

## 2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

---

Lake Silver Elementary  
2401 N RIO GRANDE AVE  
Orlando, FL 32804  
407-245-1850

### School Demographics

---

|   |                             |   |
|---|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type</b><br>Elementary School | <b>Title I</b><br>No        | <b>Free and Reduced Lunch Rate</b><br>63% |
| <b>Alternative/ESE Center</b><br>No     | <b>Charter School</b><br>No | <b>Minority Rate</b><br>60%               |

### School Grades History

---

|                     |                     |                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <b>2013-14</b><br>C | <b>2012-13</b><br>B | <b>2011-12</b><br>A | <b>2010-11</b><br>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**

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <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>20</b> |
| <b>Goals Summary</b>  | <b>24</b> |
| <b>Goals Detail</b>   | <b>24</b> |
| <b>Action Plan for Improvement</b>                                | <b>26</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>38</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 |
|-------------|--------|-----|
| 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**

Lake Silver Elementary

**Principal**

Cynthia Swanson

**School Advisory Council chair**

Terrell Daniel

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

| Name              | Title                           |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Nathan Hay        | Assistant Principal             |
| Erin LeRoy        | CRT                             |
| Jennifer Borrelli | Reading/Rtl Instructional Coach |
| Carol Hagemann    | Reading Instructional Coach     |
| Ashli Wilkerson   | Staffing Coordinator            |
| Peggy Murphy      | Media Specialist                |
| Lynn Berger       | ESE CRT                         |
| Laura Weckerle    | Guidance Counselor              |
| Terrell Daniel    | Gifted Teacher/SAC Chair        |

#### 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

- Terrell Daniel-Chairman-Teacher
- Cynthia Swanson-Principal
- Evelyn Ortiz-Teacher
- Darreyl Williams-Classified
- Jennifer Sommer-Business/Community
- Bonnie Bell-Parent
- Kimberly Gibson-Parent

Sasha Huey-Parent  
 Victor Gilroy-Parent  
 Kimberly Koon-Parent  
 40% Employees  
 60% Non-District Employees  
 50% White  
 40% Black  
 10% Hispanic

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

Principal Cynthia Swanson informed the SAC of the school performance data from 2012-2013 school year. SAC was actively involved in the preparation of the School Improvement Plan during meetings held in August and September. SAC was involved in the 2013-2014 annual budget during SAC meetings held in the Spring of 2013. Community member, Jennifer Sommer, will coordinate fundraising as it relates to problem solving activities. Funds raised will go towards teacher grants, technology and the Good Samaritan Fund to assist students with school supplies, uniforms and nutrition. Darreyl Williams will coordinate parent involvement, attendance and discipline. PTA President, Bonnie Bell, will be the liason between the SAC and the PTA.

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

SAC meets monthly. During each meeting a portion of the SIP will be addressed with school personnel and SAC members sharing with the SAC the specific goals, activities and problem solving measures that are taking place on campus. Data received from district and school assessments will be reviewed each month. SAC will select the survey for our Needs Assessment, conduct survey and evaluate results. Findings will be used with mid-year reporting and School Improvement for 2014-2015. SAC will assist the Principal with the preparation of the school budget for 2014-2015.

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

100% of school improvement funds will go towards Professional Development.

**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:**

**Cynthia Swanson**

Principal

Years as Administrator: 16

Years at Current School: 9

**Credentials**

Bachelor of Science, Masters Educational Leadership,  
Emotional Handicapped K-12, Specific Learning Disabilities K-12

**Performance Record**

Lake Silver Principal:

2007-08 School Grade A

Reading 78%/Math 78%/Writing 65%/Science 59%/Reading Gains 74%/Math Gains 85%/Reading Lowest 25% 83%/Math Lowest 25% 83 %

2008-09 School Grade A

Reading 82%/Math 71%/Writing 81%/Science 40%/Reading Gains 75%/Math Gains 72%/Reading Lowest 25% 71%/Math Lowest 25% 87%

2009-10 School Grade A

Reading 76%/Math 75%/Writing 76%/Science 67%/Reading Gains 61%/Math Gains 69%/Reading Lowest 25% 60%/Math Lowest 25% 67%

2010-11 School Grade B

Reading 79%/Math 79%/Writing 93%/Science 61%/Reading Gains 69%/Math Gains 54%/Reading Lowest 25% 57%/Math Lowest 25% 42%

2011-12 School Grade A

Reading 67%/Math 55%/Writing 74%/Science 64%/Reading Gains 82%/Math Gains 72%/Reading Lowest 25% 90%/Math Lowest 25% 72%

2012-2013 School Grade B

Reading 59%/Math 52%/Writing 46%/Science 52%/Reading Gains 60%/Math Gains 63%/Reading Lowest 25% 57%/Math Lowest 25% 66%

|                   |                           |                            |
|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Nathan Hay</b> |                           |                            |
| Asst Principal    | Years as Administrator: 0 | Years at Current School: 0 |

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Credentials</b>        | Masters in Educational Leadership<br>Bachelors of Science in Elementary Education<br>National Board Certified Teacher Middle Childhood Generalist  |
| <b>Performance Record</b> | Reading Coach<br>Wolf Lake Elementary 12-13 School Grade A<br>Reading- 73% HS, 75% LG, 78% Lowest 25%<br>Math- 72% HS, 61% LG, 63% Lowest 25%<br>Writing- 59% HS Science- 59% HS Reading Coach<br>Wolf Lake Elementary 11-12- School Grade A<br>Reading- 70% HS, 71% LG, 69% LG Lowest 25%<br>Math- 75% HS, 75% LG, 61% LG Lowest 25%<br>Writing- 87% HS Science- 53% HS<br>Dean<br>Spring Lake Elementary 10-11<br>School Grade A 100% of AYP criteria satisfied.<br>Reading- 89% HS, 74% LG, 62% LG lowest 25%<br>Math- 89% HS, 83% LG, 77% LG Lowest 25%<br>Writing- 90% HS Science- 59% HS |

**Instructional Coaches**

**# of instructional coaches**

4

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 10)

**Instructional Coach Information:**



| <b>Jennifer Borrelli</b>  |  |                             |
|---------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Full-time / School-based  | Years as Coach: 9  | Years at Current School: 15 |
| <b>Areas</b>              | Reading/Literacy, Data, RtI/MTSS   |                             |
| <b>Credentials</b>        | Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, Elementary K-6, Emotionally Handicap K-12, Mentally Handicap K-12, Reading Endorsement   |                             |
| <b>Performance Record</b> | <p>Lake Silver Elementary Reading Coach/MTSS-RtI Coach</p> <p>2008-09 School Grade A<br/>                     Reading 82%/Math 71%/Writing 81%/Science 40%/Reading Gains 75%/Math Gains 72%/Reading Lowest 25% 71%/Math Lowest 25% 87%</p> <p>2009-10 School Grade A<br/>                     Reading 76%/Math 75%/Writing 76%/Science 67%/Reading Gains 61%/Math Gains 69%/Reading Lowest 25% 60%/Math Lowest 25% 67%</p> <p>2010-11 School Grade B<br/>                     Reading 79%/Math 79%/Writing 93%/Science 61%/Reading Gains 69%/Math Gains 54%/Reading Lowest 25% 57%/Math Lowest 25% 42%</p> <p>2011-12 School Grade A<br/>                     Reading 67%/Math 55%/Writing 74%/Science 64%/Reading Gains 82%/Math Gains 72%/Reading Lowest 25% 90%/Math Lowest 25%</p> <p>2012-2013 School Grade B<br/>                     Reading 59%/Math 52%/Writing 46%/Science 52%/Reading Gains 60%/Math Gains 63%/Reading Lowest 25% 57%/Math Lowest 25% 66%</p> |                             |

| <b>Erin LeRoy</b>         |   |                            |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Full-time / School-based  | Years as Coach: 2   | Years at Current School: 6 |
| <b>Areas</b>              | Mathematics, Science, Data, Other   |                            |
| <b>Credentials</b>        | Bachelor of Arts, Elementary Education K-6  |                            |
| <b>Performance Record</b> | <p>2011-12 School Grade A<br/>                     Reading 67%/Math 55%/Writing 74%/Science 64%/Reading Gains 82%/Math Gains 72%/Reading Lowest 25% 90%/Math Lowest 25%</p> <p>2012-2013 School Grade B<br/>                     Reading 59%/Math 52%/Writing 46%/Science 52%/Reading Gains 60%/Math Gains 63%/Reading Lowest 25% 57%/Math Lowest 25% 66%</p> |                            |

| <b>Carol Hagemann</b>           |   |                                   |
|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Full-time / School-based</b> | <b>Years as Coach: 13</b>   | <b>Years at Current School: 0</b> |
| <b>Areas</b>                    | Reading/Literacy, Data, RtI/MTSS  |                                   |
| <b>Credentials</b>              | Bachelor of Arts Elementary Education 1-6, Early Childhood, ESOL K-12, Reading Endorsement  |                                   |
| <b>Performance Record</b>       | <p>District ELA Resource Teacher<br/>                 2012-2013 District Grade C<br/>                 Reading 59%/Math 59%/Writing 54%/Science 57%/Reading Gains 67%/Math Gains 67%/Reading Lowest 25% 66%/Math Lowest 25% 63%</p> <p>2011-2012 District Grade B<br/>                 Reading 57%/Math 57%/Writing 81%/Science 49%/Reading Gains 68%/Math Gains 68%/Reading Lowest 25% 69%/Math Lowest 25% 64%</p> <p>2010- 2011 District Grade B<br/>                 Reading 67%/Math 72%/Writing 83%/Science 48%/Reading Gains 60%/Math Gains 68%/Reading Lowest 25% 57%/Math Lowest 25% 65%</p> <p>2009-2010 District Grade A<br/>                 Reading 67%/Math 72%/Writing 85%/Science 47%/Reading Gains 62%/Math Gains 71%/Reading Lowest 25% 56%/Math Lowest 25% 66%</p> <p>2008-2009 District Grade A<br/>                 Reading 67%/Math 72%/Writing 88%/Science 46%/Reading Gains 63%/Math Gains 71%/Reading Lowest 25% 60%/Math Lowest 25% 66%</p> |                                   |

| Lynn Berger               |  |                            |
|---------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| Full-time / School-based  | Years as Coach: 8  | Years at Current School: 0 |
| <b>Areas</b>              | Rtl/MTSS, Other  |                            |
| <b>Credentials</b>        | Bachelor of Science in Exceptional Student Education<br>Masters, Educational Leadership<br>K-12 Certifications: Specific Learning Disabilities, Emotionally Handicapped, Mentally Handicapped  |                            |
| <b>Performance Record</b> | District ESE Resource Teacher<br>2012-2013 District Grade C<br>Reading 59%/Math 59%/Writing 54%/Science 57%/Reading Gains 67%/Math Gains 67%/Reading Lowest 25% 66%/Math Lowest 25% 63%<br>2011-2012 District Grade B<br>Reading 57%/Math 57%/Writing 81%/Science 49%/Reading Gains 68%/Math Gains 68%/Reading Lowest 25% 69%/Math Lowest 25% 64%<br>2010- 2011 District Grade B<br>Reading 67%/Math 72%/Writing 83%/Science 48%/Reading Gains 60%/Math Gains 68%/Reading Lowest 25% 57%/Math Lowest 25% 65%<br>2009-2010 District Grade A<br>Reading 67%/Math 72%/Writing 85%/Science 47%/Reading Gains 62%/Math Gains 71%/Reading Lowest 25% 56%/Math Lowest 25% 66%<br>2008-2009 District Grade A<br>Reading 67%/Math 72%/Writing 88%/Science 46%/Reading Gains 63%/Math Gains 71%/Reading Lowest 25% 60%/Math Lowest 25% 66% |                            |

**Classroom Teachers**

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <b># of classroom teachers</b>                | 55       |
| <b># receiving effective rating or higher</b> | 50, 91%  |
| <b># Highly Qualified Teachers</b>            | 100%     |
| <b># certified in-field</b>                   | 55, 100% |
| <b># ESOL endorsed</b>                        | 36, 65%  |
| <b># reading endorsed</b>                     | 10, 18%  |

**# with advanced degrees**

22, 40%

**# National Board Certified**

3, 5%

**# first-year teachers**

4, 7%

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

11, 20%

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

26, 47%

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

14, 25%

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

17

**# Highly Qualified**

17, 100%

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

9

**# 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**

The administration will work to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to Lake Silver Elementary. This will include working through the district to post vacancies in a timely manner. References will be checked in accordance with district guidelines by the administration. Administrators will also use the Effective Educators program to provide coaching and encouragement to teachers in order to increase retention of employees.

**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**

At Lake Silver, our New Teacher/Teacher Mentoring program's mission is to prepare new teachers to the profession and those new to Orange County through a structured induction program that introduces them to culture, expectations, and vision of Lake Silver and Orange County Public Schools. At Lake Silver Elementary, we have six Mentor teachers for Beginning Teachers. The

mentors were chosen based on experience at the grade level and/or area of expertise. The mentors first responsibility is to make sure that their beginning teacher is acclimated to the procedures of our school. The mentor is also responsible for guiding the beginning teacher through the Beginning Teacher Portfolio. The portfolio is a framework for beginning teachers to document completion of various professional development components, including: Differentiated Instruction, Classroom Management, Classroom Environment, Code of Ethics, Diversity, and Great Beginnings. The mentors are also responsible for meeting with their beginning teacher and guiding and reflecting through Deliberate Practice, the four domains within Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching, the Scope and Sequence of Curricular responsibilities, Progress Monitoring, Grading Procedures, Parent Conferences, Professional Development, Classroom Management and Rules and Procedures. Additionally, all New and Beginning Teachers are responsible for attending a monthly meeting. These meetings are established on the school calendar for the entire year before school begins. Much of the school and district expectations are explained in great detail at these meetings. Various key individuals throughout the school are invited to present at these meeting. In August, topics of discussion include introduction of administration and staff members, explain school procedures, orient new teachers to the building, orient new teachers to the daily record-keeping procedures of roll, lunch count, etc., and orient new teachers to their class roster and schedule. In September, topics of discussion include discussing data collection techniques and grading procedures, review the fall testing schedule, discuss Open House plans and procedures, discuss parent conferences/parent contact procedures, discuss emergency health, safety and weather procedures and offer classroom management tips. In October, the topics of discussion include classroom observations, discuss progress toward curriculum goals, discuss data analysis of assessments, discuss coping strategies for stress and review the monthly calendar and remind the new teachers of important dates. In November, topics of discussion include discussing professionalism in the workplace, setting up an opportunity for new teachers to observe another teacher on the same grade level, discuss field trip policies and plans, have the staffing coordinator discuss identification and referral process of special needs students and have the ESE resource teacher discuss IEP's and other resources for meeting the needs of students in the classroom. In December the topics of discussion are discussing progress in completing portfolio requirements, reflect on daily activities, new teacher self-reflection and setting of goals, offer to set up videotaping for a new teacher and review of the monthly calendar and important dates. In January, topics of discussion will include revisiting the teacher evaluation process and addressing concerns, evaluate progress toward curriculum goals, testing coordinator will review assessment procedures, benchmarks, FCAT, etc, and review the monthly calendar. In February, the topics of discussion will include reviewing the testing schedule for upcoming assessments, review progress in completing new teacher portfolio requirements, and review the monthly calendar. In March, topics of discussion will include a review of Deliberate Practice, review of Progress Monitoring, planning for spring parent conferences and assuring that New Teacher Portfolios are close to completion. In April, the topic of discussion will be completion of New Teacher Portfolio and reflection. Finally in May, we will have new teachers complete a survey and review the monthly calendar.

### **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**

Our problem-solving process begins with examining the school-wide data to analyze Tier I instructional needs for targeted, differentiated instruction to meet specific needs of all students. Upon further analysis of the data, Tier II and Tier III structures are determined.

The reading progress of all students is monitored by FAIR a minimum of 3 times per year to include a

baseline, mid-year, and end of the year assessment. The OCPS Benchmark tests are administered 2 times per year to all students in 3rd-5th grades. Additionally, student progress is monitored using screening and diagnostic assessment materials from our core curricular programs- Journeys and Go Math.

Struggling readers exhibiting substantial deficiencies in reading, receive immediate intensive intervention (iii) instruction that includes diagnostic assessments and frequent on-going progress monitoring. When assessment data such as FAIR (or other assessments) indicate that any student, K-5, is not making adequate progress, the MTSS Collaborative Problem Solving Team meets regularly to address the problem, analyze why it is occurring, design an intensive intervention plan targeted to meet a student's specific need, and monitor student progress as part of the District MTSS model.

Struggling readers who exhibit a substantial deficiency are provided additional daily immediate intensive intervention (iii) instruction until the deficiency is remediated. This Tier 2 or Tier 3 immediate intensive intervention focuses on the specific needs of students and is explicitly and systematically delivered for 30-45 minutes, beyond the 90-minute reading block, five days a week. This additional academic learning time is provided in a small group setting with 3-5 students or through one-on-one instruction. Tier 2 intervention is delivered by a highly qualified teacher or a certified, trained paraprofessional directly supervised by a highly qualified teacher. If a trained paraprofessional is working with Tier 2 students, they meet on a regular basis with the supervising teacher to discuss student progress. Tier 3 intervention is delivered by a highly qualified teacher.

Teachers, with the support of school-based coaches, match students' needs with intervention materials based on data. Placement will be fluid and reevaluated after each progress monitoring assessment using the Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) Model.

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

Cynthia Swanson (Principal) oversees the MTSS process, makes classroom observations and recommends strategies. Ashli Wilkerson (Staffing Coordinator) receives teachers concerns, schedules child study team meetings, sends reminders to all attending meetings, conducts the meeting, takes notes of the proceedings. Nathan Hay (Assistant Principal) serves as behavioral liaison, recommends strategies and interventions, assists with designing behavior charting plans, makes classroom observations, assists with progress monitoring.

Jennifer Borrelli (ELA/MTSS Instructional Coach) and Carol Hagemann (ELA Instructional Coach) collect academic performance data, initiate the problem solving model, provide instructional strategies and materials for teachers, assist with instructional groupings and progress monitoring, review current data, and make recommendations for interventions. Erin LeRoy (CRT/Instructional Coach) collects academic performance data, makes recommendations for instructional strategies and materials, schedules and monitors tutoring intervention when needed, and assists with progress monitoring. Lynn Berger (ESE CRT/Instructional Coach) and Stephanie Mason (VE Resource) serve as MTSS teacher leaders, participate in training opportunities, and help design and provide differentiated learning opportunities for students. Linda Guest (School Psychologist) reviews current data, makes recommendations for interventions, and assists with Problem Solving Process. Laura Weckerle (Guidance) and Darreyl Williams (Program Specialist) schedule and monitor our school mentoring program for students struggling academically or behaviorally.

Members of the MTSS Team assist in developing and implementing the school improvement plan. They make recommendations for assessments, interventions, and professional development based on the Problem Solving process, which is first used to help determine areas of need for Tier I core instruction. Those needs feed into our Professional Development plan. The Problem Solving process is then used to determine needs for Tier II and Tier II instruction as well as school/staff needs in those areas.

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

Leadership team members conduct bi-monthly data meetings to review Tier I and Tier II data and instruction. Discussions are held to determine if the core program is meeting the needs of 80% or more of the students and to make instructional decisions based on that data. Children who are not successful are further evaluated to determine the appropriate Tier II intervention. Individual and/or group problem-solving meetings using RIOT x ICEL between Tiers II and III are scheduled as needed. The MTSS Team works in cooperation with the Literacy Leadership Team to organize and coordinate efforts in terms of instruction, interventions, and progress monitoring. The teams also have many of the same members.

**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**

Kindergarten Data Sources:

FLKRS, FAIR, DRA 2, Early Literacy Survey, PAST, Journeys Assessments (Tier 1)

OPM Data (Tier 2 and 3)

PAST OPM (Tier 2 and 3)

Go Math formative assessments (Tier 1)

Go Math progress monitoring Do the Math Checks (Tier 2 and 3)

Teacher developed common formative assessments in reading (Tier 1)

Teacher developed common formative assessments in math (Tier 1)

Teacher developed common formative assessments in writing using district rubric (Tier 1)

Teacher developed common formative assessments in science using K-2 science lab sheet (Tier 1)

Writing prompts with rubrics (Tier 1)

First Grade Data Sources:

FAIR, DRA 2, Early Literacy Survey (Tier 1)

Journeys assessments-Comprehensive Screening, skills tests, selection tests, benchmark and unit tests (Tier 1)

PAST, CORE Phonics Survey, OPM Data (Tier 2 and 3)

PAST OPM, Journeys Progress Monitoring (Tier 2 and 3)

Go Math assessments (Tier 1)

Math fluency data (Tier 1)

Go Math progress monitoring Do the Math Checks (Tier 2 and 3)

Teacher developed common formative assessments in reading (Tier 1)

Teacher developed common formative assessments in math (Tier 1)

Teacher developed common formative assessments in writing using district rubric (Tier 1)

Teacher developed common formative assessments in science using K-2 science lab sheet (Tier 1)

Writing prompts with rubrics (Tier 1)

Second Grade Data Sources:

FAIR, DRA 2 (Tier 1)

Journeys assessments-Comprehensive Screening, skills tests, selection tests, benchmark and unit tests (Tier 1)

PAST, CORE Phonics Survey, OPM Data (Tier 2 and 3)

PAST OPM, Journeys Progress Monitoring (Tier 2 and 3)

Go Math assessments (Tier 1)

Go Math progress monitoring Do the Math Checks (Tier 2 and 3)

Math fluency data (Tier 1)

Teacher developed common formative assessments in reading (Tier 1)

Teacher developed common formative assessments in math (Tier 1)

Teacher developed common formative assessments in writing using district rubric (Tier 1)

Teacher developed common formative assessments in science using K-2 science lab sheet (Tier 1)

Writing prompts with rubrics (Tier 1)

Third - Fifth Grade Data Sources:

FAIR, OCPS Benchmark Reading and Math tests (all Tiers)

Journeys assessments-Comprehensive Screening, skills tests, selection tests, benchmark and unit tests (Tier 1)  
 CORE Phonics Survey (Tier 2 and 3)  
 OPM Data (Tier 2 and 3)  
 Intervention Program assessments (Tier 2 and 3)  
 Journeys leveled passages (Tier 2 and 3)  
 Orange County Writes (3rd and 4th grade, Tier 1)  
 CORE Vocabulary Survey (Tier 2 and 3)  
 OCPS Benchmark Science (5th grade only, Tier 1)  
 Go Math assessments (Tier 1)  
 Go Math progress monitoring Do the Math Checks (Tier 2 and 3)  
 Math fluency data (Tier 1)  
 Teacher developed common formative assessments in reading (Tier 1)  
 Teacher developed common formative assessments in math (Tier 1)  
 Teacher developed common formative assessments in writing using district rubric (Tier 1)  
 Writing prompts with rubrics (Tier 1)

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

Lake Silver Elementary began RtI in 2009-2010. Some of the initial training materials included logistical, step-by-step information for teachers, as well as philosophical background information regarding interventions and monitoring student progress. During the 2010-2011 school year, Lake Silver focused on creating a more comprehensive system of providing students with quality Tier II interventions that were matched to learner needs, engaging, and measurable. This included implementation of programs mentioned throughout the SIP. We worked with a district RtI resource teacher to more deeply investigate the Problem Solving Process, Intervention Design based on student data, and more effective progress monitoring. We worked with members of the District Literacy and RtI teams to pilot the use of diagnostic tools for Phonological Awareness and for Phonics, along with their respective progress monitoring measures. In 2011-2012, we fully implemented the tools that we had piloted, with Kindergarten, 1st and 2nd grade students in Tiers II and III, as well as identified 3-5 Tier III students. In 2012-2013, we continued professional development on the MTSS process during PLC's and Literacy Leadership Team meetings with school coaches.

In the current school year, MTSS will re-focus on using data to evaluate the effectiveness of core instruction along with the problem solving model. Training will include: roles and expectations of each MTSS team member; new user training on core reading and math programs and their applications when reviewing data, progress monitoring, and planning instruction; training on intervention programs included in Journeys and Go Math, along with their applications when reviewing data, progress monitoring, and planning instruction.

Support for MTSS will be provided in a variety of ways. Professional Learning Communities meet weekly as Common and Collaborative Planning Teams to focus on instruction, assessment, instructional strategies, and data analysis. They target core instruction, intervention and enrichment for students. Grade level members of the MTSS Team meet monthly to discuss instructional needs and progress monitoring; these members then report back to their grade level PLC's. In addition, continued emphasis on our school-wide Tier I behavior plan (CHAMPS) is ongoing, with new teachers attending training and ensuring that this is a common language throughout our school. Parents are instructed about the MTSS process at SAC and PTA meetings, through information sent home in newsletters, as well as Progress Monitoring letters sent home and parent conferences with individual students receiving interventions.

### **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:** 5,490

Students in grades 2-5 can participate in After School Fine Arts Clubs. Clubs for Art and Drama meet after school on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

**Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education

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

FCAT and behavioral data will be used to determine the effectiveness of this program.

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

Lindsay Thibault, Art  
 Mary Crisman, Music

**Strategy:** Summer Program  
**Minutes added to school year:** 900

Lake Silver teachers attended professional development focused on implementation of the Common Core State Standards for ELA. The cost for the consultant was shared with a neighboring elementary school.

**Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Teacher collaboration, planning and professional development

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

We will use formative assessments from Journeys (aligned with CCSS) to evaluate the effectiveness of this teacher professional development.

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

Cynthia Swanson, Principal; Erin LeRoy, CRT

**Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)**

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

| Name              | Title                          |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| Jennifer Borrelli | ELA + MTSS Instructional Coach |
| Carol Hagemann    | ELA Instructional Coach        |
| Cynthia Swanson   | Principal                      |

| <b>Name</b>        | <b>Title</b>             |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Erin LeRoy         | CRT/Instructional Coach  |
| Terrell Daniel     | Gifted, SAC Chair        |
| Nathan Hay         | Assistant Principal      |
| Margaret Murphy    | Media Specialist         |
| Margaret Martin    | Speech/Language          |
| Christie Abbott    | Kindergarten             |
| Dawn Dorris        | Kindergarten             |
| Katherine Pais     | Kindergarten             |
| Lindsey Topetcher  | Kindergarten             |
| Betty Reynolds     | First Grade              |
| Stephenny Luette   | Second Grade             |
| Amy Muccheck       | Second Grade             |
| Barbara Schessler  | Second Grade             |
| Erica Dail         | Third Grade              |
| Alexandra Kopatsis | Fourth Grade             |
| Jaqueline Arenth   | Fifth Grade              |
| Katherine Boyd     | Fifth Grade              |
| Stephanie Mason    | Varying Exceptionalities |
| Lynn Berger        | ESE CRT                  |

### **How the school-based LLT functions**

The LLT meets monthly and is facilitated by the ELA Instructional Coaches. Meetings and agendas are collaboratively planned and placed on the school calendar. The mission of the team is based on the district K-12 Reading Plan structure, to monitor the progress of reading and writing proficiency, to ensure that reading and writing are addressed in all content areas, and to provide teachers with the support and tools needed to successfully teach reading and writing skills in the classroom. This group works to ensure that professional development offerings are supportive of our school's needs and that funding is secured for initiatives. The Instructional Coaches bring back training information from the monthly Instructional Coach Staff Development meetings. The team focuses on ensuring that the needs of all learners are met using all tiers of instruction.

### **Major initiatives of the LLT**

Common Core State Standards for ELA

As this is the first year of implementation of these standards for grades 2-5 (and the second year for K-1), it is critical to continue to build teachers' understanding of the depth and complexity of the standards as well as the capacity to teach them fully. The expected results are that teachers will have a deeper understanding of the Common Core State Standards so that their teaching is aligned with the standards.

New core curriculum (Journeys) for use in Tier I and Tier II instruction

Teachers in grades K-5 also have two new core curriculum series, Journeys Reading and Go Math. It is critical that teachers understand the components of the new series as well as how to effectively utilize them for comprehensible instruction that meets the rigor and depth of the standards. The expected

results are for teachers to transition from being novice users to proficient practitioners of these series and for students to master the standards taught through these series.

#### Increasing rigor

This initiative was selected in order to support teachers' efforts to align instruction with activities and tasks at the complexity level of the standard. Teachers will have a greater understanding of levels of complexity/Depth of Knowledge and will be able to analyze the curricula and the activities to ensure that they are meeting the requirements for complexity for the standards.

#### Using the District Lesson Planning Template

This is a critical piece for teachers to be able to understand the connections between CCSS and classroom strategies and behaviors from the Marzano Art and Science of Teaching Framework and effectively utilize those understandings for the purposes of teaching and learning. The expected result is that through structured support in the use of this tool, teachers are better able to teach to the deeper understandings in their units of study.

### 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**

In May of each year, a Tiger Tot tour is offered to parents and students to become familiar with the campus and visit classrooms and school facilities. In August, kindergarten teachers conduct school orientation sessions for students. All Kindergarten students are screened with FLKRS. Interventions are put in place based on FLKRS data.

## 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               | 66%           | 59%           | No          | 69%           |
| American Indian            |               |               |             |               |
| Asian                      |               |               |             |               |
| Black/African American     | 55%           | 44%           | No          | 60%           |
| Hispanic                   | 56%           | 52%           | No          | 60%           |
| White                      | 80%           | 79%           | No          | 82%           |
| English language learners  | 50%           | 43%           | No          | 55%           |
| Students with disabilities | 40%           | 34%           | No          | 46%           |
| Economically disadvantaged | 56%           | 44%           | No          | 60%           |

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

|  | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3          | 71            | 25%           | 28%           |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 85            | 30%           | 33%           |

#### Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

|  | 2013 Actual #                              | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> |               | 22%           |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7   | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> |               | 36%           |

#### Learning Gains

|   | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)       | 143           | 60%           | 63%           |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0) | 35            | 57%           | 60%           |

**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) | 26            | 63%           | 66%           |
| Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)   | 14            | 34%           | 39%           |
| Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)  | 10            | 23%           | 28%           |

**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 | 34   | 46%           | 60%           |
| Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4               | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> |               | 53%           |

**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               | 61%           | 52%           | No          | 65%           |
| American Indian            |               |               |             |               |
| Asian                      |               |               |             |               |
| Black/African American     | 50%           | 39%           | No          | 55%           |
| Hispanic                   | 56%           | 56%           | Yes         | 60%           |
| White                      | 75%           | 67%           | No          | 78%           |
| English language learners  | 50%           | 43%           | No          | 55%           |
| Students with disabilities | 38%           | 30%           | No          | 45%           |
| Economically disadvantaged | 51%           | 39%           | No          | 56%           |

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

|  | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3          | 64            | 22%           | 25%           |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 70            | 25%           | 28%           |

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

|  | 2013 Actual #                              | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | 10   | 37%           | 40%           |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7   | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> |               | 25%           |

**Learning Gains**

|   | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Learning Gains  | 150           | 63%           | 66%           |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC) | 28            | 66%           | 69%           |

**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          | 19            | 24%           | 27%           |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 21            | 26%           | 29%           |

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

|  | 2013 Actual #                              | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> |               | 36%           |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7   | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> |               | 20%           |

**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) | 6             |               | 10          |
| Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students  | 570           | 85%           | 100%        |

**Area 8: Early Warning Systems**

**Elementary School Indicators**

|   | <b>2013 Actual #</b> | <b>2013 Actual %</b> | <b>2014 Target %</b> |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time  | 84                   | 13%                  | 10%                  |
| Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.   | 109                  | 17%                  | 15%                  |
| Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade   | 44                   | 37%                  | 34%                  |
| Students who receive two or more behavior referrals   | 65                   | 10%                  | 8%                   |
| Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S. | 44                   | 7%                   | 5%                   |

## Goals Summary

- G1.** Increase student achievement by aligning grade level content to the standards and to Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework

## Goals Detail

**G1.** Increase student achievement by aligning grade level content to the standards and to Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework

### Targets Supported

- All Areas
- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA)
- 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

### Resources Available to Support the Goal

- OCPS Unit Lesson Planning Template
- Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework
- Deconstructed Standards
- Becoming a Reflective Teacher
- Cognitive matrices- Hess, Webb, Bloom, Marzano
- Support from the OCPS Minority Achievement Office
- Common and collaborative planning time

### Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Unfamiliarity with using Common Core State Standards for planning standards-based instruction, monitoring, and decision-making
- Lack of understanding connections between standards and elements from the Art and Science of Teaching Framework



## Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Monitor progress toward increasing student achievement using standards-based instruction

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Classroom teachers, Instructional Coaches, Administrators

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

Fall and Winter OCPS Benchmark tests, after each Journeys unit of instruction, after each Go Math chapter, Orange Writes (Sept., Oct., Dec., Jan.),

### **Evidence of Completion:**

OCPS Benchmark data, Journeys Benchmark and Unit Assessment data, Orange Writes, Unique Learning Systems unit data

## Action Plan for Improvement

### Problem Solving Key

**G** = Goal

**B** = Barrier

**S** = Strategy

**G1.** Increase student achievement by aligning grade level content to the standards and to Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework

**G1.B2** Unfamiliarity with using Common Core State Standards for planning standards-based instruction, monitoring, and decision-making

**G1.B2.S1** Classroom teachers participate in professional development on Common Core State Standards

### Action Step 1

Attend professional development on Common Core State Standards for ELA

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Principal and CRT

#### Target Dates or Schedule

August 5 (K-2), August 6 (3-5)

#### Evidence of Completion

Attendance logs

#### Facilitator:

Kathy Oropallo, EduSoar Learning Corp.

#### Participants:

Cynthia Swanson, Erin LeRoy, Jennifer Borrelli, Carol Hagemann, Robin McCauley, Dawn Dorris, Beth Maroney, Christina Biondo, Joyce Nichols, Betty Reynolds, Laura Holihan, Evelyn Ortiz, Paige White, Barbie Schessler, Amy Mucheck, Courtney Bass, Marina Cravey, Carla Wassil, Michelle Forsyth, Sandy McNary, Michelle Fabrizio, Erica Dail, Tami Heins, Andrea Kopatsis, Katharine Boyd, Jackie Arenth, Stephanie Mason, Cindy Rusnak, Terrell Daniel, Linda Guest

## Action Step 2

Ongoing professional development in using CCSS to plan instruction for units, weeks, days

### Person or Persons Responsible

Instructional Coaches

### Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly at Common and Collaborative Planning Team meetings

### Evidence of Completion

Meeting Agendas, Meeting Notes

### Facilitator:

Carol Hagemann, Jennifer Borrelli, Lynn Berger

### Participants:

Classroom and resource teachers

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

Monitor alignment of the standards to instruction

### Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coaches

### Target Dates or Schedule

Common and collaborative planning team meetings, classroom walk-throughs, iObservation

### Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans, walk-through and observation notes

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S1

Monitor alignment of the standards to instruction

### Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coaches

### Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly data meetings, classroom walk-throughs, iObservation

### Evidence of Completion

Journeys Benchmark and Unit Assessments, Writing Samples, Formative Assessments

**G1.B4** Lack of understanding connections between standards and elements from the Art and Science of Teaching Framework

**G1.B4.S1** Classroom teachers participate in professional development on core curriculum series

**Action Step 1**

Initial User Training for Journeys, Go Math

**Person or Persons Responsible**

District Trainers, Instructional Coaches

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Initial user trainings were provided by OCPS during the summer. Lake Silver instructional coaches provided initial user training for Journeys during preplanning as many teachers did not attend during the summer.

**Evidence of Completion**

Rosters of attendees

**Facilitator:**

Carol Hagemann, Jennifer Borrelli

**Participants:**

Lake Silver classroom and resource teachers

**Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B4.S1**

Monitor that Journeys and GoMath are being implemented as intended

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administrators, Instructional Coaches

**Target Dates or Schedule**

During classroom walk-throughs and observations

**Evidence of Completion**

Lesson plans, observation notes

## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B4.S1

Monitor that Journeys and GoMath are being implemented effectively

### Person or Persons Responsible

Administrators, Instructional Coaches

### Target Dates or Schedule

During classroom walk-throughs and observations, during data meetings

### Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans, observation notes, Journeys and GoMath assessment data

**G1.B4.S2** Classroom teachers participate in professional development to gain an understanding of Marzano's Art and Science Design Questions with a focus on the implementation of DQ3, DQ4, and DQ9

### Action Step 1

Provide initial training in the new Design Questions being monitored in 2013-2014, DQ's 3, 4, and 9.

### Person or Persons Responsible

Administrators, Instructional Coaches

### Target Dates or Schedule

At faculty professional development during September (DQ3), October (DQ9), and January (DQ4)

### Evidence of Completion

Workshop handouts, attendance rosters

### Facilitator:

Jennifer Borrelli, Erin LeRoy, Carol Hagemann, Lynn Berger, Nathan Hay

### Participants:

Lake Silver Elementary faculty members

### **Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B4.S2**

Implement initial training in DQ's 3, 4, and 9.

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

Administrators, Instructional Coaches

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

Faculty professional development in September, October, and November

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Presentation handouts, attendance rosters

### **Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B4.S2**

Evaluate effectiveness of initial training in DQ's 3, 4, and 9.

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

Administrators, Instructional Coaches

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

During walk-throughs and classroom observations

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Walk-through and observation data, including teacher scores on the scales for DQ's 3, 4, and 9.

**G1.B4.S3** Classroom teachers participate in Common Lesson Planning professional development with completed Unit Lesson Plans being provided

**Action Step 1**

Provide teachers with a planned unit of instruction using the OCPS Lesson Planning Template; teachers will complete the daily/weekly instructional plans within the unit. Instructional coaches will use the Gradual Release model with teachers in unit lesson planning.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Instructional coaches

**Target Dates or Schedule**

1 professional development day each quarter with grade level common and collaborative planning teams

**Evidence of Completion**

Unit lesson plans, Weekly lesson plans, walk-throughs and observations

**Facilitator:**

Instructional Coaches

**Participants:**

Lake Silver faculty members

**Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B4.S3**

Use of the OCPS Lesson Planning Template; along with the daily/weekly instructional plans within the unit; Gradual Release model with teachers in unit lesson planning.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administrators, Instructional Coaches

**Target Dates or Schedule**

After each quarterly Professional Development day for a grade level team

**Evidence of Completion**

completed OCPS Lesson Planning Templates for units of instruction, instructional plans

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B4.S3

Evaluate effective use of the OCPS Lesson Planning Template

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administrators, Instructional Coaches

**Target Dates or Schedule**

At the end of each unit of instruction

**Evidence of Completion**

completed planning templates, student data on unit formative assessments

**G1.B4.S4** Classroom teachers participate in weekly common and collaborative planning team meetings using the district provided lesson planning template as a guide to ensure the alignment of standards based instruction with the Design Questions

**Action Step 1**

Teachers meet weekly with the PLC teams for common and collaborate planning focused on aligning instruction to the standards through effective use of the Design Questions

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Instructional coaches, Administrators

**Target Dates or Schedule**

at weekly C+CPT meetings

**Evidence of Completion**

C+CPT meeting agendas

### Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B4.S4

Determine that weekly C+CPT meetings focus on aligning instruction to standards and Marzano

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Administrators, Instructional Coaches

**Target Dates or Schedule**

monthly examination of weekly meeting notes

**Evidence of Completion**

C+CPT meeting notes



## Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B4.S4

Determine effectiveness of weekly C+CPT meetings focusing on aligning instruction to standards and Marzano

### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Administrators, Instructional Coaches

### **Target Dates or Schedule**

after units of instruction

### **Evidence of Completion**

Chapter, Benchmark and Unit Assessment data

## 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 II funds and SAI funds will be used to pay for substitutes for teachers to attend quarterly professional development days with their grade level teams.

## 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 student achievement by aligning grade level content to the standards and to Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework

**G1.B2** Unfamiliarity with using Common Core State Standards for planning standards-based instruction, monitoring, and decision-making

**G1.B2.S1** Classroom teachers participate in professional development on Common Core State Standards

### PD Opportunity 1

Attend professional development on Common Core State Standards for ELA

#### Facilitator

Kathy Oropallo, EduSoar Learning Corp.

#### Participants

Cynthia Swanson, Erin LeRoy, Jennifer Borrelli, Carol Hagemann, Robin McCauley, Dawn Dorris, Beth Maroney, Christina Biondo, Joyce Nichols, Betty Reynolds, Laura Holihan, Evelyn Ortiz, Paige White, Barbie Schessler, Amy Muccheck, Courtney Bass, Marina Cravey, Carla Wassil, Michelle Forsyth, Sandy McNary, Michelle Fabrizio, Erica Dail, Tami Heins, Andrea Kopatsis, Katharine Boyd, Jackie Arenth, Stephanie Mason, Cindy Rusnak, Terrell Daniel, Linda Guest

#### Target Dates or Schedule

August 5 (K-2), August 6 (3-5)

#### Evidence of Completion

Attendance logs

## PD Opportunity 2

Ongoing professional development in using CCSS to plan instruction for units, weeks, days

### Facilitator

Carol Hagemann, Jennifer Borrelli, Lynn Berger

### Participants

Classroom and resource teachers

### Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly at Common and Collaborative Planning Team meetings

### Evidence of Completion

Meeting Agendas, Meeting Notes

**G1.B4** Lack of understanding connections between standards and elements from the Art and Science of Teaching Framework

**G1.B4.S1** Classroom teachers participate in professional development on core curriculum series

## PD Opportunity 1

Initial User Training for Journeys, Go Math

### Facilitator

Carol Hagemann, Jennifer Borrelli

### Participants

Lake Silver classroom and resource teachers

### Target Dates or Schedule

Initial user trainings were provided by OCPS during the summer. Lake Silver instructional coaches provided Initial user training for Journeys during preplanning as many teachers did not attend during the summer.

### Evidence of Completion

Rosters of attendees

**G1.B4.S2** Classroom teachers participate in professional development to gain an understanding of Marzano's Art and Science Design Questions with a focus on the implementation of DQ3, DQ4, and DQ9

**PD Opportunity 1**

Provide initial training in the new Design Questions being monitored in 2013-2014, DQ's 3, 4, and 9.

**Facilitator**

Jennifer Borrelli, Erin LeRoy, Carol Hagemann, Lynn Berger, Nathan Hay

**Participants**

Lake Silver Elementary faculty members

**Target Dates or Schedule**

At faculty professional development during September (DQ3), October (DQ9), and January (DQ4)

**Evidence of Completion**

Workshop handouts, attendance rosters

**G1.B4.S3** Classroom teachers participate in Common Lesson Planning professional development with completed Unit Lesson Plans being provided

**PD Opportunity 1**

Provide teachers with a planned unit of instruction using the OCPS Lesson Planning Template; teachers will complete the daily/weekly instructional plans within the unit. Instructional coaches will use the Gradual Release model with teachers in unit lesson planning.

**Facilitator**

Instructional Coaches

**Participants**

Lake Silver faculty members

**Target Dates or Schedule**

1 professional development day each quarter with grade level common and collaborative planning teams

**Evidence of Completion**

Unit lesson plans, Weekly lesson plans, walk-throughs and observations

## Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

### Budget Summary by Goal

| Goal  | Description  | Total   |
|-------|--|---------|
| G1.   | Increase student achievement by aligning grade level content to the standards and to Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework | \$2,141 |
| Total |  | \$2,141 |

### Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

| Funding Source                              | Professional Development | Total   |
|---|--------------------------|---------|
| School budget                               | \$2,125                  | \$2,125 |
| Title II funds, \$2,100 SAI funds, \$14,400 | \$16                     | \$16    |
| Total                                       | \$2,141                  | \$2,141 |

### Budget Details

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

**G1.** Increase student achievement by aligning grade level content to the standards and to Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework

**G1.B2** Unfamiliarity with using Common Core State Standards for planning standards-based instruction, monitoring, and decision-making

**G1.B2.S1** Classroom teachers participate in professional development on Common Core State Standards

#### Action Step 1

Attend professional development on Common Core State Standards for ELA

#### Resource Type

Professional Development

#### Resource

12 teachers attended the K-2 CCSS ELA professional development on August 5; 13 teachers attended the 3-5 CCSS ELA professional development in August 6. Each received an \$85 stipend.

#### Funding Source

School budget

#### Amount Needed

\$2,125

**G1.B4** Lack of understanding connections between standards and elements from the Art and Science of Teaching Framework

**G1.B4.S3** Classroom teachers participate in Common Lesson Planning professional development with completed Unit Lesson Plans being provided

**Action Step 1**

Provide teachers with a planned unit of instruction using the OCPS Lesson Planning Template; teachers will complete the daily/weekly instructional plans within the unit. Instructional coaches will use the Gradual Release model with teachers in unit lesson planning.

**Resource Type**

Professional Development

**Resource**

Grade level teams of teachers will have quarterly release days for structured professional development focused on using the standards, grade level content, and applying elements from the Art and Science of Teaching to increase student achievement.

**Funding Source**

Title II funds, \$2,100 SAI funds, \$14,400

**Amount Needed**

\$16