

## 2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Eagles Nest Elementary  
5353 METROWEST BLVD  
Orlando, FL 32811  
407-521-2795

### School Demographics

<b>School Type</b> Elementary School	<b>Title I</b> Yes	<b>Free and Reduced Lunch Rate</b> 100%
<b>Alternative/ESE Center</b> No	<b>Charter School</b> No	<b>Minority Rate</b> 95%

### School Grades History

<b>2013-14</b> C	<b>2012-13</b> C	<b>2011-12</b> B	<b>2010-11</b> A	<b>2009-10</b> C
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

### SIP Authority and Template

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

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

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

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Differentiated Accountability</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Part I: Current School Status</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Part II: Expected Improvements</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Goals Summary</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Goals Detail</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Action Plan for Improvement</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Part III: Coordination and Integration</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>39</b>

---

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

---

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

### **Part I: Current School Status**

---

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

### **Part II: Expected Improvements**

---

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

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

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

### **Part III: Coordination and Integration**

---

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

### **Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals**

---

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

### **Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals**

---

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

## Differentiated Accountability

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

### DA Regions

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

### DA Categories

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

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

### DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

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

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

### 2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Prevent	3	Ella Thompson

  

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

## Current School Status

### School Information

#### School-Level Information

##### School

Eagles Nest Elementary

##### Principal

Bernadette M Jaster

##### School Advisory Council chair

Jackie Glover

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

Name	Title
Christine Smith	Math Coach
Allison Collins	Reading Coach
Cara Backherms	CRT/CCT
Lovelle Wright	Staffing Specialist
Carletta Davis-Wilson	Assistant Principal
Tammy Dawson	Dean
Kimberly Borden	Guidance Counselor

#### District-Level Information

##### District

Orange

##### Superintendent

Dr. Barbara M Jenkins

##### Date of school board approval of SIP

1/28/2014

### School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

#### Membership of the SAC

The School Advisory Council (SAC) shall be comprised of a Chair, Co-Chair and Secretary. The SAC representation will be comprised of the school principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial and economic community served by the school. A majority (51%) of the members of this school advisory council must be persons who are not employees of the school.

Bernadette Jaster - Principal

Chair - Jackie Glover - Parent

Co-Chair Lise Noel - Parent

Secretary - Christine Smith - Teacher

Julia Cuevas - Paraprofessional

Kirstal Ackwood-Thomas - Parent  
Nate Jean-Jaques - Community  
Saidah Bell - Parent  
Karimah Adderly - Parent  
Bakr Aldulaimi - Parent

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

The SAC shall assist in the preparation, implementation, and evaluation of the school improvement plan. The SAC will use the results of last years school effectiveness survey to establish goals, identify barriers and strategies for the school improvement plan (SIP). The SIP parts will be shared during monthly SAC meetings in order for parents to better understand the document and ask questions or provide feedback.

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

The SAC board will:

- work with the school in developing the school's vision
- use state and district goals as a guide for assessing the school's needs
- determine and prioritize the goals of the school based on appropriate needs assessments and other data
- develop measurable objectives and strategies for addressing the goals that have been prioritized
- assist in the preparation, implementation, and evaluation of the school improvement plan
- identify the appropriate use of school improvement dollars for implementing the approved school improvement plan
- assist in choosing a survey to measure the needs of the school and analyzing the data returned

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

SAC funds shall be used for the students. Funds will be used this year to bring in a BMX show for our K-5 students on Character Education and celebrating student success.

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

In Compliance

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

## **Highly Qualified Staff**

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

### **Administrators**

#### **# of administrators**

2

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

(not entered because basis is < 10)

#### **Administrator Information:**

**Bernadette M Jaster**

Principal

Years as Administrator: 7

Years at Current School: 5

**Credentials**

Masters of Arts in Educational Leadership,  
 Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education,  
 Certified in Elementary Education,  
 Primary Education,  
 School Principal

**Performance Record**

2012-2013 Grade C: 38% met high standards in reading, 39% met high standards in math, 33% met high standards in writing, and 38% met high standards in science. 62% of students made learning gains in reading, 40% made learning gains in math, 63% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 48% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

## AMO Data:

38% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 50%. The reading target was not met. 39% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 51%. The math target was not met. 33% of all students scored satisfactory on the 2013 writing assessment.

## Subgroups:

## Black/African American students:

36% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 48%. The target was not met. 38% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 51%. The target was not met.

## Hispanic students:

42% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 53%. The target was not met. 42% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 43%. The target was not met.

## English Language Learners:

33% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 48%. The target was not met. 36% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 50%. The target was not met.

## Economically Disadvantaged:

37% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 49%. The target was not met. 38% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 51%. The target was not met.

2011-2012 Grade B: 38% met high standards in reading, 42% met high standards in math, 80% met high standards in writing, and 22% met high standards in science. 74% of students made learning gains in reading, 67% made learning gains in math, 88% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 66% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

## AMO Data:

38% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 45%. The reading target was not met. 42% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 46%. The math target was not met. 80% of all students scored

satisfactory on the 2013 writing assessment.

Subgroups:

Black/African American students:

36% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 43%.

The target was not met. 40% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 46%. The target was not met.

Hispanic students:

38% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 48%.

The target was not met. 53% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 38%. The target was met.

English Language Learners:

34% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 42%.

The target was not met. 46% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 45%. The target was met.

Students with disabilities:

21% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 14%.

The target was met. 21% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 14%. The target was met.

Economically Disadvantaged:

36% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 44%.

The target was not met. 42% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 46%. The target was not met.

2010-2011 Grade A: 57% met high standards in reading, 64% met high standards in math, 88% met high standards in writing, and 48% met high standards in science. 60% of students made learning gains in reading, 64% made learning gains in math, 62% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 86% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.



**Carletta Davis-Wilson**

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 4

Years at Current School: 1

**Credentials**

Specialists Degree in Education Leadership,  
Masters of Arts in Education,  
Certified Elem Ed K-6,  
Math 5-9, and Science 5-9

**Performance Record**

2012-2013 Grade C: 43% met high standards in reading, 41% met high standards in math, 40% met high standards in writing, and 38% met high standards in science. 68% of students made learning gains in reading, 64% of the students made learning gains in math, 65% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 67% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

**AMO Data:**

43% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 46%. The reading target was not met. 41% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 43%. The math target was not met. 40% of all students scored satisfactory on the 2013 writing assessment.

**Subgroups:****Black/African American students:**

38% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 43%. The target was not met. 37% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 39%. The target was not met.

**Hispanic students:**

45% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 47%. The target was not met. 43% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 46%. The target was not met.

**White students:**

71% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 62%. The target was met. 59% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 29%. The target was met.

**English Language Learners:**

33% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 44%. The target was not met. 35% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 42%. The target was not met.

**Students with disabilities:**

16% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 27%. The target was not met. 24% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 28%. The target was not met.

**Economically Disadvantaged:**

43% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 46%. The target was not met. 41% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 43%. The target was not met.

2011-2012 Grade C: 43% met high standards in reading, 42% met high standards in math, 73% met high standards in writing, and 30% met high standards in science. 80% of students made learning gains in reading, 67% of the students made learning gains in math, 89% of the students in the lowest 25% made

learning gains in reading, 70% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

AMO Data:

43% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The reading target was met. 42% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 38%. The math target was met. 73% of all students scored satisfactory on the 2012 writing assessment.

Subgroups:

Black/African American students:

42% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 37%. The target was not met. 38% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 33%. The target was met.

Hispanic students:

38% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 41%. The target was not met. 43% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 40%. The target was met.

White students:

82% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 58%. The target was met. 47% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 22%. The target was met.

English Language Learners:

38% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 39%. The target was not met. 40% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 36%. The target was not met.

Students with disabilities:

16% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 19%. The target was not met. 19% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 20%. The target was not met.

Economically Disadvantaged:

43% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The target was met. 42% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 37%. The target was met.

2010-2011 Grade C: 55% met high standards in reading, 56% met high standards in math, 74% met high standards in writing, and 33% met high standards in science. 57% of students made learning gains in reading, 59% of the students made learning gains in math, 58% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 65% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

## Instructional Coaches

**# of instructional coaches**

2

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 10)

**Instructional Coach Information:**

Allison Collins		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 4	Years at Current School: 4
<b>Areas</b>	Reading/Literacy	
<b>Credentials</b>	Professional Certificate – Elementary Education/English as a Second Language (ESOL) certified Bachelor’s of Science in Elem. Education	
<b>Performance Record</b>	<p>2012-2013 Grade C: 38% met high standards in reading, 39% met high standards in math, 33% met high standards in writing, and 38% met high standards in science. 62% of students made learning gains in reading, 40% made learning gains in math, 63% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 48% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>AMO Data:                  38% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 50%. The reading target was not met. 39% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 51%. The math target was not met. 33% of all students scored satisfactory on the 2013 writing assessment.</p> <p>Subgroups:                  Black/African American students:                  36% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 48%. The target was not met. 38% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 51%. The target was not met.                  Hispanic students:                  42% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 53%. The target was not met. 42% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 43%. The target was not met.                  English Language Learners:                  33% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 48%. The target was not met. 36% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 50%. The target was not met.                  Economically Disadvantaged:                  37% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 49%. The target was not met. 38% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 51%. The target was not met.</p> <p>2011-2012 Grade B: 38% met high standards in reading, 42% met high standards in math, 80% met high standards in writing, and 22% met high standards in science. 74% of students made learning gains in reading, 67% made learning gains in math, 88% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 66% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>AMO Data:                  38% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 45%. The reading target was not met. 42% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 46%. The math target was not met. 80% of all students scored satisfactory on the 2013 writing assessment.</p>	

Subgroups:

Black/African American students:

36% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 43%. The target was not met. 40% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 46%. The target was not met.

Hispanic students:

38% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 48%. The target was not met. 53% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 38%. The target was met.

English Language Learners:

34% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 42%. The target was not met. 46% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 45%. The target was met.

Students with disabilities:

21% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 14%. The target was met. 21% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 14%. The target was met.

Economically Disadvantaged:

36% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 44%. The target was not met. 42% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 46%. The target was not met.

2010-2011 Grade A: 57% met high standards in reading, 64% met high standards in math, 88% met high standards in writing, and 48% met high standards in science. 60% of students made learning gains in reading, 64% made learning gains in math, 62% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 86% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

<b>Christine Smith</b>		
<b>Full-time / School-based</b>	<b>Years as Coach: 2</b>	<b>Years at Current School: 6</b>
<b>Areas</b>	Mathematics	
<b>Credentials</b>	Professional Certification - Elementary Education K-6, Exceptional Student Education K-12, ESOL endorsed Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education K-6, Masters of Education in Educational Leadership K-12	
<b>Performance Record</b>	<p>2012-2013 Grade C: 38% met high standards in reading, 39% met high standards in math, 33% met high standards in writing, and 38% met high standards in science. 62% of students made learning gains in reading, 40% made learning gains in math, 63% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 48% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>AMO Data:                  38% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 50%. The reading target was not met. 39% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 51%. The math target was not met. 33% of all students scored satisfactory on the 2013 writing assessment.</p> <p>Subgroups:                  Black/African American students:                  36% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 48%. The target was not met. 38% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 51%. The target was not met.                  Hispanic students:                  42% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 53%. The target was not met. 42% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 43%. The target was not met.                  English Language Learners:                  33% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 48%. The target was not met. 36% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 50%. The target was not met.                  Economically Disadvantaged:                  37% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 49%. The target was not met. 38% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 51%. The target was not met.</p> <p>2011-2012 Grade B: 38% met high standards in reading, 42% met high standards in math, 80% met high standards in writing, and 22% met high standards in science. 74% of students made learning gains in reading, 67% made learning gains in math, 88% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 66% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>AMO Data:                  38% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 45%. The reading target was not met. 42% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 46%.</p>	

The math target was not met. 80% of all students scored satisfactory on the 2013 writing assessment.

Subgroups:

Black/African American students:

36% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 43%. The target was not met. 40% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 46%. The target was not met.

Hispanic students:

38% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 48%. The target was not met. 53% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 38%. The target was met.

English Language Learners:

34% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 42%. The target was not met. 46% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 45%. The target was met.

Students with disabilities:

21% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 14%. The target was met. 21% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 14%. The target was met.

Economically Disadvantaged:

36% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 44%. The target was not met. 42% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 46%. The target was not met.

2010-2011 Grade A: 57% met high standards in reading, 64% met high standards in math, 88% met high standards in writing, and 48% met high standards in science. 60% of students made learning gains in reading, 64% made learning gains in math, 62% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 86% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

## Classroom Teachers

### # of classroom teachers

44

### # receiving effective rating or higher

33, 75%

### # Highly Qualified Teachers

100%

### # certified in-field

44, 100%

### # ESOL endorsed

22, 50%

### # reading endorsed

2, 5%

### # with advanced degrees

5, 11%

**# National Board Certified**

0, 0%

**# first-year teachers**

3, 7%

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

17, 39%

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

24, 55%

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

5, 11%

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

9

**# Highly Qualified**

9, 100%

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

5

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is &lt; 10)

**Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies**

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

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

1. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal, Assistant Principal, Grade Level teams and mentors - Principal, Assistant Principal and Instructional Coach
2. Veteran staff paired with new staff - Principal, Assistant Principal and Instructional Coach
3. Referrals from current staff and district staff - Principal and Assistant Principal
4. Use of e-recruiting to identify qualified candidates for open positions - Principal and Assistant Principal

**Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan**

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

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

New teachers are provided with a school orientation. This includes Exceptional Student Education (ESE)/ESOL information, cum folders/classroom management/report cards, parent meetings and Reading/Math instruction.

Anita Anthony is paired with LaTanya Harden. Ms. Anthony is a new teacher. Her mentor, Ms. Harden, has taught 6 years in grades 2 and 3. She has completed her Clinical Educator training. Katharyn Morton is paired with Jennifer Leonard. Ms. Morton is a new teacher. Her mentor, Mrs.

Leonard, has taught 7 years in grades 4, 5 and Science Lab. She has completed her Clinical Educator training.

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

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

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

The MTSS Leadership Team collaborates with the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) to monitor the students' academic achievement in the areas of level 1,2,3,4, and 5 on the FCAT (grades 3-5) and Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) (grades K-5) and addresses any behavioral modifications that are needed within the student population. Monthly meetings are scheduled for the MTSS Leadership Team to discuss student progression and utilize the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) to ensure progress toward increasing academic and behavioral achievement. Programs are modified as the students progress in each stage of intervention. Plans and approaches are discussed at each meeting and the group of students that are on the MTSS Leadership Teams roster changes as the year progresses. The MTSS Leadership Team will work to decrease disproportionate classification in Special Education.

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

- Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
- Select General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate): Provides information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2 and Tier 3 activities. ESE Teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.
- Instructional Coach(es) Reading/Math/Science: School Wide Florida's Continuous Improvement Model
- Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
- Reading Instructional Specialist: Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.
- School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision



making activities.

- Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills
- Student Services Personnel: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

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

The MTSS team will meet monthly to evaluate the school's MTSS plan and SIP. During these meetings, the components of both the MTSS and SIP will be discussed by the Leadership Team member over the specific components of that plan.

### **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**

The Staffing Designee will coordinate the tiered data management system. Tier I data will be drawn from classroom curriculum assessments and benchmark data. Tier II data will be drawn from interventions using programs such as Triumphs and/or Kaleidoscope. Tier III data will be drawn from research based strategies, Stars and Cars, FAIR components, Triumphs and/or Kaleidoscope. Tier III is a targeted area of concerns. For example, multisyllabic words. Teachers will maintain a data notebook with specific information on each student.

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

In order to support MTSS, returning staff members will be provided with a MTSS refresher professional development session. New staff members will be provided professional development on MTSS by our staffing designee. The MTSS team will meet monthly to evaluate student data. We will also discuss which students need to be targeted for needing exceptional education services, and which need additional Tier II support. The MTSS team will support teachers in collecting data and analyzing the data. If necessary, the MTSS team can observe students who may qualify for services. Teachers will provide students with Tier I support during class. Teachers will also provide students with Tier II support through intervention. The MTSS team will provide Tier III support, as needed.

### **Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities**

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

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

**Strategy: Before or After School Program****Minutes added to school year: 9,360**

We provide after school tutoring for students in grades 3-5. We targeted our lowest 25% in reading and math for 4th and 5th grade. For 3rd grade, we targeted our retained students and those that scored lowest on the FAIR AP3 test in 2nd grade. Tutoring takes place 4 days per week, 60 minutes per day, with 2 days of reading instruction and 2 days of math instruction. The other 30 minutes of tutoring is homework assistance.

**Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Teacher collaboration, planning and professional development

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

Each month, teachers are required to turn in reading and math progress monitoring assessment data for analysis. Once the data is collected, the leadership team disaggregates data and determines the effectiveness of the tutoring program on the targeted students. Data is turned into Title I each month as required for compliance. The pre and post assessment data will come from benchmark assessments, FAIR, and FCAT.

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

Christine Smith, Math Coach

**Strategy: Weekend Program****Minutes added to school year: 1,080**

We will provide Saturday school tutoring for students in grades 3-5. We will target our bubble students based on Performance Matters winter reading and math test scores. Saturday tutoring will take place for 6 weeks, 120 minutes per day, with 90 minutes of reading instruction and 90 minutes of math instruction.

**Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Teacher collaboration, planning and professional development

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

Data will be collected at the start and end of Saturday School to determine the effectiveness of the tutoring program. During the program we will progress monitor each week using a formative assessment.

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

Christine Smith, Math Coach

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

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
Bernadette Jaster	Principal
Carletta Davis-Wilson	Assistant Principal
Allison Collins	Reading Coach
Christine Lowery	Teacher
Abby Collins	Teacher
Meagan Dolan	Teacher
Farrah Hawkins	Teacher
Christina Columbus	Teacher

**How the school-based LLT functions**

The team will meet monthly to discuss the literacy needs at the school, classroom and student level. Professional development for reading will be determined by the team as evidenced by data. The roles and responsibilities for team members will be established during the first meeting in October. During each monthly meeting the roles and functions will be reviewed with the team and adjusted as needed.

**Major initiatives of the LLT**

The literacy leadership team will work to increase the number of students meeting grade level standards. The focus of the literacy team will be to develop a plan to increase readership of non-fiction and complex text and incorporate a monthly reading challenge. The team will work to implement CCSS school-wide and plan the school Literacy Night in April.

**Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction****How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student**

Every classroom teacher will teach a minimum of 130 minutes a day for reading. Thirty minutes of instruction will be whole group instruction focused on the specific standard as stated on the instructional focus calendar provided by the district. Sixty minutes is used to provide rigorous and relevant practice using the same standard with peers and for differentiated guided reading instruction. Each staff member provides intervention support outside the reading block to review the previously learned standards with below level, on level and above level students. Each teacher will integrate the CCSS or a blended NGSS/CCSS curriculum while infusing higher order questioning to provide a rigorous learning environment.

**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**

All kindergarten students are assessed using Florida Kindergarten Readiness test (FLKRS) and the FAIR assessment. These tools are used to measure the progress of foundational reading skills. These assessments are completed within the first 20 days of school. Eagle's Nest will test all VPK students that are in our Kindergarten and show a 3% increase based on FLKRS data (score 70% and above). Data will be used to plan daily academic and social instruction for all students. Teachers will determine if supplemental instruction is needed for small groups and/or individual students. Core academic and

social instruction will be provided by the teacher. Supplemental instruction may also be provided by the teacher or could be provided by paraprofessional or support staff member. The FAIR assessment will be administered mid- year and at the end of the year in order to determine if students are making necessary learning gains. Teachers will utilize the social behavior observation checklist to determine if students are progressing in the social development.

## 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**

Students are being exposed to real-world problems based on the common core standards in math. In reading, students are exposed to fiction and non-fiction text to help them make real-world connections.

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

Our fifth grade students will participate in goal setting for career development and a forced choices planner. This forced choice planner provides our students with their interests and future career options. The middle school counselors will educate our fifth grade students on their middle school course selection. Each November, our students are exposed to various careers through the annual Teach-In event. Professionals are invited to share their professional career choices with our students.

### **Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level**

## 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	50%	38%	No	55%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	48%	36%	No	54%
Hispanic	53%	42%	No	57%
White		60%		
English language learners	48%	33%	No	53%
Students with disabilities	22%	0%	No	30%
Economically disadvantaged	49%	37%	No	54%

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

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	71	25%	50%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	36	16%	36%

#### Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	111	63%	70%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	29	68%	75%

#### Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	71	48%	50%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	41	28%	30%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	28	19%	21%

**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	32	31%	80%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4			

**Area 3: Mathematics**

**Elementary and Middle School Mathematics**

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

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	51%	39%	No	56%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	51%	38%	No	56%
Hispanic	43%	42%	No	49%
White		50%		
English language learners	50%	36%	No	55%
Students with disabilities	22%	8%	No	30%
Economically disadvantaged	51%	38%	No	56%

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

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	79	27%	54%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	33	12%	25%

**Learning Gains**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	75	43%	64%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	16	38%	72%

**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	23	25%	30%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	12	13%	18%

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

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

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

**All Levels**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	4		4
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	658	100%	100%

**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	109	15%	12%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	14	2%	2%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	58	63%	50%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	17	31%	25%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	17	31%	25%

**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**

Increase parental involvement participation up to 25% of families being involved in a positive way in the school more than once during the 2013-2014 school year.

### Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Increase in parent participation	1297	19%	25%



## Goals Summary

- G1.** Student achievement will increase when we implement MTSS with fidelity.
- G2.** Student achievement will increase when teachers apply rigorous standards-based instruction across content areas.

## Goals Detail

### G1. Student achievement will increase when we implement MTSS with fidelity.

#### Targets Supported

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

#### Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Progress monitoring and assessment data, MTSS Team, Leadership Team, and research-based reading and math interventions.

#### Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Need for school-wide understanding of analyzing and disaggregating data to drive instruction.
- Lack of understanding of ways to differentiate instruction.

### Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Analyze progress monitoring and classroom walkthrough data to determine if teacher knowledge of MTSS has improved student achievement for students receiving Tier II and Tier III instruction.

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach, Reading Coach

#### Target Dates or Schedule:

Initiated September 17 and bi-monthly thereafter.

#### Evidence of Completion:

iObservation and assessment data.

**G2. Student achievement will increase when teachers apply rigorous standards-based instruction across content areas.**

**Targets Supported**

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

**Resources Available to Support the Goal**

- Common Core Standards, Item Specifications, Instructional Management System (IMS), Science Boot Camp, Houghton Mifflin Journey's, Go Math, Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework, Webb's Depth of Knowledge (DOK).

**Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal**

- Lack of teacher content knowledge to deconstruct standard.
- Lack of teacher knowledge on the implementation of Design Questions 2 and 3.

**Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal**

Analyze progress monitoring, common assessments and iObservation data to determine if application of standards-based instruction is incorporated across content areas.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach, Reading Coach, and School Transformation Office team.

**Target Dates or Schedule:**

Initiated September 17 and weekly thereafter.

**Evidence of Completion:**

Assessment data, classroom walkthrough trend data, iObservation and feedback.

## Action Plan for Improvement

### Problem Solving Key

**G** = Goal

**B** = Barrier

**S** = Strategy

**G1.** Student achievement will increase when we implement MTSS with fidelity.

**G1.B1** Need for school-wide understanding of analyzing and disaggregating data to drive instruction.

**G1.B1.S1** Professional development on analyzing and disaggregating data to drive instruction.

#### **Action Step 1**

Principal will coordinate professional development calendar to include professional development on analyzing and disaggregating data to drive instruction. Facilitators will be assigned to schedule, plan and conduct professional development. Professional development will be delivered in whole group (K-5) and small group (K-2 and 3-5) settings. Kindergarten through second grades will focus on FAIR assessment data. Third through fifth grades will focus on diagnostic and benchmark assessment data.

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

Principal and Assistant Principal

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

Professional development will be conducted on November 6 and 13. Follow up will be conducted weekly during data meetings.

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Professional development calendar, professional development sign-in sheets, and exit slips.

#### **Facilitator:**

Allison Collins and Christine Smith

#### **Participants:**

All instructional staff

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

Observe PLC and data meetings to monitor teachers analyzing data to make instructional decisions.

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

Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach, and Reading Coach

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

Initiated September 17 and weekly thereafter.

#### **Evidence of Completion**

PLC minutes, data meeting minutes.

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

Analyze classroom walkthrough and assessment data during leadership team meetings.

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

Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach, Reading Coach

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

Initiated September 17 and weekly thereafter.

#### **Evidence of Completion**

iObservation data, leadership meeting agenda, data binders, data walls, assessment data.

**G1.B3** Lack of understanding of ways to differentiate instruction.

**G1.B3.S1** Professional development on differentiated instruction.

**Action Step 1**

Principal will coordinate professional development calendar to include professional development on differentiated instruction. Facilitators will be assigned to schedule, plan, and conduct professional development. Professional Development will be delivered in whole group (K-5) and small group (K-2 and 3-5) settings.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Principal and Assistant Principal

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Professional development will be conducted on October 2, October 16, December 4 and December 11. Follow up will be conducted weekly during data meetings.

**Evidence of Completion**

Professional development calendar, professional development sign-in sheets, and exit slips.

**Facilitator:**

Allison Collins, Christine Smith and Lovelle Wright

**Participants:**

All instructional staff

**Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B3.S1**

Facilitate classroom observations to look for implementation of differentiated instruction.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach, and Reading Coach

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Initiated September 17 and twice a week thereafter.

**Evidence of Completion**

iObservation data.

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B3.S1

Analyze classroom walkthrough and assessment data for increased student achievement during leadership team meetings.

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach, and Reading Coach.

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Initiated September 17 and weekly thereafter.

#### Evidence of Completion

iObservation data

**G2.** Student achievement will increase when teachers apply rigorous standards-based instruction across content areas.

**G2.B1** Lack of teacher content knowledge to deconstruct standard.

**G2.B1.S1** Coaches will facilitate common planning to build teacher capacity in deconstructing standards.

#### Action Step 1

Assistant Principal will develop weekly common planning calendar. During weekly common planning, reading and math coaches facilitate training on the deconstruction of NGSSS and CCSS. Common planning action step template was developed to guide planning utilizing IMS, item specifications, content limits, prerequisites and available resources.

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach, Reading Coach, and School Transformation Office team.

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Initiated September 17 and twice weekly thereafter.

#### Evidence of Completion

Common planning calendar, common planning sign-in sheets, common planning action step template.

#### Facilitator:

Allison Collins and Christine Smith.

#### Participants:

Kindergarten through fifth grade teachers.

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

Review lesson plans, participate in common planning meetings to observe coaches supporting teachers in deconstructing standards, and observe classroom instruction.

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

Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach, and Reading Coach.

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

Initiated September 17 and weekly thereafter.

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Lesson plan, iObservation and feedback.

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

Analyze progress monitoring and classroom walkthrough data to determine if teacher knowledge of deconstructing standards has improved student achievement.

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

Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach, and Reading Coach.

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

Initiated September 17 and bi-monthly thereafter.

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Assessment data, iObservation and feedback.

**G2.B3** Lack of teacher knowledge on the implementation of Design Questions 2 and 3.

**G2.B3.S1** Provide professional development on Marzano's Framework Design Questions 2 and 3, Webb's depth of knowledge and text dependent questions.

**Action Step 1**

Principal will coordinate professional development calendar to include professional development on implementation of Design Questions 2 and 3, Webb's depth of knowledge and text dependent questions. Facilitators will be assigned to schedule, plan and conduct professional development. Professional development will be delivered in whole group settings.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach and Reading Coach.

**Target Dates or Schedule**

September 18, January 8, and January 15.

**Evidence of Completion**

Professional development sign-in sheets and professional development agenda.

**Facilitator:**

Carletta Davis-Wilson, Allison Collins and Christine Smith.

**Participants:**

Instructional staff.

**Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B3.S1**

Review lesson plans and observe classrooms for evidence of implementation of text dependent questions, Webb's Depth of Knowledge and elements from Design Questions 2 and 3 throughout the lesson progression.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach and Reading Coach.

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Initiated September 17 and weekly thereafter.

**Evidence of Completion**

iObservation and feedback, lesson plan feedback, classroom walkthrough trends, and leadership meeting agendas.



### **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B3.S1**

Analyze progress monitoring and classroom walkthrough data to determine if teacher implementation of Webb's Depth of Knowledge, text dependent questions, and evidence of Design Questions 2 and 3 through lesson progression has improved student achievement.

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

Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Coach, and Reading Coach.

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

Initiated September 17 and monthly thereafter.

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Assessment data, iObservation and feedback.

## 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

The funds provided by Title I are used to assist in meeting the needs of our at-risk population. Title I funds have enabled us to

- hire support staff to assist classroom teachers
- provide a support staff person and funds to incorporate parental involvement activities
- provide teacher training and materials to support the core curriculum and strengthen components related to curriculum and instruction such as computer assisted instruction

The school social worker will coordinate migrant activities that we may have this year with our migrant students. Title II funds will be used to cover the substitutes for 1st and 4th grade teachers while they participate in 3 cycles of Lesson Study. Our registrar will serve as our homeless contact (Title X). She will assist families in need on an individual basis. The district Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) funds will be used to pay for staff to support students in grades 3, 4 and 5 that scored a level 1 or 2 in FCAT Math to ensure they achieve at a higher level. The Super Kids program provided by the Orlando Police Department will be implemented to encourage students to make good decisions and avoid violence both in and out of school.

The school has been awarded Provision II status. All students will be provided free breakfast and lunch daily. Students will learn the importance of eating healthy through Physical Education course work and our Fruit and Vegetable grant that includes instruction on healthy eating habits.

## Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

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

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

**G1.** Student achievement will increase when we implement MTSS with fidelity.

**G1.B1** Need for school-wide understanding of analyzing and disaggregating data to drive instruction.

**G1.B1.S1** Professional development on analyzing and disaggregating data to drive instruction.

### PD Opportunity 1

Principal will coordinate professional development calendar to include professional development on analyzing and disaggregating data to drive instruction. Facilitators will be assigned to schedule, plan and conduct professional development. Professional development will be delivered in whole group (K-5) and small group (K-2 and 3-5) settings. Kindergarten through second grades will focus on FAIR assessment data. Third through fifth grades will focus on diagnostic and benchmark assessment data.

#### Facilitator

Allison Collins and Christine Smith

#### Participants

All instructional staff

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Professional development will be conducted on November 6 and 13. Follow up will be conducted weekly during data meetings.

#### Evidence of Completion

Professional development calendar, professional development sign-in sheets, and exit slips.

**G1.B3** Lack of understanding of ways to differentiate instruction.

**G1.B3.S1** Professional development on differentiated instruction.

**PD Opportunity 1**

Principal will coordinate professional development calendar to include professional development on differentiated instruction. Facilitators will be assigned to schedule, plan, and conduct professional development. Professional Development will be delivered in whole group (K-5) and small group (K-2 and 3-5) settings.

**Facilitator**

Allison Collins, Christine Smith and Lovelle Wright

**Participants**

All instructional staff

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Professional development will be conducted on October 2, October 16, December 4 and December 11. Follow up will be conducted weekly during data meetings.

**Evidence of Completion**

Professional development calendar, professional development sign-in sheets, and exit slips.

**G2.** Student achievement will increase when teachers apply rigorous standards-based instruction across content areas.

**G2.B1** Lack of teacher content knowledge to deconstruct standard.

**G2.B1.S1** Coaches will facilitate common planning to build teacher capacity in deconstructing standards.

**PD Opportunity 1**

Assistant Principal will develop weekly common planning calendar. During weekly common planning, reading and math coaches facilitate training on the deconstruction of NGSSS and CCSS. Common planning action step template was developed to guide planning utilizing IMS, item specifications, content limits, prerequisites and available resources.

**Facilitator**

Allison Collins and Christine Smith.

**Participants**

Kindergarten through fifth grade teachers.

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Initiated September 17 and twice weekly thereafter.

**Evidence of Completion**

Common planning calendar, common planning sign-in sheets, common planning action step template.

**G2.B3** Lack of teacher knowledge on the implementation of Design Questions 2 and 3.

**G2.B3.S1** Provide professional development on Marzano's Framework Design Questions 2 and 3, Webb's depth of knowledge and text dependent questions.

**PD Opportunity 1**

Principal will coordinate professional development calendar to include professional development on implementation of Design Questions 2 and 3, Webb's depth of knowledge and text dependent questions. Facilitators will be assigned to schedule, plan and conduct professional development. Professional development will be delivered in whole group settings.

**Facilitator**

Carletta Davis-Wilson, Allison Collins and Christine Smith.

**Participants**

Instructional staff.

**Target Dates or Schedule**

September 18, January 8, and January 15.

**Evidence of Completion**

Professional development sign-in sheets and professional development agenda.

## Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

### Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
	Total	\$0

### Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Evidence-Based Program	Total
		\$0
Total		\$0

### Budget Details

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

**G2.** Student achievement will increase when teachers apply rigorous standards-based instruction across content areas.

**G2.B3** Lack of teacher knowledge on the implementation of Design Questions 2 and 3.

**G2.B3.S1** Provide professional development on Marzano's Framework Design Questions 2 and 3, Webb's depth of knowledge and text dependent questions.

#### Action Step 1

Principal will coordinate professional development calendar to include professional development on implementation of Design Questions 2 and 3, Webb's depth of knowledge and text dependent questions. Facilitators will be assigned to schedule, plan and conduct professional development. Professional development will be delivered in whole group settings.

#### Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

#### Resource

#### Funding Source

#### Amount Needed