathematics.

Specific Additional Targets

| Target | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| FAA Levels 1 & 2 Reading achievement Improvement | 18 | 78% | 50% |

Goals Summary

- G1.** Improvement in the Reading & Math achievement of students persistently performing at FAA levels 1 & 2.

Goals Detail

G1. Improvement in the Reading & Math achievement of students persistently performing at FAA levels 1 & 2.

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Writing
- Science
- Science - Elementary School
- Science - Middle School
- Science - High School
- STEM
- STEM - All Levels
- CTE
- Parental Involvement
- EWS
- EWS - Elementary School
- EWS - Middle School
- EWS - High School
- EWS - Graduation

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- In-service relative to the major goal provided by FDLRS Galaxy Professional Consultants

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Increased FAA Reading & Math achievement with ESE students persistently performing at Levels 1 & 2

Person or Persons Responsible

Dr. Tom Gollery, Principal

Target Dates or Schedule:

Weekly; Quarterly; and End-of-Year

Evidence of Completion:

Less #'s & percentage of FAA "takers" performing at FAA Level 1 & 2.

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

Coordination and Integration

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

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

In that Wabasso School is an ESE Center School, federal funding is received via IDEA. In times past, Title I-like funds had been accessed. However, The last 2 school years our % of free & reduced lunch did not meet the threshold for receipt of Title I-Like funding. Remaining funding is student-based, FTE driven.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals