



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Lighthouse Elementary School

4750 DAKOTA DR

Jupiter, FL 33458

561-741-9400

www.edline.net/pages/lighthouse_elementary_school

School Demographics

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

School Grades History

SIP Authority and Template

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

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

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| Differentiated Accountability | 5 |
| Part I: Current School Status | 6 |
| Part II: Expected Improvements | 13 |
| Goals Summary | 16 |
| Goals Detail | 16 |
| Action Plan for Improvement | 18 |
| Part III: Coordination and Integration | 21 |
| Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals | 22 |
| Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

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

Lighthouse Elementary School

Principal

Dr. Julie Hopkins

School Advisory Council chair

Lori Brimanson

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

| Name | Title |
|------------------|--------------------|
| Angela Frederick | Chair |
| Kathe Kainec | ESE Teacher |
| Carol Hahn | Speech Teacher |
| Allison Simons | SAI Teacher |
| Tammy Trivison | SAI Teacher |
| Nicole Griffin | Guidance Counselor |
| Kim Dahlmeier | Reading Teacher |
| Katey Thompson | Music Teacher |

District-Level Information

District

Palm Beach

Superintendent

Mr. E. Wayne Gent

Date of school board approval of SIP

11/19/2013

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

- Dr. Julie Hopkins, Principal - Member
- Lori Brimanson, VPK Teacher - SAC Chair
- Kathy Salvador, Parent - Member
- Patti Reagan, Teacher - Secretary
- Carol Van de Water, Teacher - Member
- Kara Levinson, Teacher - Former SAC Chair
- Marie Delizia, School Support Person - Member
- Janice Long, Teacher - Member

Jennifer Coady, Parent - Member
Helene Baxter, Parent - Member
Karen Plump, Parent - Member
Caroline Kennedy, Parent - Member
Elizabeth Mchanty, Parent - Member
Jennifer Goldin, Parent - Member
Wayne Anderson, Community/Business Partner - Member

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

SAC members read, revised, and approved the School Improvement Plan (SIP).

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

SAC will meet monthly to monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and amend the plan if needed based on the data presented.

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

SAC Funds will be used for Reading Running Record substitutes for teachers.
SAC Funds will be used to pay part of the Media Specialist Conference Tuition.

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:

Dr. Julie Hopkins

Principal

Years as Administrator: 10

Years at Current School: 0

Credentials

B.S. in Education -OSU; M.S. in Math and Science - UCF; Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership -FAU; Ed.D. in Educational Leadership -FAU; ESOL Endorsement

Performance Record

Principal of Hope-Centennial 2012-2013: Grade F (based on the FCAT 2.0), Reading mastery - 30.4%, Math mastery - 31.1%, Writing mastery 51,8%, Science mastery 49.5%. Gains made in reading - 58% and gains made in math - 41%. Students in the lowest 25%: reading -67% and math - 55% met proficiency.
 Principal of Hope-Centennial 2011-2012: Grade D (based on the FCAT 2.0), Reading mastery - 22%, Math mastery - 24%, Writing mastery 86%, Science mastery 14%. Gains made in reading - 61% and gains made in math - 58%. Students in the lowest 25%: reading -65% and math - 59% met proficiency.
 Principal of Hope-Centennial 2010-2011: Grade C, Reading mastery - 48%, Math mastery - 51%, Writing mastery 87%, Science mastery 32%. Gains made in reading - 60% and gains made in math -58%. Students in the lowest 25%: reading -73% and math - 68% met proficiency.72% of the criteria was met for AYP, but no subgroups made AYP during the second year of the school.

Janet Anderson

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 12

Years at Current School: 8

Credentials

BS – Elementary Education, University of S. Mississippi; MS – Educational Leadership, University of S. Mississippi; Specialist Degree - TSOL, Nova University; ESOL Endorsement – State of Florida

Performance Record

AP of Lighthouse Elementary 2012: Grade A
 Reading Mastery: 69% scored level 4 or higher in reading
 78% of lowest 25% made learning gains
 Math Mastery: 64% scored level 4 or higher
 75% of the lowest 25% made learning gains
 AP of Lighthouse Elementary from 2006 – 2013: Grade A, Reading Mastery Average: 95%, Math Mastery Average: 95%, Science Mastery Average: 91%, AYP Average: 76%
 AP of Grove Park Elementary from 2002 – 2006: Grade C, Reading Mastery Average: 57%, Math Mastery Average: 51%, AYP Average: 91%

Classroom Teachers

of classroom teachers

54

receiving effective rating or higher

54, 100%

Highly Qualified Teachers

100%

certified in-field

54, 100%

ESOL endorsed

38, 70%

reading endorsed

4, 7%

with advanced degrees

22, 41%

National Board Certified

1, 2%

first-year teachers

1, 2%

with 1-5 years of experience

2, 4%

with 6-14 years of experience

24, 44%

with 15 or more years of experience

26, 48%

Education Paraprofessionals

of paraprofessionals

2

Highly Qualified

2, 100%

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

There are 0 teachers teaching out of field and 0 teachers received a less than effective rating. All staff are highly qualified.

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

The School District has trained teachers in the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (BTAP). Beginning teachers are taken through the Educator Support Program and assigned mentor teachers. Grade Level planning is done at each grade level.

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

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), District Reading Assessment, Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA), Absences, Retentions, and Office Discipline Referrals

Midyear: Winter Diagnostic Test, District Reading Assessments, Progress Monitoring and Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)

End of year: District Reading Assessment, Spring Diagnostic Test, and SRI

Frequency of Data Days: twice a month for data analysis

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

Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RTI, conducts assessment of RTI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RTI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RTI plans and activities.

Select General Education Teachers: Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teacher: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as coteaching.

Resource Teacher: Develops, identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring,

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

The team meets once a week to engage in the following activities: Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

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

Supplemental Academic Instruction Teacher: Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills

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

The Rtl Leadership Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

| Name | Title |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| Dr. Julie Hopkins | Principal |
| Doreen Milfeld | Kindergarten Teacher |
| Tracy Hetzel | 1st Grade Teacher |
| Jennifer Klug | 2nd Grade Teacher |
| Linda Marlow | 2nd Grade Teacher |
| Allison Simons | SAI Teacher |

How the school-based LLT functions

Team meets monthly to discuss current data, curriculum needs, district and school initiatives and school-wide literacy concerns.

Major initiatives of the LLT

- Identifying quality professional development to support the School Improvement Plan
- Establishing programs and guidelines to increase the number of books children read
- Parent training on content appropriate high level books
- Parent training on how to assist struggling readers at home

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

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

Through LTMs monitor students' progress through district Literacy Assessment Fountas & Pinnell Students reading below grade level according to pupil progression will be placed on a PMP and receive 30 additional minutes of iii. Teachers will collaborate through data chats to monitor progress and set learning

goals and discuss appropriate strategies.

Teachers will engage students in a variety of genre in the classroom and encourage additional reading outside the classroom for pleasure and information. Students will become "book critics" appearing on the morning news to recommend books for reading.

All teachers will provide differentiated instruction to engage all students and enhance learning.

Teachers will refer to and utilize the Marzano higher order thinking questioning techniques in reading.

Teachers will utilize the school resource room to increase the number of texts available to students in the classroom.

Teachers will regularly access and review the results of the K-4 Literacy Assessment Data and the Diagnostic

test results from the Educational Data Warehouse (EDW).

Teachers will provide differentiated instruction that corresponds to each child's needs, abilities and interests.

SAI teacher will provide support to the classroom teacher through either pullout or small-group instruction.

SAI teacher will provide support to classroom teachers by providing small group instruction to struggling readers outside the 90 minute reading block. An additional .5 reading teacher will assist in the instruction of the lowest 25% outside the reading block.

Teachers will utilize the resource room to provide Students with just right books during daily independent read time.

Data chats through LTMs will help identify specific areas of deficiency in reading and identify specific strategies that will increase proficiency in that area.

Teachers will use ESOL strategies to help students learn and understand the English language.

Teachers will attend professional development involving differentiated instruction.

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

New VPK program started for 2013-2014 school year with 20 students enrolled.

Send out Kindergarten registration information to area day care programs and provide a Kindergarten Round-up program for parents to attend to learn about the Kindergarten program.

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

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | 176 | 19% | 22% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 631 | 69% | 72% |

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> | | 100% |

Learning Gains

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA) | 717 | 79% | 81% |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0) | 56 | 78% | 81% |

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) | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 53% |
| Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 36% |
| Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 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 | 234 | 81% | 84% |
| Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 0% |

Area 3: Mathematics

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | 205 | 23% | 25% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 581 | 64% | 67% |

Learning Gains

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Learning Gains | 735 | 81% | 84% |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC) | 68 | 75% | 78% |

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 | 63 | 19% | 22% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 211 | 65% | 68% |

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% |

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

Elementary School Indicators

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time | 5 | 0% | 0% |
| Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S. | 3 | 0% | 0% |
| Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade | 42 | 14% | 11% |
| Students who receive two or more behavior referrals | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S. | 0 | 0% | 0% |

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

Lighthouse Elementary School will infuse the content required by Florida Statute 1003.42(2) and S.B. Policy 2.09 (8)(b), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, including but not limited to: History of Holocaust; History of Africans and African Americans; Hispanic Contributions; Women's Contributions; and Sacrifices of Veterans.

Specific Additional Targets

| Target | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| All teachers will infuse content as described above and as required by the state. | 33 | 80% | 100% |

Goals Summary

- G1.** Increase math learning gains as measured by beginning of year assessment and end of year assessment for second grade students.
- G2.** Increase on grade level students as assessed with Reading Running Records.

Goals Detail

G1. Increase math learning gains as measured by beginning of year assessment and end of year assessment for second grade students.

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Common Core Go Math Curriculum beginning of the year assessment and end of the year assessment.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teacher's comfort with using the Common Core Go Math Curriculum for the first time.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Assessment data from Chapter assessments.

Person or Persons Responsible

Grade 2 Teachers and Administration.

Target Dates or Schedule:

Weekly, September 2013 to May 2014

Evidence of Completion:

Learning Gains on assessment data analyzed.

G2. Increase on grade level students as assessed with Reading Running Records.

Targets Supported

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- District Literacy Roll Out Resources/Materials.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Lack of knowledge for teachers of the new literacy initiative.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Informal Observation, Formal Observations, and classroom walk-through.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule:

Weekly walk-through August 2013 to May 2014.

Evidence of Completion:

Review of walk-through data, observations, and checklist.

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. Increase math learning gains as measured by beginning of year assessment and end of year assessment for second grade students.

G1.B1 Teacher's comfort with using the Common Core Go Math Curriculum for the first time.

G1.B1.S1 Teacher grade level planning to focus on student learning gains for Math.

Action Step 1

Grade 2 Teachers plan together to achieve student learning gains.

Person or Persons Responsible

All Grade 2 Teachers and Administration.

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly, September 2013 to May 2014

Evidence of Completion

Teacher Lesson Plans.

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

Classroom walkthroughs during Math.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly, September 2013 to May 2014

Evidence of Completion

End of year Test Data showing learning gains.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Lesson plans and test data.

Person or Persons Responsible

Grade 2 Teachers and Administration.

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly, September 2013 to May 2014

Evidence of Completion

Test data analyzed from Math Chapter Test.

G2. Increase on grade level students as assessed with Reading Running Records.

G2.B1 Lack of knowledge for teachers of the new literacy initiative.

G2.B1.S1 Teachers receive professional development on the new Literacy Roll Out Training.

Action Step 1

Teachers attend Literacy Roll Out Training.

Person or Persons Responsible

All teachers.

Target Dates or Schedule

August 2013 to May 2014

Evidence of Completion

Log of teachers attending.

Facilitator:

District Professional Team for the Literacy Roll Out Training.

Participants:

All classroom teachers grades K-2

Action Step 2

Schedule teachers for the district Literacy Roll Out training.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

August 2013 to May 2014

Evidence of Completion

Log of teachers attending training.

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

Review attendance logs for all training.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly between August 2013 and May 2014.

Evidence of Completion

Analysis of attendance log by Administration.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S1

Utilize classroom walk-through to insure strategies taught in professional development on the literacy roll out training.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly August 2013 to May 2014

Evidence of Completion

Walk-through checklist.

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

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success, following our Behavioral Matrix and teaching expected behaviors, communicating with parents, and monitoring SwPBS. We update our action plans during Learning Team Meetings. We instill an appreciation for multicultural diversity through our anti-bullying campaign, structured lessons, and implementation of SwPBS programs. School Budget: Materials such as science boards, manipulative, paper etc. to make hands-on activities that can be taken and implemented into the classroom.

Administrative Funds: For iii and SAI teacher based progress monitoring purchase of LLI Reading Intervention.

PTO: Nooks were purchased to use in the classrooms to enhance the reading curriculum and motivate students to read. \$2000.00 is committed by PTO to purchase classroom books to support learning how to read.

Internal Accounts: A variety of genre of leveled readers for teacher/student use.

District Budget: Literacy Roll Out Materials.

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.

G2. Increase on grade level students as assessed with Reading Running Records.

G2.B1 Lack of knowledge for teachers of the new literacy initiative.

G2.B1.S1 Teachers receive professional development on the new Literacy Roll Out Training.

PD Opportunity 1

Teachers attend Literacy Roll Out Training.

Facilitator

District Professional Team for the Literacy Roll Out Training.

Participants

All classroom teachers grades K-2

Target Dates or Schedule

August 2013 to May 2014

Evidence of Completion

Log of teachers attending.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

| Goal | Description | Total |
|-------|--|---------|
| G2. | Increase on grade level students as assessed with Reading Running Records. | \$2,000 |
| Total | | \$2,000 |

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

| Funding Source | Evidence-Based Materials | Total |
|----------------|--------------------------|---------|
| PTO | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |
| Total | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |

Budget Details

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

G2. Increase on grade level students as assessed with Reading Running Records.

G2.B1 Lack of knowledge for teachers of the new literacy initiative.

G2.B1.S1 Teachers receive professional development on the new Literacy Roll Out Training.

Action Step 1

Teachers attend Literacy Roll Out Training.

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Materials

Resource

Leveled classroom reading books

Funding Source

PTO

Amount Needed

\$2,000