

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Apopka Elementary
675 DIXIE HWY
Apopka, FL 32712
407-884-2200

School Demographics

School Type Elementary School	Title I Yes	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate 74%
Alternative/ESE Center No	Charter School No	Minority Rate 75%

School Grades History

2013-14 C	2012-13 C	2011-12 D	2010-11 C
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

SIP Authority and Template

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

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

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
Differentiated Accountability	4
Part I: Current School Status	5
Part II: Expected Improvements	16
Goals Summary	22
Goals Detail	22
Action Plan for Improvement	25
Part III: Coordination and Integration	33
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	34
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	35

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

Apopka Elementary

Principal

Sandra Pipkin

School Advisory Council chair

Leigh Burritt

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

Name	Title
Jason Fritz	Assistant Principal
Pam Tarpley	Dean-Instructional Coach
Jennifer Dempsey	Dean-Instructional Coach
Ruby Johnson	Reading Coach
Yulimey Gonzalez	CCT
Helena Gurgone	Media
Denise Palmerini	Secretary
James Montgomery	Guidance

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

Leigh Burritt (parent)-Chairperson
 James Montgomery (OCPS employee, Guidance Counselor)-Co-Chairperson
 Darlene Tyler (parent)
 Joe Serwe (Community Representative)
 Kim Rogers (parent)
 Marilou Blackberg (parent)
 Sandra Pipkin (Principal)
 Kim Mowatt (parent)

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

The involvement of SAC is to develop and review climate surveys from students, teachers, and parents of Apopka Elementary. The findings of the climate surveys assist in developing goals for the needs of the school. The SAC will review school grade data from the prior school year to assist in developing action plans for the current school year. Prior to the submission of the school improvement plan to the school district, the SAC will review the plan and conduct a vote by SAC members for acceptance of the plan for the current school year.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

- Support Title I activities and compliance
- Review new SAC membership for balance and representation
- Review SAC by-laws
- Review & develop climate surveys of parents, teachers, students
- Assist with green school activities
- Assist and plan with administration for new school development

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

Apopka ES does not have any school improvement funds.

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:

Sandra Pipkin		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 16	Years at Current School: 2

Credentials	<p>BS in Elementary Education MS in Educational Leadership Certification- Elementary Education, ESOL, Principal</p>
Performance Record	<p>Principal of Apopka Elementary, 2012-2013, Grade-C 53% meeting high standards in Reading, 53% meeting high standards in Math, 47% meeting high standards in Writing, and 36% meeting high standards in Science. AMO Reading Target Met. AMO Math Target Met.</p> <p>Principal of Meadow Woods ES, 2011-2012, Grade-A, 59% meeting high standards in reading, 58% meeting high standards in math, 86% meeting high standards in writing, 52% meeting high standards in science. AMO Reading Target Not Met. AMO Math Target Not Met.</p> <p>Principal of Meadow Woods ES, 2010-2011, Grade-A, AYP not met, 69% meeting high standards in reading, 69% meeting high standards in math, 92% meeting high standards in writing, 50% meeting high standards in science.</p> <p>Principal of Meadow Woods ES, 2009-2010, Grade-A, AYP not met, 78% meeting high standards in reading, 83% meeting high standards in math, 80% meeting high standards in writing, 49% meeting high standards in science.</p> <p>Principal of Meadow Woods ES, 2008-2009, Grade-A, AYP met, 77% meeting high standards in reading, 77% meeting high standards in math, 99% meeting high standards in writing, 35% meeting high standards in science.</p>

Jason Fritz		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 4	Years at Current School: 1

Credentials	<p>BS in Elementary Education MS in Administration and Supervision Certification- Elementary Education, ESOL, Administration</p>
Performance Record	<p>Assistant Principal Pinewood Elementary, 2012-2013, Grade D, Reading: 45% meeting high standards, Math: 38% meeting high standards, Writing: 31% meeting high standards, and Science: 47% meeting high standards. AMO Reading Target Not Met. AMO Math Target Not Met.</p> <p>Assistant Principal Pinewood Elementary, 2011-2012, Grade C, 44% meeting high standards in Reading, 62% meeting learning gains, 67% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading. 41% meeting high standards in Math, 66% meeting learning gains, 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Math.</p> <p>Assistant Principal Pinewood Elementary, 2010-2011, Grade B, 64% meeting high standards in Reading, 70% meeting learning gains, 66% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading 64% meeting high standards in Math, 64% meeting learning gains, 70% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Math. AYP: 82% did not meet AYP with Blacks, ED, and ELL students</p> <p>Assistant Principal Lake Gem Elementary, 2009-2010, Grade A, 76% meeting high standards in Reading, 67% meeting learning gains, 52% of lowest 25% made learning gains in reading Math: 72% meeting high standards, 59% making learning gains, 67% of lowest 25% made learning gains in Math. AYP: 85%, did not meet AYP with Blacks, and Economically Disadvantage students. Met AYP for ELL in Reading.</p>

Instructional Coaches

of instructional coaches
3

receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach:	Years at Current School:
Areas	Mathematics	
Credentials	Bachelors - Elementary Education K-6 ESOL	

Performance Record

Pam Tarpley		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 7	Years at Current School: 0
Areas	Mathematics	
Credentials	BS Elementary Ed MAED; Educational Leadership	
Performance Record	<p>Boggy Creek Elementary (Osceola County), 2012-2013, Grade C Boggy Creek ES, 2011-2012, Grade C, 52% met high standards in Reading, 52% met high standards in Math, 37% met high standards in Writing, 76% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading, 64% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Math. AMO Reading Target Not Met. AMO Math Target Not Met.</p> <p>2011-2012 Boggy Creek ES, Grade C, 52% met high standards in Reading, 51% met high standards in Math, 37% met high standards in Writing, 82% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading, 76% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Math.</p> <p>2010-2011 Boggy Creek ES, Grade A: 95% of AYP met.</p>	

Jennifer Dempsey		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 1	Years at Current School: 2
Areas	Mathematics	
Credentials	Bachelors and Masters in Early Childhood Education ESOL certification	
Performance Record	<p>Apopka Elementary School, 2012-2013, Grade C, 54% met high standards in Reading, 53% met high standards in Math, 47% met high standards in Writing, 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading, 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Math. AMO Reading Target Met. AMO Math Target Met.</p>	

Ruby Johnson		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 5	Years at Current School: 1
Areas	Reading/Literacy	
Credentials	BS Elementary, Reading Endorsement, ESOL	
Performance Record	<p>Apopka Elementary, 2012-2013, Grade C, 54% met high standards in Reading, 53% met high standards in Math, 47% met high standards in Writing, 63% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading, 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Math. AMO Reading Target Met. AMO Math Target Met.</p> <p>Meadow Woods Elementary, 2011-2012, Grade A, 59% met high standards in Reading, 58% met high standards in Math. 86% met high standards in Writing, 77% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading, 71% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Math. AMO Reading Target Not Met. AMO Math Target Not Met.</p> <p>Meadow Woods Elementary, 2010-2011, Grade A, 77% of AYP criteria met</p>	

Classroom Teachers

# of classroom teachers	58
# receiving effective rating or higher	51, 88%
# Highly Qualified Teachers	100%
# certified in-field	47, 81%
# ESOL endorsed	35, 60%
# reading endorsed	9, 16%
# with advanced degrees	, 0%
# National Board Certified	0, 0%
# first-year teachers	3, 5%
# with 1-5 years of experience	31, 53%
# with 6-14 years of experience	18, 31%

with 15 or more years of experience

6, 10%

Education Paraprofessionals**# of paraprofessionals**

26

Highly Qualified

26, 100%

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

0

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

Apopka ES provides a high-quality mentoring program that supports and welcomes beginning and new to Apopka teachers alike. Apopka ES also provides numerous PD opportunities as well as modeling of lessons and co-teaching in the classroom. Apopka ES also implements a functioning and effective PLC for teachers to collaborate together on a weekly basis.

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

Ruby Johnson is our Teacher Mentoring Program coordinator. Apopka ES has also created a "New Teacher Orientation Committee". The committee is responsible for mentoring/training teachers that are new to the school, or new to a grade level. The goal is to provide support and build positive relationships through mentoring. Mentors hold weekly meetings, model lessons, co-teach, team build, and analyze data, together, throughout the year.

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

All MTSS team members play an active role in each step of the process to ensure optimum intervention development and implementation.

Step 1:

A. The teacher is the person that spends the most time with the student and therefore, has the most

knowledge of the student. The teacher indicates that there is something impeding the academic success of a student and submits that student's name and information to the MTSS team.

B. The leadership team will analyze students' prior year FCAT or standardized test scores to identify if a deficiency exists (observed level of performance vs. expected level of performance).

Step 2: Analyze the problem by looking at all available data as well as qualitative information from the student's cumulative folder and past teacher notes (fact finding-whole child), generate hypotheses, validate selected hypotheses by bringing the student's prior year teacher into the fold to utilize their expertise (if available).

Step 3: Design and implement appropriate intervention for that individual's needs (plan/framework).

Step 4: Re-evaluate the student's growth while analyzing deficiencies that persist or have emerged to ensure that his/her plan is meeting his/her individual needs.

Step 5: Re-evaluate the student and make adjustments to the plan.

Step 6: Provide continued support and re-evaluation.

The principal will meet weekly with each grade level team to continually reassess, and provide support, for developing PLCs with the appropriate MTSS process. The MTSS Leadership team will meet monthly to process data, address multi-tiered instruction/intervention and progress monitoring.

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

The Guidance Counselor/LEA Representative: coordinates the MTSS process with all team members, is the liaison between the school and the parents, coordinates the intervention implementation, and assists the teacher in successful intervention implementation.

Principal/Assistant Principal: provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that MTSS is at the core of the grade level PLC, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS consistently across grade levels and school, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.

General Education Teachers: provide information about core instruction and student's unique deficiencies, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities, and provides ongoing documentation of all MTSS implementation and the subsequent results.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teacher: participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, provides strategies to/for the general education teachers, and collaborates with general education teachers to assist them in meeting the individual needs of the students.

Reading Teacher: provides guidance on district/school K-12 reading plan, facilitates and supports data collection activities (such as administering DRAs and training teachers on how to administer assessments), assists in data analysis, helps provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

Instructional Coaches: coordinates grade level assessments, breaks down data and assists teachers with understanding the data, assists teachers in understanding/implementing effective data-based decisions, and provides insight to the MTSS administration team regarding individual students/classes data.

School Psychologist: participates in data analysis and interpretation, is the liaison to the district and provides information and updates to the team, adds insight into the social/emotional/mental impairments/challenges of the student, provides support and assists in the development of intervention plans, provides training for: data analysis, data-based decision making, problem solving, intervention planning/creation, and the art of reflection.

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

The administrative team and support staff will meet weekly with grade level teams to assist them in identifying Tier 2 and 3 students. After students are identified, the proper processes will be developed to support the individual students in their academic pursuits. The guidance counselor and school psychologist will be brought into the fold to assist in streamlining the process to get the individuals the assistance they require and to ensure county policies and assistance are utilized.

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

Reading: PY FCAT, FAIR, Performance Matters Benchmark tests, DRAs, common formative and summative assessments, and computer-based programs (Read 180, Earobics).

Math: PY FCAT, FAIR, Performance Matters Benchmark tests, common formative and summative assessments and computer-based programs (FASTT Math, ST Math)

Writing: PY FCAT, school-wide writing prompts, grade level writing rubrics, common formative and summative assessments.

Behavior: behavior checklists (and subsequent behavior documentation), discipline referrals and additional teacher documentation.

Science: common formative and summative assessments, and computer-based programs: FCAT Explorer/FOCUS

All of the above assessment sources will be utilized to drive instructional decision-making and to determine appropriate interventions.

Teachers will meet frequently to analyze grade level and classroom data with the coaching assistance of members of the MTSS Leadership team to determine instructional matches and identify progress monitoring systems.

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

Apopka Elementary teachers were introduced to the RtI/MTSS process during the 2009-10 school year. District resource RtI/MTSS personnel worked with the team during the 2010-11 and 2011-12 school years on data analysis of the FAIR assessments and this year, district RtI/MTSS personnel and the Apopka MTSS team will provide staff training on the MTSS process. Training for all staff will continue on an "as needed basis" for teachers that have been at Apopka ES. New teachers and teachers requiring additional support, will receive training at the beginning of the 2013-2014 school year and continue as needed. The school psychologist and guidance counselor will attend district meetings and share information monthly with the instructional staff. There will be staff meetings where everyone will be trained on the current MTSS process.

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

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

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

Strategy: Before or After School Program

Minutes added to school year: 2,880

Apopka hosts an after school tutoring program to target students with high needs in our core subjects of reading and math. Tutoring is offered twice per week at 60 minutes per session. After school tutoring takes place from October to April. Research based material is used by highly qualified personnel for instruction.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

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

Data will be collected through progress monitoring. We will use Performance Matters benchmark assessments, as well as the assessments from the intervention programs to monitor effectiveness and to make necessary changes in the instructional plan.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

Name	Title
Sandra Pipkin	Principal
Jason Fritz	Assistant Principal
Ruby Johnson	Reading Coach
Helena Gurgone	Media
Debra Comer	Reading Resource
Raechel Cain	Reading Resource
Donna McRee	Reading Resource
Yvonne Ferney	Kindergarten Teacher
Georgia Bukowski	1st Grade Teacher
Leena Patel	2nd Grade Teacher
Krisite Hutton	3rd Grade Teacher
Nicole Larson	4th Grade Teacher
Deborah Blakeslee	5th Grade Teacher
Tammy Thurmond	ESE Team Leader

How the school-based LLT functions

The LLT will meet monthly to address school wide literacy issues, assist in developing the literacy instructional proficiency of our staff composed of a majority of new staff members, reflect upon professional development initiatives that have been delivered, monitor reading data, oversee school wide

intervention/enrichment time, plan and execute parent training, and help implement a common language in grades K-5 on the six core comprehension strategies.

Major initiatives of the LLT

The major initiatives of the LLT this year will be to develop activities that will infuse literacy and increase vocabulary across the curriculum through media, technology, AR, book fairs, parent nights and extra-curricular activities with literacy emphasis. These activities will be planned in conjunction with other schoolwide events to maximize potential parent participation.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

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

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

Apopka Elementary School seeks the input from all area preschool programs. It is our hope that through open lines of communication we can receive academic/behavioral student information from the programs, while keeping them abreast of our summer kindergarten orientations. Individual tours are also given to interested families throughout the year to assist in the transition to kindergarten.

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

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

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	54%	54%	Yes	59%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	49%	50%	Yes	54%
Hispanic	53%	46%	No	58%
White	68%	69%	Yes	71%
English language learners	47%	41%	No	52%
Students with disabilities	37%	27%	Yes	43%
Economically disadvantaged	49%	48%	No	54%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	76	25%	28%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	80	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>		27%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		47%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	137	69%	72%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	36	75%	78%

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)	82	53%	56%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	36	23%	26%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	38	25%	28%

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	53	45%	48%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	39	35%	38%

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%	53%	Yes	58%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	48%	40%	No	54%
Hispanic	56%	57%	Yes	60%
White	63%	64%	Yes	66%
English language learners	48%	54%	Yes	54%
Students with disabilities	29%	28%	No	36%
Economically disadvantaged	48%	51%	Yes	54%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	87	27%	30%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	76	24%	27%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		53%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		15%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	124	63%	66%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	30	61%	64%

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			

Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

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

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

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

Area 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	18	17%	20%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	21	20%	23%

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>		0%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		0%

Middle School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

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

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	20	7%	15%

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

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

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	215	30%	25%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	9	1%	1%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	38	38%	30%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	9	1%	1%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	23	3%	1%

Middle School Indicators

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

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

PIP will be linked to this report.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
--------	---------------	---------------	---------------

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

Specific Additional Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
--------	---------------	---------------	---------------

Goals Summary

- G1.** Apopka Elementary will increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

- G2.** Apopka Elementary will increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment.

- G3.** Apopka Elementary School will increase the percentage of students who score at or above Level 3.5 on FCAT Writes.

Goals Detail

G1. Apopka Elementary will increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

Targets Supported

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- HMH Journeys -- Comprehensive Core Reading Program (Tier I) - used daily by classroom teachers for whole and small group instruction within a 90-minute, uninterrupted block of time.
- LLI (Leveled Literacy Instruction) -- (Tier II) -- used by resource teachers for small group interventions at all grade levels on a daily basis for 40 minutes outside of the 90-minute reading block.
- Phonics Bags (Benchmark Education Co) -- (Tier II) -- used for small group interventions at all grade levels on a daily basis for 30 - 40 minutes by classroom teachers and/or resource teachers.
- Making Meaning -- a reading program for whole group instruction; to be used for on-level students during the intervention block.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Students lack comprehension and phonics skills.
- There is limited time for teachers to analyze data and plan accordingly.
- The HMH Journeys Comprehensive Core Reading Program is new to all instructional staff who have had limited, if any, training.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Observations; student data

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal; Assistant Principal; Literacy Coach

Target Dates or Schedule:

Weekly

Evidence of Completion:

Notes; calendar; student data

G2. Apopka Elementary will increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment.

Targets Supported

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Teachers
- Math Coaches
- Go Math
- Performance Matters
- Scope and Sequence provided by the district

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teachers are in the process of learning a newly adopted math curriculum.
- Newly adopted curriculum focuses on Common Core State Standards and does not include some of the NGSSS that will be tested on the Math FCAT 2.0 Assessment.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Focus calendars, lesson plans, and classroom instruction includes NGSSS tested standards.

Person or Persons Responsible

School administrators

Target Dates or Schedule:

Daily during classroom observations of math instructions aligned to monthly focus calendars and weekly/daily lesson plans.

Evidence of Completion:

Student data from mini benchmark assessments which include NGSSS tested standards not addressed in newly adopted curriculum.

G3. Apopka Elementary School will increase the percentage of students who score at or above Level 3.5 on FCAT Writes.

Targets Supported

- Writing

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Lucy Calkins Units of Study; staff resource people who will provide the training and follow-up support.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Lack of consistency in our writing program across all grade levels.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Observations; Lesson Plans;

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal; Assistant Principal; Literacy Coach

Target Dates or Schedule:

Bi-weekly

Evidence of Completion:

Writing assessments

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. Apopka Elementary will increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

G1.B1 Students lack comprehension and phonics skills.

G1.B1.S1 In PLCs, teachers will analyze current student data and then use it to determine small-group instruction within individual classrooms as well as in intervention instruction.

Action Step 1

Provide time for weekly planning within PLCs

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal; Assistant Principal; Literacy Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Lesson Plans; Observation; summary notes of meeting

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

Assessments: FAIR; Running Records; Journeys weekly and unit tests; DRAs; Benchmarks

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal; Assistant Principal; Literacy Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Notes from Student Profile meetings, observations

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Observation; classroom assessments

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal; Assistant Principal; Literacy Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Notes from observations; focus calendar

G1.B2 There is limited time for teachers to analyze data and plan accordingly.

G1.B2.S1 Schedule PLC meetings in school calendar to analyze data to adjust instruction as needed.

Action Step 1

Analyze data

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers; literacy coach; assistant principal; principal

Target Dates or Schedule

Bi-weekly;

Evidence of Completion

Observation; classroom assessment

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

Observations

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal; Assistant Principal; Literacy Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans; observation notes

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S1

Observation

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal; Assistant Principal; Literacy Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Observation notes; student data

G1.B3 The HMH Journeys Comprehensive Core Reading Program is new to all instructional staff who have had limited, if any, training.

G1.B3.S1 Provide time for county and in-house training on all components of Journeys as well as for Think Central.

Action Step 1

Professional Development Calendar

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal; Assistant Principal; Literacy Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

On-going

Evidence of Completion

Training agenda, sign-in sheets

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

Lesson Plans; Observation

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal; Assistant Principal

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Notes from observations

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B3.S1

Observation; classroom assessments

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal; Assistant Principal

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Student data; observation notes

G2. Apopka Elementary will increase the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment.

G2.B1 Teachers are in the process of learning a newly adopted math curriculum.

G2.B1.S1 Teachers will participate in professional development for Go Math Curriculum offered by the district and home school.

Action Step 1

Math Coaches will sit with teachers to view/review Go Math resources and discuss how to include the different components in the 60 minute instructional block and view the Think Central professional development videos. Teachers will participate in Go Math professional development offered by the district.

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers, Math Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Once monthly

Evidence of Completion

Classroom walk-throughs

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

Monthly Go Math professional development to be scheduled on school-wide calendar, classroom walk-throughs

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principal

Target Dates or Schedule

Daily classroom observation

Evidence of Completion

Teachers will implement instructional strategies and utilize Go Math lesson plans

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S1

Effectiveness of implementation of new Math curriculum

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration team, Math coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans, observation data, mini-assessment data, unit assessments

G2.B2 Newly adopted curriculum focuses on Common Core State Standards and does not include some of the NGSSS that will be tested on the Math FCAT 2.0 Assessment.

G2.B2.S1 Teachers in grades 3-5 will follow the district's Scope and Sequence and plan together with the intermediate grades' math coach to ensure that appropriate resources are used to teach the tested NGSSS that are not addressed in the newly adopted curriculum.

Action Step 1

Bi-monthly planning with math coach to plan and discuss upcoming math standards

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers for grades 3-5 and math coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Bi-monthly

Evidence of Completion

Agendas and sign-in sheets

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

Lesson plans and classroom walk-throughs

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrators and math coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Daily

Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans to address all tested standards

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B2.S1

Mini common assessments

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers, math coach, and administrators

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Analysis of data from mini common assessments will be shared with staff at faculty meetings

G3. Apopka Elementary School will increase the percentage of students who score at or above Level 3.5 on FCAT Writes.

G3.B1 Lack of consistency in our writing program across all grade levels.

G3.B1.S1 All grade levels will use the same writing program ensuring common language and expectations from all students in relation to their grade level.

Action Step 1

Professional development in the use of the new writing program

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers; literacy coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Four times a year

Evidence of Completion

Professional development agenda, sign-in sheets, and materials

Facilitator:

Literacy Coach

Participants:

All classroom teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B1.S1

Observations

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal; Assistant Principal; Literacy Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Bi-weekly

Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans; notes from observations; assessments

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B1.S1

Review of Writing Samples and data from school-wide writing prompts.

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers; Literacy coach; Principal; Assistant Principal

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Student 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 I, Part A: Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional intervention and remediation with resource teachers through after-school programs. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided.

Title II: Professional development is provided through: off site trainings, Lesson Study, PLC, Science Boot Camp, GO Math, HMH; Journeys, MTSS Training, and Pearson Management Systems. Subsequent data meetings are held to determine needs/trainings of staff and substitutes are provided when teachers attend such training.

Title III: Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners. This year tutoring for adult ELL students will be offered on campus.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI): SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide after school tutoring providing supplemental instruction for Level 1 and Level 2 students as determined by FCAT and materials and salaries for teachers.

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.

G3. Apopka Elementary School will increase the percentage of students who score at or above Level 3.5 on FCAT Writes.

G3.B1 Lack of consistency in our writing program across all grade levels.

G3.B1.S1 All grade levels will use the same writing program ensuring common language and expectations from all students in relation to their grade level.

PD Opportunity 1

Professional development in the use of the new writing program

Facilitator

Literacy Coach

Participants

All classroom teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Four times a year

Evidence of Completion

Professional development agenda, sign-in sheets, and materials

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals