

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Eccleston Elementary
1500 AARON AVE
Orlando, FL 32811
407-296-6400

School Demographics

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

School Grades History

2013-14 B	2012-13 B	2011-12 A	2010-11 C	2009-10 B
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

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	3
Differentiated Accountability	4
Part I: Current School Status	5
Part II: Expected Improvements	29
Goals Summary	34
Goals Detail	34
Action Plan for Improvement	36
Part III: Coordination and Integration	42
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	43
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	47

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

Eccleston Elementary

Principal

Tracy Webley

School Advisory Council chair

Vivian Geary

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

Name	Title
Tracy Webley	Principal
Felecia Goodman	Assistant Principal
Rozene Frett	Dean
Laura Matthews	Curriculum Resource Teacher
Gwendolyn Bekemeyer	Academic Coach
Jamie Andersen	Literacy Coach
Michelle Thrift	Math/Science Coach

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

Tracy Webley-Principal
 Norma Beasley- Community
 Ethel Pierce- Community
 Vivian Geary- Community
 Mary Maxwell-Community
 Diane Goodson-Teacher
 Ava Clarke- Parent
 Shevona Reaves-Parent
 Bridgette Hall-Parent
 Melanie Dickens-Teacher

Betty Chandler-Teacher
Willie Martin- Paraprofessional
Jamie Andersen-Teacher

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

SAC met to develop the 2013-2014 school improvement plan utilizing the 8-step problem solving process. Members analyzed 2012-2013 assessment data, created goals and strategies to increase student achievement. The SIP was reviewed and revisions were made based on recommendations from committee members.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

The SAC assisted with the development of the school improvement plan. During the upcoming year, the SAC will meet to analyze assessment data, identify academic needs and monitor student achievement. The SAC will meet monthly to review progress toward SIP goals for the 2013-2014 school year.

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

Funds will be used to purchase supplies and materials for parental involvement activities.

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:

Tracy Webley		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 6	Years at Current School: 3
Credentials	<p>M.A Elementary Education B.S Elementary Education Certified in Educational Leadership (1-12), Elementary Education, ESOL School Principal</p>	
Performance Record	<p>2012-2013 Grade B: 44% met high standards in reading, 52% met high standards in math, 49% met high standards in writing, and 17% met high standards in science. 59% of students made learning gains in reading, 69% made learning gains in math, 70% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 69% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>AMO Data: 44% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 45%. The reading target was not met. 52% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 53%. The math target was met. 29% of all students scored satisfactory on the 2012 writing assessment. 49% scored satisfactory on the 2013 writing assessment. The AMO writing target was met.</p> <p>Subgroups: Black/African American students: 44% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 45%. The target was not met. 52% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 53%. The target was not met. 29% scored satisfactory in writing in 2012. 50% of the African American/Black students scored satisfactory in writing in 2013. The target AMO was met.</p> <p>English Language Learners: 44% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 41%. The target was met. 50% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 41%. The target was met. Writing - N/A</p> <p>Students with disabilities: 12% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 20%. The target was not met. 50% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 41%. The target was met. Writing- N/A</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged: 44% scored satisfactory in reading. The AMO was 45%. The target was not met. 52% scored satisfactory in math. The AMO target was 53%. The target was met. 29% scored satisfactory in writing in 2012. 49% scored satisfactory in writing in 2013. The target was met.</p>	

2011-2012 Grade A: Grade A: 44% met high standards in reading, 47% met high standards in math, 73% met high standards in writing, and 23% met high standards in science. 78% of students made learning gains in reading, 81% made learning gains in math, 91% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 91% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

AMO Data:

44% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The reading target was met. 47% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 48%. The math target was not met.

Subgroups:

Black/African American:

44% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The reading target was met.

47% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 49%. The math target was not met.

English Language Learners:

43% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 35%. The reading target was met.

38% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 35%. The math target was met.

Students with Disabilities:

Reading- N/A

22% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 18%. The math target was met.

Economically Disadvantaged:

44% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The reading target was met.

47% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 48%. The math target was not met.

2010-2011 Grade C: 85% of AYP standards met, 53% met high standards in reading, 63% met high standards in math, 93% met high standards in writing, 24% met high standards in science, 60% made learning gains in reading, 66% made learning gains in math, 50% 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.

Felicia E. Goodman

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 10

Years at Current School: 5

Credentials

BS Elementary Education
 M ED Elementary Education
 Certification in Educational Leadership 1-12
 ESOL

Performance Record

2012-2013 Grade B: 44% met high standards in reading, 52% met high standards in math, 49% met high standards in writing, and 17% met high standards in science. 59% of students made learning gains in reading, 69% made learning gains in math, 70% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 69% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

AMO Data:

44% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 45%. The reading target was not met. 52% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 53%. The math target was met. 29% of all students scored satisfactory on the 2012 writing assessment. 49% scored satisfactory on the 2013 writing assessment. The AMO writing target was met.

Subgroups:

Black/African American students:

44% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 45%. The target was not met.

52% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 53%. The target was not met.

29% scored satisfactory in writing in 2012. 50% of the African American/Black students scored satisfactory in writing in 2013. The target AMO was met.

English Language Learners:

44% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 41%. The target was met.

50% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 41%. The target was met.

Writing - N/A

Students with disabilities:

12% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 20%. The target was not met.

50% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 41%. The target was met.

Writing- N/A

Economically Disadvantaged:

44% scored satisfactory in reading. The AMO was 45%. The target was not met.

52% scored satisfactory in math. The AMO target was 53%. The target was met.

29% scored satisfactory in writing in 2012. 49% scored satisfactory in writing in 2013. The target was met.

2011-2012 Grade A: Grade A: 44% met high standards in reading,

47% met high standards in math, 73% met high standards in writing, and 23% met high standards in science. 78% of students made learning gains in reading, 81% made learning gains in math, 91% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 91% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

AMO Data:

44% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The reading target was met. 47% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 48%. The math target was not met.

Subgroups:

Black/African American:

44% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The reading target was met.

47% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 49%. The math target was not met.

English Language Learners:

43% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 35%. The reading target was met.

38% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 35%. The math target was met.

Students with Disabilities:

Reading- N/A

22% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 18%. The math target was met.

Economically Disadvantaged:

44% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The reading target was met.

47% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 48%. The math target was not met.

2010-2011 Grade C: 85% of AYP standards met, 53% met high standards in reading, 63% met high standards in math, 93% met high standards in writing, 24% met high standards in science, 60% made learning gains in reading, 66% made learning gains in math, 50% 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.

Instructional Coaches

of instructional coaches

5

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Jamie Andersen		
Full-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 3	Years at Current School: 1
Areas	Reading/Literacy, Data, RtI/MTSS	
Credentials	MA Educational Leadership BS Elementary Education K-6 Educational Leadership Certified K-12 ESOL Endorsement Reading Endorsement National Board Certification (Middle Childhood Generalist)	
Performance Record	<p>2012-2013 Grade F: 45% met high standards in reading, 50% met high standards in math, 43% met high standards in writing, and 53% met high standards in science. 61% of students made learning gains in reading, 49% made learning gains in math, 71% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 59% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>AMO Data: 40% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 39%. The reading target was met. 28% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 40%. The math target was not met. 56% of all students scored satisfactory on the 2012 writing. 55% scored satisfactory on the 2013 writing assessment. The AMO writing target was not met.</p> <p>Subgroups: Black/African American students: 40% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The target was met. 27% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 41%. The target was not met. 58% scored satisfactory in writing in 2012. 56% of the African American/Black students scored satisfactory in writing in 2013. The target was not met.</p> <p>Students with disabilities: 19% scored satisfactory in reading. The target was 17%. The target was met. 8% scored satisfactory in math. The target was 23%. The target was not met.</p> <p>Writing- N/A Economically Disadvantaged: 40% scored satisfactory in reading. The AMO was 39%. The target was met. 28% scored satisfactory in math. The AMO target was 39%. The target was not met. 56% scored satisfactory in writing in 2012. 55% scored satisfactory in writing in 2013. The target was not met.</p> <p>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 the students made learning gains in reading. 67% of the students made learning</p>	

gains in math. 89% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 70% of 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.

Subgroups:

Black/African American students:

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

38% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 33%. The target was met.

Hispanic:

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:

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 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 AMO was 40%. The target was met.

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

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

Laura Matthews

Full-time / District-based Years as Coach: 10 Years at Current School: 4

Areas Data, RtI/MTSS

Credentials BS Primary Elementary Education Pre-K-3

Performance Record

2012-2013 Grade B: 44% met high standards in reading, 52% met high standards in math, 49% met high standards in writing, and 17% met high standards in science. 59% of students made learning gains in reading, 69% made learning gains in math, 70% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 69% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

AMO Data:
44% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 45%. The reading target was not met. 52% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 53%. The math target was met. 29% of all students scored satisfactory on the 2012 writing assessment. 49% scored satisfactory on the 2013 writing assessment. The AMO writing target was met.

Subgroups:
Black/African American students:
44% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 45%. The target was not met.
52% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 53%. The target was not met.

29% scored satisfactory in writing in 2012. 50% of the African American/Black students scored satisfactory in writing in 2013. The target AMO was met.

English Language Learners:
44% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 41%. The target was met.

50% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 41%. The target was met.

Writing - N/A
Students with disabilities:
12% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 20%. The target was not met.

50% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 41%. The target was met.

Writing- N/A
Economically Disadvantaged:
44% scored satisfactory in reading. The AMO was 45%. The target was not met.
52% scored satisfactory in math. The AMO target was 53%. The target was met.

29% scored satisfactory in writing in 2012. 49% scored satisfactory in writing in 2013. The target was met.

2011-2012 Grade A: Grade A: 44% met high standards in reading, 47% met high standards in math, 73% met high standards in writing, and 23% met high standards in science. 78% of students

made learning gains in reading, 81% made learning gains in math, 91% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 91% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

AMO Data:

44% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The reading target was met. 47% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 48%. The math target was not met.

Subgroups:

Black/African American:

44% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The reading target was met.

47% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 49%. The math target was not met.

English Language Learners:

43% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 35%. The reading target was met.

38% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 35%. The math target was met.

Students with Disabilities:

Reading- N/A

22% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 18%. The math target was met.

Economically Disadvantaged:

44% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The reading target was met.

47% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 48%. The math target was not met.

2010-2011 Grade C: 85% of AYP standards met, 53% met high standards in reading, 63% met high standards in math, 93% met high standards in writing, 24% met high standards in science, 60% made learning gains in reading, 66% made learning gains in math, 50% 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.

Gwendolyn Beckemeyer		
Full-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 2	Years at Current School: 1
Areas	Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, Data	
Credentials	MA Educational Leadership MS Elementary Education	
Performance Record	<p>2012-2013: Grade D: 40% met high standards in reading, 28% met high standards in math, 55% met high standards in writing, and 32% met high standards in science. 71% of students made learning gains in reading, 45% made learning gains in math, 79% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 45% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>AMO Data: 40% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 39%. The reading target was met. 28% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The math target AMO was 40%. The math target was not met. 55% of all students scored satisfactory in writing. The AMO was 56%. The writing target was not met.</p> <p>Subgroups: Black/African American students: 40% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The target was met. 27% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 41%. The target was not met. 58% scored satisfactory in writing in 2012. 56% of the African American/Black students scored satisfactory in writing in 2013. The target AMO was not met.</p> <p>Students with disabilities: 19% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 17%. The target was met. 8% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 23%. The target was not met.</p> <p>Writing- N/A</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged: 40% scored satisfactory in reading. The AMO was 39%. The target was met. 28% scored satisfactory in math. The AMO target was 39%. The target was not met. 56% scored satisfactory in writing in 2012. 55% scored satisfactory in writing in 2013. The target was not met.</p> <p>2011-2012: Grade C: 34% of all students met high standards in reading, 30% met high standards in math, 97% met high standards in writing, and 14% met high standards in science. 79% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 71% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>AMO Data: 34% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 33%. The reading target was met. 30% of all students</p>	

scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 34%. The math target not met.

Subgroups:

Black/African American:

34% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 34%. The reading target was met.

32% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 35%. The math target was not met.

Students with Disabilities:

8% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 8%. The reading target was met.

15% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 15%. The math target was met.

Economically Disadvantaged:

34% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 33%. The reading target was met.

30% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 33%. The math target was not met.

2010-2011: Grade D: 79% of AYP standards met, 66% met high standards in reading, 62% met high standards in math, 95% met high standards in writing, 39% met high standards in science, 66% made learning gains in reading, 64% made learning gains in math, 70% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 68% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

Michelle Thrift		
Full-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 3	Years at Current School: 1
Areas	Mathematics, Science, Data	
Credentials	MA BS Elementary Education ESOL Endorsement	
Performance Record	<p>2012-2013 Grade C: 59% met high standards in reading, 59% met high standards in math, 54% met high standards in writing, 57% met high standards in science, 67% made learning gains in reading, 67% made learning gains in math, 66% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 63% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>AMO Data: 59% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 63%. The reading target was not met. 59 % of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 62%. The math target was not met. 54% of all students scored satisfactory on the 2012 writing assessment. 52% scored satisfactory on the 2013 writing assessment. The AMO writing target was met.</p> <p>Subgroups: American Indian: 67% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 66%. The reading target was met. 70% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 70%. The math target was met.</p> <p>Asian: 79% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 79%. The reading target was met. 84% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 83%. The math target was met.</p> <p>Black/African American: 42% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 48%. The reading target was not met. 43% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 48%. The math target was not met.</p> <p>Hispanic: 52% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 57%. The reading target was not met. 53% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 57%. The math target was not met.</p> <p>White: 76% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 78%. The reading target was not met. 76% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 75%. The math target was met.</p> <p>English Language Learners: 33% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 46%. The reading target was not met.</p>	

37% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 48%. The math target was not met.

Students with Disabilities:

26% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 38%. The reading target was not met.

29% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 38%. The math target was not met.

Economically Disadvantaged:

48% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 53%. The reading target was not met.

49% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 53%. The math target was not met.

2011-2012 Grade B; 57% met high standards in reading, 57% met high standards in math, 81% met high standards in writing, and 49% meeting high standards in science. 68% of students made learning gains in reading, 68% made learning gains in math, 69% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 64% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

AMO Data:

57% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 60%. The reading target was not met. 57% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 58%. The math target was not met.

Subgroups:

American Indian:

65% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 62%. The reading target was met.

70% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 67%. The math target was met.

Asian:

77% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 77%. The reading target was met.

84% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 82%. The math target was met.

Black/African American:

41% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 43%. The reading target was not met.

40% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 42%. The math target was not met.

Hispanic:

51% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 52%. The reading target was not met.

51% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 52%. The math target was not met.

White:

75% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 76%. The reading target was not met.

74% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 73%. The math target was met.

English Language Learners:

36% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The reading target was not met.
39% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 43%. The math target was not met.

Students with Disabilities:

26% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 31%. The reading target was not met.
28% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 31%. The math target was not met.

Economically Disadvantaged:

46% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 49%. The reading target was not met.
43% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 47%. The math target was not met.

2010-2011 Grade C: 77% AYP met, 60% met high standards in reading, 59% met high standards in math, 84% met high standards in writing, 24% met high standards in science, 60% made learning gains in reading, 59% made learning gains in math, 57% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 69% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

Rozone Frett		
Part-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 5	Years at Current School: 4
Areas	Data, RtI/MTSS	
Credentials	MA Educational Leadership K-12 MS Primary Elementary Education K-6	
Performance Record	<p>2012-2013 Grade B: 44% met high standards in reading, 52% met high standards in math, 49% met high standards in writing, and 17% met high standards in science. 59% of students made learning gains in reading, 69% made learning gains in math, 70% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 69% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>AMO Data: 44% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 45%. The reading target was not met. 52% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 53%. The math target was met. 29% of all students scored satisfactory on the 2012 writing assessment. 49% scored satisfactory on the 2013 writing assessment. The AMO writing target was met.</p> <p>Subgroups: Black/African American students: 44% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 45%. The target was not met. 52% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 53%. The target was not met. 29% scored satisfactory in writing in 2012. 50% of the African American/Black students scored satisfactory in writing in 2013. The target AMO was met.</p> <p>English Language Learners: 44% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 41%. The target was met. 50% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 41%. The target was met.</p> <p>Writing - N/A Students with disabilities: 12% scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 20%. The target was not met. 50% scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 41%. The target was met.</p> <p>Writing- N/A Economically Disadvantaged: 44% scored satisfactory in reading. The AMO was 45%. The target was not met. 52% scored satisfactory in math. The AMO target was 53%. The target was met. 29% scored satisfactory in writing in 2012. 49% scored satisfactory in writing in 2013. The target was met.</p> <p>2011-2012 Grade A: Grade A: 44% met high standards in reading, 47% met high standards in math, 73% met high standards in</p>	

writing, and 23% met high standards in science. 78% of students made learning gains in reading, 81% made learning gains in math, 91% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading, 91% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

AMO Data:

44% of all students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The reading target was met. 47% of all students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 48%. The math target was not met.

Subgroups:

Black/African American:

44% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The reading target was met.

47% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 49%. The math target was not met.

English Language Learners:

43% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 35%. The reading target was met.

38% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 35%. The math target was met.

Students with Disabilities:

Reading- N/A

22% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 18%. The math target was met.

Economically Disadvantaged:

44% of students scored satisfactory in reading. The target AMO was 40%. The reading target was met.

47% of students scored satisfactory in math. The target AMO was 48%. The math target was not met.

2010-2011 Grade C: 85% of AYP standards met, 53% met high standards in reading, 63% met high standards in math, 93% met high standards in writing, 24% met high standards in science, 60% made learning gains in reading, 66% made learning gains in math, 50% 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.

Classroom Teachers

of classroom teachers

52

receiving effective rating or higher

51, 98%

Highly Qualified Teachers

100%

certified in-field

52, 100%

ESOL endorsed

38, 73%

reading endorsed

8, 15%

with advanced degrees

18, 35%

National Board Certified

1, 2%

first-year teachers

1, 2%

with 1-5 years of experience

9, 17%

with 6-14 years of experience

20, 38%

with 15 or more years of experience

21, 40%

Education Paraprofessionals

of paraprofessionals

5

Highly Qualified

5, 100%

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

1. Beginning Teacher Program- Beginning teachers attend monthly support meetings to become familiar with the school expectations and collaborate on best practices. Laura Matthews
2. Teacher Mentoring Program- Continue with the school wide teacher mentoring program where new teachers are paired with veteran teachers for support and encouragement.
3. Coaching Support Team- Eccleston coaches are paired with teachers to support, monitor, and coach throughout the year. The Leadership Team Members responsible are: Gwendolyn Bekemeyer, Laura Matthews, Jamie Andersen, Rozene Frett, and Michelle Thrift
4. Weekly Staff recognition- Each Friday one teacher is selected by staff as the Player of the Week- Tracy Webley/Felecia Goodman
5. Professional Learning Communities- Teams will work collaboratively to common plan standards

based instruction, create common assessments and share instructional strategies. - Professional Learning Leadership Team Members, Administration, and PLC Facilitators

6. Lesson Study- Each grade level will participate in research based instruction, data analysis, and pedagogy reflection through participating in lesson study- Leadership Team Members and Administration

7. Book Study- The instructional staff will read, discuss, implement, and reflect collaboratively about effective research based practices based on the book "Becoming a Reflective Teacher" by Robert Marzano, Tina Boogren, et. all.

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

Our school mentoring program is designed to assist first and second year teachers with the necessary tools needed to manage an effective classroom, including but not limited to classroom design and procedures, planning for and providing rigorous instruction and the use of high probability strategies and research based practices.

The mentee will be supported by the CRT/Instructional Coach, Laura Matthews. Monthly meetings will be scheduled to provide collaboration between the beginning teachers. School updates, team building and opportunities for questions and reflection will be included in each month's agenda. Open lines of communication will be maintained to ensure that the beginning teacher is provided with the necessary support to succeed.

Each beginning teacher will also be paired with an experienced, veteran teacher. This mentor will provide constant support and feedback to the mentee. The pair will meet daily-weekly to discuss the important happenings in the school as well as assistance with, but not limited to lesson planning, assessments and progress monitoring.

Both the instructional coach and mentor will assist the beginning teacher with the requirements of the OCPS Beginning Teacher Program.

Beginning Teacher: Daniela Robertson – 1st year teacher

Mentor: Lisa Taylor – 4 years teaching experience

- Teaching on the same grade level as mentee
- Mentor has been successful in the past with student achievement
- Motivated teacher leader
- Mentor is scheduled to complete Clinical Educator
- Individual support during grade level PLCs
- Weekly mentor/mentee meetings
- Monthly Instructional Coach/Mentee meetings
- Ongoing trainings with curriculum and behavior management

Beginning Teacher: Carlene Honor – 2nd year teacher

Mentor: Laura Matthews – 24 years teaching experience

- Curriculum Resource Teacher with 21 years of mentoring experience
- Mentor has been successful in the past with student achievement
- Motivated teacher leader
- Mentor has completed Clinical Educator
- Individual support during grade level PLCs
- Weekly mentor/mentee meetings
- Monthly Instructional Coach/Mentee meetings
- Ongoing trainings with curriculum and behavior management

Beginning Teacher: Lauren Rhodes - 2nd year teacher

Mentor: Michelle Thrift – 14 years teaching experience

- Math/Science Coach with 11 years of mentoring experience
- Mentor has been successful in the past with student achievement

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 purpose of the MTSS team is to provide a delivery of service model which addresses academic and behavioral concerns of all students as addressed in the School Improvement Plan. The MTSS team and teachers meet weekly to address the areas of instruction, curriculum, and school/classroom environment. During these meetings, the team will first analyze grade level benchmark data to determine the effectiveness and rigor of the core instruction. In addition, the team will review class and individual student data to determine small group and/ or individual needs to plan for interventions. A progress monitoring plan will be implemented to ensure student achievement. From this information, professional development, coaching support and other resources will be identified to assist with instruction and behavior management. Further meetings are held to evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions using ongoing progress monitoring data and modifications are made as necessary.

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

The Principal, Tracy Webley, will provide a common mission and vision for the MTSS Team. Ms. Webley and the Assistant Principal, Felecia Goodman, will ensure that data is collected, analyzed and appropriate plans are put into place to enhance the academic and behavioral growth of all learners. The Curriculum Resource Teacher, Laura Matthews, will assist with the curriculum and assessment needs of the teachers and students. The Literacy Coach, Jamie Andersen, the Math/Science Coach, Michelle Thrift, and the Academic Coach, Gwendolyn Bekemeyer, will help teachers clarify and implement appropriate researched based instructional strategies. The Behavior Dean, Rozene Frett, will coordinate the development of a school wide behavior plan, as well as behavior plans for specific students and collect data on behavior concerns. These support teachers will also assist with the collection and analysis of data reports and provide teachers with the appropriate training on the disaggregation of the data and teaching strategies. They will also assist with the weekly/biweekly monitoring of student data as well as provide modeling and professional development. In addition, they will assist with TIER II and TIER III interventions.

The Staffing Coordinator, Emmanuela Bough, will assist the teachers with collecting and tracking the data of the exceptional educational students as well as provide resources and materials for students making minimal progress.

The ESOL Compliance Teacher, Emmanuela Bough, will monitor the progress and implementation of interventions and strategies for identified ELL students ensuring that intervention plans remain ESOL compliant.

The School Psychologist, Julie Mejia, will provide historical data on students, data collection tools, and provide suggestions for intervention techniques and practices as well as assessment support. Ms. Mejia will also be available for class or student observations.

The Social Workers, Karie Johnston and Norma Gonzalez, will provide additional data on students collected through home visits and/or phone conversations with parents.

The Exceptional Education Teachers, Scottie Martin (SLD), Jennifer Sullivan (Speech & Language) and Sarita Johnson (Gifted) will help integrate instructional strategies and collaborate with the general education teachers to ensure that the exceptional education student needs are being met.

The School MTSS Support Coach, Laura Matthews, will schedule and facilitate meetings. Ms. Matthews will also assist with the completion of the appropriate data collection and paperwork.

The General Education Teachers will provide student data and observations as well as information on core and intervention instruction. They will work collaboratively with their grade level team members to analyze and problem solve issues regarding the effectiveness of the instructional strategies and curricula.

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

The leadership team will monitor the fidelity of the MTSS and SIP through reviewing the MTSS problem solving process, instructional observation notes and student progress monitoring data to provide feedback and make instructional decisions.

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

1. Tier 1 - Analyze school wide data to look for patterns and deliver instruction or counseling based on needs.
2. Tier 2 – Remediate according to the needs of the students beyond what is provided during the regular schedule.
3. Tier 3 – Intensive interventions based on the needs of the students and progress monitor every week to check for mastery or improvement.

Reading – Students will be monitored using DRA, Core Phonics Survey, Journey’s chapter tests, Successmaker, ongoing mini standards based assessments, and teacher made assessments.

Mathematics – Go Math Assessments, ongoing mini standards based assessments, Successmaker and teacher made assessments will be used to monitor the students’ progress.

Science – Fusion chapter tests, Science Boot Camp Practice questions (5th grade), ongoing standards based mini assessments (5th grade) and teacher made assessments will be used to monitor the students’ progress.

Writing – Orange County Writes and school wide weekly writing assessments will be used to monitor the students’ progress.

Behavior – PBS management systems will be used to monitor and remediate as needed.

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

The current MTSS Team is trained in the multi-tiered process. For the 2013-2014 school year, the MTSS Support Coach will provide a review/overview for all teachers. Additional training will be provided for new teachers not familiar with the process. Ongoing professional development and support will also be provided by the MTSS Team in regards to updates on services, instructional strategies, data analysis and progress monitoring for the current school year.

We will meet with the teachers during weekly data meetings to monitor the progress of the students. Our coaches will push in to assist the teachers with their needs. We will discuss behavior concerns of the students during our PBS meetings to give suggestions and monitor behavior progress. We will continue to implement staff development based on the needs of the teachers and students.

Teachers will inform parents of the MTSS process through parent conferences and phone calls. Parents are encouraged to contact our school personnel with any concerns they may have regarding their student(s) progress. Parents are always welcome and encouraged to attend any discussions/meetings concerning the needs of their student(s).

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: 3,360

Provide 3rd - 5th grade students with extra reading and math instruction based on 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade curriculum. Students are tutored by highly qualified teachers utilizing targeted resources to meet the needs of students.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

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

Progress monitoring, teacher observations, classroom informal or formal assessments, as well as exit slips will be used to analyze the effectiveness of after school tutoring.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Administration and teachers are responsible for monitoring extended learning.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

Name	Title
Julia Thompson	Teacher
Tanya Cooke	Teacher
Holly Golden	Teacher
Pamela Rumph	Teacher
Charles Wallick	Teacher
Mary Downey-Pierce	Teacher
Christine Lombard	Teacher
LeAnn Winsley	Teacher
Diane Goodson	Media Specialist
Jamie Andersen	Literacy Coach

How the school-based LLT functions

The Literacy Team meets weekly to discuss data, share updates, review recent activity reports, and interventions. Each team member meets daily with a small group of students for in intensive intervention in reading.

Major initiatives of the LLT

The major initiatives of the LLT will be to assist teachers with implementing the 130 minutes of ELA instruction, promoting and utilizing Accelerated Reader, differentiating instruction, intervention support,

and finding resources to strengthen standards-based instruction to meet the students' needs. The LLT will also provide staff development and peer support throughout the year in these areas.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

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

Every teacher will teach a minimum of 130 consecutive minutes for the ELA block. 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 will be used to provide rigorous and relevant practice using the same standard with peers and for differentiated guided reading instruction that addresses learning gaps. During instruction, the teachers model using the gradual release model and integrate opportunities for students to collaborate and write as a response to reading. During whole group, the teacher will use complex on grade level text. In addition, each teacher and the leadership team will provide intervention support outside the reading block to review the previously learned standards with level 1 and 2 students and any students showing a need according to weekly benchmark assessments. Each teacher will integrate the CCSS and 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

The Pre-K Program offers students a stimulating environment that provides a well-rounded academic curriculum before entering kindergarten. Parents and incoming kindergartners are invited to attend "Meet the Teacher" before the first day of school. They are also encouraged to spend the first 15 minutes with their child on the first day of school assisting them with getting acclimated to their new environment. The students also eat their free breakfast and lunch with the K-5 students, they watch morning announcements, walk in lines in the hallways, participate in circle time lessons to learn basics of literacy and mathematics, participate in learning centers, learn social skills, learn to follow simple school rules, and participate in student celebrations.

Our Pre-K and Kindergarten teachers are all part of a Professional Learning Community. They attend data meetings, CIA meetings, field trips, and assemblies together. They are involved in professional development opportunities for instructional strategies to meet the needs of the students.

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

4th and 5th grade students participate in the AVID program. AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) is a college-readiness system designed to increase the number of students who successfully enroll in college.

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

Each 4th and 5th grade AVID student will be given a binder or organizational tool in which he or she is required to keep materials for each subject. Students are taught study skills, test preparation, time management, and the writing process.

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	45%	44%	No	51%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	45%	44%	No	51%
Hispanic				
White				
English language learners	41%	44%	Yes	47%
Students with disabilities	20%	12%	No	28%
Economically disadvantaged	45%	44%	No	51%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	47	25%	39%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	28	15%	19%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

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

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	63	59%	78%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	20	72%	77%

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)	18	53%	60%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		50%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		25%

Postsecondary Readiness

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

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	44	49%	66%
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	53%	52%	No	57%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	53%	52%	No	58%
Hispanic				
White				
English language learners	41%	50%	Yes	47%
Students with disabilities	26%	20%	No	33%
Economically disadvantaged	53%	52%	No	57%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	54	31%	40%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	34	20%	25%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

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

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	72	69%	76%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	19	68%	76%

Middle School Acceleration

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

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>		15%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		15%

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)	2		4
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	100	25%	35%

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	68	14%	12%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	30	4%	4%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	16	15%	15%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	16	3%	3%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	41	9%	7%

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

Parents and/or family members will attend family curriculum nights throughout the school year including: Reading Night, Science Night, Math Night, Fine Arts Night, and FCAT/ Curriculum Night.

Parents and/or family members will attend conference night two times a year to meet with their child's teacher and discuss progress.

Staffing Coordinator interprets parent activity night meetings to help with the language barrier for our Haitian Creole parents and will hold PLC meetings for parents of ELL students.

Teachers and parents will keep an open line of communication through the use of the daily agendas.

Parents and/or family members will participate in ongoing curriculum nights, classroom participation, and communicate regularly with their teacher to be on the parent honor roll.

A school newsletter will go home monthly to inform parents and families what the students are learning and list upcoming events.

Selected Staff will use Connect Orange to share information with our families.

Ms. Betty Chandler will provide family and community resources as requested for parents and families.

Volunteer "Grannies" will provide social, reading, and emotional support for students.

During parent activity nights, a training is offered in the computer lab on student programs. Parents learn about some of the computer programs that students use during the school day as well as ones that can be accessed from home.

Each quin, information sheets will be updated by the attendance clerk and teachers to improve communication between the school and parents.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
In 2013, 94 parents were inducted in the Eccleston parent honor society. At least 10% more family members will be inducted in to the Eccleston Parent honor society in 2014.	94	20%	30%

Goals Summary

- G1.** Increase critical thinking and rigor utilizing standards-based instruction to increase student achievement.
- G2.** Increase student achievement through the implementation of MTSS.

Goals Detail

G1. Increase critical thinking and rigor utilizing standards-based instruction to increase student achievement.

Targets Supported

- All Areas
- 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)
- Social Studies
- Science
- Science - Elementary School
- STEM
- STEM - All Levels
- Parental Involvement
- EWS
- EWS - Elementary School
- Additional Targets

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Standards, Item Specs, Instructional Focus Calendars, Journeys, Fusion, Go Math, Write from the Beginning, Core Connections Writing, OCPS Essential Labs, CPALMS, and Think Central

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teachers lack knowledge of standards and strategies for providing rigorous instruction.
- Teachers lack effective instructional delivery of standards.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Analyze iObservation, benchmark data and common assessment data to determine student growth as a result of standards based instruction.

Person or Persons Responsible

Tracy Webley and Felecia Goodman

Target Dates or Schedule:

Weekly beginning on 08/29

Evidence of Completion:

Administration agenda, meeting minutes, iObservation data and data binders

G2. Increase student achievement through the implementation of MTSS.

Targets Supported

- All Areas
- 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)

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Progress monitoring data, FAIR data, Edusoft benchmark assessments, Core Phonics data, the MTSS team, Administration, and research based interventions (Elements of Reading Phonics, Voyager, Successmaker, and AR) are resources for MTSS implementation.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teachers are not implementing ongoing progress monitoring and disaggregating data through the MTSS process with fidelity to determine instructional decisions.
- Teachers are not targeting differentiated intervention instruction with fidelity.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Disaggregate and analyze iObservation data, benchmark data, progress monitoring data, and common assessments to determine if implementing the MTSS process with fidelity is increasing student achievement for students receiving Tier II and Tier III instruction.

Person or Persons Responsible

Tracy Webley and Felecia Goodman

Target Dates or Schedule:

Monthly beginning on 10/02

Evidence of Completion:

Agenda, meeting minutes, iObservation data and data binders

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. Increase critical thinking and rigor utilizing standards-based instruction to increase student achievement.

G1.B1 Teachers lack knowledge of standards and strategies for providing rigorous instruction.

G1.B1.S1 Provide professional development for deconstructing standards and planning learning activities aligned to the rigor level of the standards.

Action Step 1

School based coaches will facilitate common planning meetings focusing grade levels to deconstruct standards and align activities to the rigor of standards.

Person or Persons Responsible

School based coaches and the leadership team

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly beginning on 08/17

Evidence of Completion

Common planning meeting minutes and standards based lesson plans

Facilitator:

Team leaders and the leadership team

Participants:

All instructional staff

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

Administration will observe classroom instruction, participate in common planning sessions, review lessons and provide feedback.

Person or Persons Responsible

Tracy Webley and Felecia Goodman

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly beginning on 09/17

Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans, common planning agendas, and iObservation

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

The leadership team will analyze iObservation data and student benchmark data to identify trends and measure student achievement as a result of the standards-based professional development.

Person or Persons Responsible

Tracy Webley, Felecia Goodman and the leadership team

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly beginning on 09/19

Evidence of Completion

Data binders, meeting minutes and data pie charts

G1.B2 Teachers lack effective instructional delivery of standards.

G1.B2.S1 Provide professional development for implementing Marzano's design questions 2,3 and 4 for effective instructional delivery of standards-based instruction.

Action Step 1

School based coaches will facilitate professional development meetings focused on implementing Marzano's DQs 2,3 and 4 for effective instructional delivery of standards based instruction.

Person or Persons Responsible

Tracy Webley and Felecia Goodman

Target Dates or Schedule

08/13, 09/18, and 11/06

Evidence of Completion

Professional development agendas, meeting notes, sign in sheets

Facilitator:

School based coaches and the CRT

Participants:

All instructional staff

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B2.S1

Administration will observe classroom instruction, participate in professional development and common planning meetings, review lesson plans and provide feedback.

Person or Persons Responsible

Tracy Webley and Felecia Goodman

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly beginning on 09/17

Evidence of Completion

Sign in sheets, meeting minutes, meeting agendas, lesson plans, and iObservation

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S1

Analyze iObservation data and student data to determine trends and increases in student achievement as a result of the Marzano DQs 2,3, and 4 instructional delivery of standards professional development.

Person or Persons Responsible

Tracy Webley and Felecia Goodman

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly beginning on 10/02

Evidence of Completion

Data binders and meeting minutes

G2. Increase student achievement through the implementation of MTSS.

G2.B2 Teachers are not implementing ongoing progress monitoring and disaggregating data through the MTSS process with fidelity to determine instructional decisions.

G2.B2.S1 MTSS team will provide professional development to facilitate teachers through the disaggregation of data to identify academic needs.

Action Step 1

Tracy Webley, Felecia Goodman, and Laura Matthews will conduct MTSS professional development through data meetings, MTSS meetings, and training sessions to analyze benchmark assessment and progress monitoring data.

Person or Persons Responsible

Tracy Webley and Felecia Goodman

Target Dates or Schedule

Whole group MTSS professional development took place on 10/9 and follow up will continue weekly through small group data and individual MTSS meetings.

Evidence of Completion

Reflection slips, MTSS notes, and staff development sign in sheets will be collected as evidence of professional training sessions.

Facilitator:

Tracy Webley, Felecia Goodman, Laura Matthews, and Jamie Andersen

Participants:

All instructional staff

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B2.S1

Tracy Webley and Felecia Goodman will observe classroom instruction, facilitate MTSS meetings and professional development, review lesson plans and provide feedback.

Person or Persons Responsible

Tracy Webley and Felecia Goodman

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly beginning on 09/03

Evidence of Completion

iObservation data, lesson plans, agendas and meeting notes

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B2.S1

Analyze iObservation data and student data for trends to determine student learning gains as a result of MTSS professional development and implementation.

Person or Persons Responsible

Tracy Webley, Felecia Goodman, and Laura Matthews

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly beginning on 09/17

Evidence of Completion

iObservation, data binders, meeting minutes and pie graphs

G2.B3 Teachers are not targeting differentiated intervention instruction with fidelity.

G2.B3.S1 Professional development will be provided for staff to implement differentiated instruction based on their assessment data.

Action Step 1

School based and School Transformation Office coaches will provide professional development on differentiating instruction.

Person or Persons Responsible

Tracy Webley and Felecia Goodman

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly beginning on 10/02

Evidence of Completion

Sign in sheets and reflection slips

Facilitator:

Tracy Webley, Felecia Goodman, Laura Matthews, Jamie Andersen, Rozene Frett, Michelle Thrift and Gwendolyn Bekemeyer

Participants:

All instructional staff

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

Observe classroom instruction, participate in differentiated instruction planning, review lesson plans and provide feedback.

Person or Persons Responsible

Tracy Webley and Felecia Goodman

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly beginning on 09/17

Evidence of Completion

iObservation data and lesson plans

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B3.S1

Analyze iObservation and student data to determine if student achievement is increasing due to effective implementation of differentiated instruction through MTSS.

Person or Persons Responsible

Tracy Webley, Felecia Goodman and Laura Matthews

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly beginning on 10/02

Evidence of Completion

iObservation data, data binders and meeting minutes

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

Title I Part A:

Title I funds will be used to purchase positions for staff members who serve our entire student population such as (but not limited to) instructional support teachers, paraprofessionals, technology support person and hourly tutors. VPK is provided. Title I provides funds for tutoring and a Parent Resource Position.

Title 1 Part C: Migrant N/A

Title 1 Part D: N/A

Title II funds: Substitute coverage for teachers to attend professional development opportunities

Title III funds: N/A

Title VI funds, Part B:

SAI funds:

SAI funds will be used to provide tutoring and materials for level 1 third grade students, levels 1 & 2 fourth and fifth grade students, summer reading camp is available for third grade students who scored level one on FCAT.

The school provides free tutoring services and materials for students in third through fifth grades. The tutoring focuses on reading and math for third and fourth grade. Fifth grade focuses on reading, math, and science. Our 3-5 students are offered Saturday school during select parts of the year.

Title X: Homeless

The homeless education program, provided through the McKinney Vento Act, assists our students and their families if they are classified homeless. The school staffing coordinator and the family outreach coordinator are the contacts for this program. They ensure parents are aware of services available to them.

Nutrition: Our students are offered free breakfast and lunch. We follow the USDA program for all public schools.

Head start: We have VPK

Housing: N/A

Adult Education: Parent resource teacher provides training for parents on skills to help their children at home with their school work.

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. Increase critical thinking and rigor utilizing standards-based instruction to increase student achievement.

G1.B1 Teachers lack knowledge of standards and strategies for providing rigorous instruction.

G1.B1.S1 Provide professional development for deconstructing standards and planning learning activities aligned to the rigor level of the standards.

PD Opportunity 1

School based coaches will facilitate common planning meetings focusing grade levels to deconstruct standards and align activities to the rigor of standards.

Facilitator

Team leaders and the leadership team

Participants

All instructional staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly beginning on 08/17

Evidence of Completion

Common planning meeting minutes and standards based lesson plans

G1.B2 Teachers lack effective instructional delivery of standards.

G1.B2.S1 Provide professional development for implementing Marzano's design questions 2,3 and 4 for effective instructional delivery of standards-based instruction.

PD Opportunity 1

School based coaches will facilitate professional development meetings focused on implementing Marzano's DQs 2,3 and 4 for effective instructional delivery of standards based instruction.

Facilitator

School based coaches and the CRT

Participants

All instructional staff

Target Dates or Schedule

08/13, 09/18, and 11/06

Evidence of Completion

Professional development agendas, meeting notes, sign in sheets

G2. Increase student achievement through the implementation of MTSS.

G2.B2 Teachers are not implementing ongoing progress monitoring and disaggregating data through the MTSS process with fidelity to determine instructional decisions.

G2.B2.S1 MTSS team will provide professional development to facilitate teachers through the disaggregation of data to identify academic needs.

PD Opportunity 1

Tracy Webley, Felecia Goodman, and Laura Matthews will conduct MTSS professional development through data meetings, MTSS meetings, and training sessions to analyze benchmark assessment and progress monitoring data.

Facilitator

Tracy Webley, Felecia Goodman, Laura Matthews, and Jamie Andersen

Participants

All instructional staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Whole group MTSS professional development took place on 10/9 and follow up will continue weekly through small group data and individual MTSS meetings.

Evidence of Completion

Reflection slips, MTSS notes, and staff development sign in sheets will be collected as evidence of professional training sessions.

G2.B3 Teachers are not targeting differentiated intervention instruction with fidelity.

G2.B3.S1 Professional development will be provided for staff to implement differentiated instruction based on their assessment data.

PD Opportunity 1

School based and School Transformation Office coaches will provide professional development on differentiating instruction.

Facilitator

Tracy Webley, Felecia Goodman, Laura Matthews, Jamie Andersen, Rozene Frett, Michelle Thrift and Gwendolyn Bekemeyer

Participants

All instructional staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly beginning on 10/02

Evidence of Completion

Sign in sheets and reflection slips

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G1.	Increase critical thinking and rigor utilizing standards-based instruction to increase student achievement.	\$2,500
Total		\$2,500

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Professional Development	Total
Title II and Title I	\$2,500	\$2,500
Total	\$2,500	\$2,500

Budget Details

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

G1. Increase critical thinking and rigor utilizing standards-based instruction to increase student achievement.

G1.B1 Teachers lack knowledge of standards and strategies for providing rigorous instruction.

G1.B1.S1 Provide professional development for deconstructing standards and planning learning activities aligned to the rigor level of the standards.

Action Step 1

School based coaches will facilitate common planning meetings focusing grade levels to deconstruct standards and align activities to the rigor of standards.

Resource Type

Professional Development

Resource

Collaborative planning with substitutes

Funding Source

Title II and Title I

Amount Needed

\$2,500