

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2011-2012

2011 – 2012 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION Add rows to tables as needed throughout.

School Name: Hillcrest Elementary	District Name: Polk
Principal: Barbara Jones	Superintendent: Jesse Jackson
SAC Chair: Stacie Padgett	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

School Accountability Report Click on the column header to re-sort by that column.																	
School Number	School	Level	School Year (Click on year to see detailed report)	Grade (Includes Learning Gains) more info	% Meeting High Standards in Reading	% Meeting High Standards in Math	% Meeting High Standards in Writing	% Meeting High Standards in Science	% Making Learning Gains in Reading	% Making Learning Gains in Math	% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading	% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math	Bonus points for 11th-12th grade Retakes	Points Earned (Sum of Previous 9 Columns) more info	Percent Tested	Free and Reduced Lunch	Minority Rate
Polk																	
1361	HILLCREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Elementary	2010-11	A	65	77	94	43	62	73	62	65	NA	541	100	78	57
1361		Elementary	2009-10	A	68	79	90	43	64	68	68	71	NA	551	100	79	54

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

1361	Elementary	2008-09	A	75	81	96	44	71	75	68	66	NA	576	100	74
------	------------	---------	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	----

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 5A-5D of the reading and mathematics goals and Section 3A-3D of the writing goals.)

2009-2010 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - School Level - Page 1	Polk HILLCREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 1361
--	--

Detailed Report

Did the School Make Adequate Yearly Progress?	NO	Percent of Criteria Met: 90%		
Total Writing Proficiency Met:	YES	2009-2010 School Grade:	A	
Total Graduation Criterion Met:	NA			
	95% Tested Reading	95% Tested Math	Reading Proficiency Met	Math Proficiency Met
TOTAL	YES	YES	NO	YES
WHITE	YES	YES	YES	YES
BLACK	YES	YES	NO	YES
HISPANIC	YES	YES	NO	YES
ASIAN	NA	NA	NA	NA
AMERICAN INDIAN	NA	NA	NA	NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	YES	YES	NO	YES

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	NA	NA	NA	NA
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	YES	YES	NA	NA

2008-2009 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - School Level - Page 1	Polk HILLCREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 1361
Detailed Report	

Did the School Make Adequate Yearly Progress?	YES	Percent of Criteria Met: 100%		
Total Writing Proficiency Met:	YES	2008-2009 School Grade:	A	
Total Graduation Criterion Met:	NA			
	95% Tested Reading	95% Tested Math	Reading Proficiency Met	Math Proficiency Met
TOTAL	YES	YES	YES	YES
WHITE	YES	YES	YES	YES
BLACK	YES	YES	YES	YES
HISPANIC	YES	YES	YES	YES
ASIAN	NA	NA	NA	NA
AMERICAN INDIAN	NA	NA	NA	NA
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	YES	YES	YES	YES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	NA	NA	NA	NA

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	YES	YES	NA	NA
-----------------------------------	-----	-----	----	----

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

School Percent Scoring Three and Above																																															
Grade Level	Reading										Mathematics										Writing Essay (3.5 and above)										Writing Essay (4.0 and above)		Science														
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011								
Polk																																															
HILLCREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (1361)																																															
3	NA	52	45	54	53	69	70	65	67	60	NA	NA	46	54	61	57	64	68	76	75	76	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
4	44	34	55	65	69	52	58	62	67	64	NA	NA	21	48	59	63	61	47	77	75	74	NA	‡	30	67	59	70	67	84	80	89	76	93	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA				
5	NA	41	39	48	61	56	63	60	71	61	NA	29	25	29	37	51	57	54	63	72	64	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	23	33	34	41	36	39

+Indicates data is not available at this time.

‡The State compiled State Percent Scoring 3.5 and Above data from 2002-2009

Note: NA indicates the test was not given for that year or grade level, or Achievement Levels had not been established.

The table below provides the School mean Scale Scores in Reading, Mathematics, Writing and Science. The Scale Score is a score used to report test results on the entire test. Scale Scores on the FCAT Sunshine State Standards tests range from 100 through 500 for each grade level and content area. A computer program is used to analyze student responses and to compute the Scale Score. As of 2011, certain FCAT assessments are no longer administered. In their place are new assessments called FCAT 2.0, which are aligned to the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. This transition began in 2011 with FCAT 2.0 Reading (grades 3-10) and FCAT 2.0 Mathematics (grade 3-8) assessments. A comprehensive mathematics assessment is no longer administered to grade 9 students. The only FCAT assessments administered in 2011 are FCAT Mathematics (grade 10), FCAT Science (grades 5, 8, and 11), and FCAT Writing (grades 4, 8, and 10). FCAT 2.0 results are not reported in this database. They may be accessed in Excel spreadsheets found at <http://fcats.fldoe.org/mediapacket/2011/default.asp>.

School Mean Scores				
Grade	Reading	Mathematics	Writing	Science

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Level																																					
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011

Polk

HILLCREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (1361)

3	NA	278	272	290	292	296	304	300	303	294	NA	288	292	306	306	305	314	326	326	327	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	287	265	293	301	314	293	297	313	311	310	NA	254	281	298	312	296	295	330	329	328	NA	270	296	286	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	268	259	274	294	297	298	309	299	299	NA	287	287	289	304	316	315	315	336	346	334	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	247	263	281	283	297	295	314	306	303

+Indicates data is not available at this time.

Note: NA indicates the test was not given for that year or grade level, or Achievement Levels had not been established.

Note: FCAT Writing+ was administered from 2006 – 2008. In 2009, the multiple-choice items were removed from the statewide writing assessment; therefore, the test name was changed back to FCAT Writing, and Scale Scores are no longer reported for the statewide writing assessment.

The table below provides the School average Developmental Scale Score (DSS) in Reading and Mathematics for FCAT and the change in DSS score since last year. The DSS is a score used to determine a student's annual progress from grade to grade. The FCAT Developmental Scales for Reading and Mathematics range from 86 through 3008 across grades 4 through 10.

School - Mean Developmental Scale Score (DSS)

Grade	Reading Scores				Mathematics Scores			
Grade Level	% of Students Matched to 2010	Mean DSS (Matched Students 2011)	Mean DSS (Matched Students 2010)	Mean DSS Change for Matched Students	% of Students Matched to 2010	Mean DSS (Matched Students 2011)	Mean DSS (Matched Students 2010)	Mean DSS Change for Matched Students

Note: Matched DSS data cannot be generated for grade 3 because it is the first year that students take the FCAT.

The tables below provide a School summary of FCAT Reading, Mathematics, Writing and Science, including the percent of students scoring in each Achievement Level. For FCAT Reading and Mathematics, the data include the number of students tested, mean Scale Scores, mean Developmental Scale Scores, and the percentage of students scoring in each achievement level. There are five categories of achievement that describe the success students have with the content tested on the FCAT Reading, Mathematics and Science. Level 5 is the highest, and level 1 is the lowest. Levels 3 and above are considered on or above grade level. Writing is assessed in grades 4, 8, and 10. Writing mean essay scores combined are the result of combining the average scores for each type of writing assessed, in years when multiple prompts per grade level were administered. When reviewing FCAT Writing results from 2010 and beyond, comparisons to previous years' writing scores should be avoided. This caution is given for two reasons. First, beginning in 2010, each essay was scored by one rater. In previous years, two raters were used and the scores were averaged. A

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

student could have received a half-point score, such as 4.5, whereas since 2010, no half-point scores are possible. Second, beginning in 2010, each student within the same grade level was required to write an essay using the same mode of writing (narrative, expository, or persuasive). In previous years, there were two modes assessed at each grade level with half of the students responding to each mode. For example, the 2010 Grade 4 FCAT Writing required all students to write a narrative essay. In 2009, half of the students wrote a narrative essay, and half of the students were required to write an expository essay. As of 2011, certain FCAT assessments are no longer administered. In their place are new assessments called FCAT 2.0, which are aligned to the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. This transition began in 2011 with FCAT 2.0 Reading (grades 3-10) and FCAT 2.0 Mathematics (grade 3-8) assessments. A comprehensive mathematics assessment is no longer administered to grade 9 students. The only FCAT assessments administered in 2011 are FCAT Mathematics (grade 10), FCAT Science (grades 5, 8, and 11), and FCAT Writing (grades 4, 8, and 10). FCAT 2.0 results are not reported in this database. They may be accessed in Excel spreadsheets found at

<http://fcat.fldoe.org/mediapacket/2011/default.asp>.

School Summary of Students Tested

Grade 3

Reading Scores

Percentage of Students by Achievement Level

Year	Students Tested	Mean DSS	Mean Scale Score	1	2	3	4	5	Level 3 & above**
------	-----------------	----------	------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Polk

HILLCREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (1361)

2001	92	NA	268	0	0	0	0	0	0
2002	82	1165	278	30	18	32	20	0	52
2003	84	1130	272	43	12	32	11	2	45
2004	101	1240	290	27	19	32	20	3	54
2005	90	1251	292	28	19	27	24	2	53
2006	99	1278	296	22	9	47	16	5	69
2007	111	1327	304	16	14	41	25	4	70
2008	93	1300	300	18	17	33	26	5	65
2009	97	1318	303	18	15	38	24	5	67
2010	99	1261	294	26	14	36	18	5	60

Mathematics Scores

Percentage of Students by Achievement Level

Year	Students Tested	Mean DSS	Mean Scale Score	1	2	3	4	5	Level 3 & above**
------	-----------------	----------	------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Polk									
2001	94	NA	250	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2002	82	1243	288	26	29	32	10	4	46
2003	84	1264	292	26	19	32	15	7	54
2004	102	1329	306	13	26	35	24	2	61
2005	90	1329	306	17	27	30	22	4	57
2006	99	1322	305	13	23	36	24	3	64
2007	111	1364	314	14	18	45	17	6	68
2008	93	1420	326	9	15	42	25	10	76
2009	97	1419	326	8	16	44	22	9	75
2010	100	1426	327	12	12	42	24	10	76

* No data is reported when fewer than ten students were tested.

** Adding the percents in Achievement Levels 3 – 5 may not result in the percent reported under "Level 3 and above" due to rounding.

Note: NA indicates the test was not given for that year or grade level, or Achievement Levels had not been established.

Note: FCAT Writing+ was administered from 2006 – 2008. In 2009, the multiple-choice items were removed from the statewide writing assessment; therefore, the test name was changed back to FCAT Writing, and Scale Scores are no longer reported for the statewide writing assessment.

Grade 4									
Reading Scores									
Year	Students Tested	Mean DSS	Mean Scale Score	Percentage of Students by Achievement Level					
				1	2	3	4	5	Level 3 & above**
Polk									

HILLCREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (1361)

2001	109	NA	287	41	15	21	19	4	44
2002	92	1263	265	51	15	23	10	1	34
2003	82	1427	293	30	15	32	18	5	55
2004	75	1470	301	17	17	40	21	4	65
2005	93	1551	314	15	16	40	23	6	69
2006	87	1425	293	30	18	32	16	3	52
2007	98	1449	297	29	13	36	18	4	58

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2008	97	1544	313	20	19	37	20	5	62
2009	89	1530	311	17	16	38	24	6	67
2010	99	1525	310	19	17	39	20	4	64

Mathematics Scores

Percentage of Students by Achievement Level

Year	Students Tested	Mean DSS	Mean Scale Score	1	2	3	4	5	Level 3 & above**
------	-----------------	----------	------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

Polk

2001	110	NA	263	0	0	0	0	0	0
2002	87	1255	254	56	23	16	5	0	21
2003	82	1373	281	26	27	32	12	4	48
2004	75	1445	298	19	23	37	21	0	59
2005	93	1509	312	8	29	39	22	3	63
2006	87	1440	296	20	20	49	9	2	61
2007	98	1432	295	24	29	30	16	1	47
2008	97	1585	330	11	11	47	23	7	77
2009	89	1584	329	7	18	38	27	10	75
2010	99	1580	328	4	22	41	24	8	74

Writing Scores

Percentage of Students by Achievement Level

Year	Students Tested	Mean Essay Score Combined†	Mean Scale Score	1	2	3	4	5	
------	-----------------	----------------------------	------------------	---	---	---	---	---	--

Polk

2001	112	3.3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
2002	91	2.8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
2003	84	3.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
2004	71	3.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
2005	91	3.6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
2006	85	3.6	270	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
2007	99	3.9	296	17	26	44	10	2	
2008	95	3.7	286	22	24	47	5	1	

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2009	87	4.1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2010	97	4.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2011	97	4.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

† Mean essay score combined is the result of combining the mean scores for each mode of writing assessed. Prior to 2010, with the exception of grade 10 in 2008, two modes were assessed per grade level. Beginning in 2010, one mode was assessed per grade level.

* No data is reported when fewer than ten students were tested.

** Adding the percents in Achievement Levels 3 – 5 may not result in the percent reported under "Level 3 and above" due to rounding.

Note: NA indicates the test was not given for that year or grade level, or Achievement Levels had not been established.

Note: FCAT Writing+ was administered from 2006 – 2008. In 2009, the multiple-choice items were removed from the statewide writing assessment; therefore, the test name was changed back to FCAT Writing, and Scale Scores are no longer reported for the statewide writing assessment.

Grade 5									
Reading Scores									
				Percentage of Students by Achievement Level					
Year	Students Tested	Mean DSS	Mean Scale Score	1	2	3	4	5	Level 3 & above**

Polk

HILLCREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (1361)

2001	92	NA	266	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2002	113	1416	268	40	19	28	9	4	41
2003	87	1363	259	43	18	25	14	0	39
2004	86	1449	274	33	20	28	17	2	48
2005	92	1560	294	22	17	36	20	5	61
2006	101	1546	292	24	20	33	17	7	56
2007	71	1574	297	15	21	37	24	3	63
2008	90	1583	298	19	21	28	29	3	60
2009	95	1645	309	9	20	45	17	8	71
2010	90	1589	299	19	20	32	21	8	61

Mathematics Scores									
				Percentage of Students by Achievement Level					
Year	Students Tested	Mean DSS	Mean Scale Score	1	2	3	4	5	Level 3 & above**

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Polk									
2001	91	NA	287	38	32	15	10	4	29
2002	114	1453	287	40	35	12	11	2	25
2003	87	1460	289	39	31	11	18	0	29
2004	86	1531	304	28	35	20	14	3	37
2005	92	1591	316	26	23	28	21	2	51
2006	101	1602	319	21	22	34	20	4	57
2007	71	1584	315	24	23	28	21	4	54
2008	90	1684	336	12	24	23	33	7	63
2009	95	1729	346	7	21	25	38	8	72
2010	90	1674	334	9	27	36	23	6	64
Science Scores									
			Percentage of Students by Achievement Level						
Year	Students Tested		Mean Scale Score	1	2	3	4	5	Level 3 & above**
Polk									
2003	85		247	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2004	86		263	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2005	92		281	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2006	99		283	38	38	20	3	0	23
2007	70		297	27	40	24	7	1	33
2008	90		295	28	38	31	3	0	34
2009	95		314	18	41	27	11	3	41
2010	90		306	27	38	26	8	2	36
2011	92		303	25	36	30	7	2	

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Highly Qualified Administrators This may be copied from last year's SIP and updated to be current.

List your school's highly qualified administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year)
Principal	Barbara Jones	BS Communicative Disorders Florida A&M University, MA in Counselor Education University South Florida, EDS Educational Leadership Nova Southeastern University	0	17	Newly hired retired principal
Assistant Principal	Jennifer Barrow	BS Elementary Education Warner Southern College Masters Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University	1	1	2010-2011: School Grade A: AYP: 79%

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches This may be copied from last year's SIP and updated to be current.

List your school's highly qualified instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year)
Reading (AIF)	Amanda Shelton	BA in Education	6	3	Her first 3 years were spent in grades below the 3 rd . The school has been an "A" for the three years that she has served at Reading Coach.
Math (AIF)	Anna Powell	BA in Education	29	10	She has been at this school her entire career. The school was a "B" 2003-2007 and an "A" the last four years. The school made AYP 3 of those 8 years (last year being the

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

					most recent) with the lowest AYP percentage being 92.
Writing	Elizabeth Borders	BA in Education	14	8	She has been at this school for most of her career. The school was a "B" 2003-2007 and an "A" the last four years. The school made AYP 3 of those 9 years (last year being the most recent) with the lowest AYP percentage being 90.
Science	Heather Teague	BA in Education	4	3	The school earned an "A" in every year and 95% AYP in her first year, 100% the 2 nd year, and 90 % last year.

Highly Qualified Teachers This may be copied from last year's SIP and updated to be current. Satisfies Title I Component #3

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, highly qualified teachers to the school. Title I Component #5

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Updated website	LWCS Community Involvement Director	2011-2012 School year	
2.			
3.			
4.			

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly qualified.

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Qualified
Kimberly Buchanan	Elementary Education K-6	2 nd Grade Teacher	Complete ESOL classes
Nicole Goodman	Elementary Education K-6	2 nd Grade Teacher	Complete ESOL classes
Andrea Herrington	Elementary Education K-6, ESE, (K-12)	Self Contained ESE teacher	Complete ESOL classes
Yapracia Mitchell	ESE K-12	ESE inclusion	Complete ESOL classes
Lana Roe	Elementary Education K-6	2 nd Grade Teacher	Complete ESOL classes
Jennifer Simpson	Elementary Education K-6	4 th Grade Teacher	Complete ESOL classes
Bonnie Skinner	Ages 3-6	Kindergarten Teacher	Complete ESOL classes
Megan Whitaker	Elementary Education 1-6	4 th Grade Teacher	Complete ESOL classes

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
50	1%	18%	44%	38%	36%	84%	14%	8%	84%

Teacher Mentoring Program Title I SINI School Component #5

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
-------------	-----------------	-----------------------	------------------------------

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Jennifer Fugate	Bonnie Skinner	First Year teacher	Monthly meetings and observations, mentoring, feedback from mentor, etc.

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only Title I Component #10 (Title I provides sample content for schools to adapt to fit their program.)

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A: Title I, Part A, funds school-wide services to Hillcrest Elementary. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. Title I, Part A, may include but not limited to support to provide after-school and summer instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant students enrolled in Hillcrest Elementary will be assisted by the school and by the District Migrant Education Program (MEP). Students will be prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status. MEP Teacher Advocates, assigned to schools with high percentages of migrant students, monitor the progress of these high need students and provide or coordinate supplemental academic support. Migrant Home-School Liaisons identify and recruit migrant students and their families for the MEP. They provide support to both students and parents in locating services necessary to ensure the academic success of these students whose education has been interrupted by numerous moves.

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II :Professional development resources are available to Title I schools through Title II funds. In addition, School Technology Services provide technical support, technology training, and licenses for software programs and web-based access via Title II-D funds. Funds available to Hillcrest Elementary are used to purchase but not limited to Beginning Teacher Program and various professional needs at the individual school.

Title III: (ESOL or ELL): The LEA which include Hillcrest Elementary will work together to provide such services as but not limited to: parent building capacity events, translation of documents, use of the T.A.L.K. System, and etc.

Title X- Homeless: The Hearth program, funded through Title X, provides support for identified homeless students. Title I provides support for this program, and many activities implemented by the Hearth program are carried out in cooperation with the Migrant Education Program (MEP) funded through Polk County’s grant. This is the final year of their competitive grant and Hillcrest Elementary will receive services under Polk County’s direction.

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI): N/A
Violence Prevention Programs : Title IV provides violence and drug prevention programs in schools in order to promote a safe school environment. Examples of violence prevention programs include anti-bullying and drug awareness.
Nutrition Programs: Hillcrest Elementary is a location for a summer feeding program for the community.
Housing Programs: N/A
Head Start: N/A
Adult Education: N/A
Career and Technical Education: N/A
Job Training: N/A
Other: N/A

Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-Based RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team: Principal: The Principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision –making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure for implementation of PS/RTI; ensures that the school-based team is implementing PS/RTI; conducts assessment of PS/RTI skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; ensures and participates in adequate professional learning to support PS/RTI implementation; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff for the implementation of PS/RTI school wide; ensures resources are assigned to those areas in most need; and communicates with parents regarding school-based PS/RTI plans and activities.</p> <p>Assistant Principal: Assists Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of PS/RTI, further assists the principal in the assessment of PS/RTI skills, implementation of intervention support and documentation, professional learning, and communication with parents concerning PS/RTI plans and activities.</p> <p>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 2/3 interventions; and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.</p> <p>Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials/ instruction in tiered interventions; collaborates with general education teachers.</p> <p>Academic Intervention Facilitator, Curriculum Specialist and Resource Team: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need</p>

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk,” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

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 evaluation; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities.

PS/RTI Behavior Representative (PBS): Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation 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 systematic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

Guidance Counselor: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. Communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students’ academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

Describe how the school-based RtI Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate RtI efforts?

The PS/RTI Leadership Team will focus meetings on how to improve school/teacher effectiveness and student achievement using the Problem Solving Model.

The PS/RTI Leadership Team will meet at least once per month (or more frequently as needed) to engage in the following activities:

- o Review school-wide, grade level, and teacher data to problem solve needed interventions on a systemic level and identify students meeting/exceeding benchmarks as well as those at moderate or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. This will be done at least three times per year or more frequently if new data is available.
- o Help referring teachers design feasible strategies and interventions for struggling students by collaborating regularly, problem solving, sharing effective practices, evaluating implementation, assist in making decisions for school, teacher, student improvement.
- o Facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.
- o Focus on improving student achievement outcomes with evidence based interventions implemented with fidelity and frequent progress monitoring. Intervention teams also foster a sense of collegiality and mutual support among educators, promote the use of evidence-based interventions, and support teachers in carrying out intervention plans.

Describe the role of the school-based RtI Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The PS/RTI 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.

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

RtI Implementation
<p>Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.</p> <p>Baseline data is gathered through August and September. FAIR data is processed through the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN). Kindergarten and First Grade data is gathered for the SBAR. First and Second Grade instructional data is gathered from the previous year SAT 10. Third through Tenth Grade instructional data is gathered from the previous year's FCAT scores. Progress Monitoring data is gathered mid-year and toward the end of the year. FAIR data is processed twice more through the PMRN. Kindergarten and First Grade data is gathered for the SBAR every nine weeks. Other Progress Monitoring data is collected as needed for classroom or student progress. This information may be obtained by probes, Quick Reads, Fluency checks, etc. Diagnostic Assessment data is gathered through the FAIR, ERDA, and DAR End of Year data is gathered through FAIR, SAT 10, FCAT, and SBAR. Data is discussed and analyzed at least monthly at the PS/RTI Leadership Team Meetings.</p>
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on RtI.</p> <p>Professional learning will be provided during the teachers' common planning time and sessions will occur throughout the year. The PS/RTI Overview will be provided in mid-August/September. The District has five other mini-modules that will be provided throughout the year. The PS/RTI Leadership Team will evaluate additional staff Professional Learning needs during the monthly PS/RTI Leadership Team meetings.</p>

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
<p>Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).</p> <p>Hillcrest Elementary LLT includes: administration, resource staff, and grade level chairpersons.</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions):</p> <p>Ongoing meetings will implement strategies to address the needs identified by our state assessments.</p>
<p>What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?</p> <p>To monitor the student progress and make individual academic and instructional adjustments to address the needs of students in order to achieve AYP.</p>

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

NCLB Public School Choice

Letters generated by Title I and sent to schools for updated information

- **Notification of School in Need of Improvement (SINI) Status** **SINI - #6**
Upload a copy of the Notification of SINI Status to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.
- **Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification**
Upload a copy of the CWT Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.
- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**
Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition* **Title I Component #7

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

Hillcrest plans to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs. The local pre-schools bring their students to visit kindergarten classrooms in the spring. All incoming kindergarten students are given an assessment before they are placed in classrooms to help determine kindergarten readiness. On campus VPK and School readiness pre-k programs are also given at orientation of the kindergarten classrooms. A support group has been formed through the Lake Wales Charter School Superintendent's office to work with all Lake Wales community daycares to bridge the gap for school readiness among the incoming kindergartners. A kindergarten support program has also been implemented that funds the endeavors of preschool transition. Current or Planned Programs to assist preschoolers: Two weeks prior to school startup, the Kindergarten Resource Teacher with the assistance of four classroom teachers, delivers a program to all Hillcrest Preschoolers. Attendance is voluntary but encouraged. During a period of two four-day weeks, 2 hours per day, the teachers prepare the student for transition. The assessment tool used is created by the kindergarten staff and the objectives for this activity include: The student will be able to: recognize his/her name in print; develop an awareness that print contains a message; demonstrate good listening skills; communicate ideas and needs in an appropriate way; handle books appropriately; learn appropriate uses of class materials; share space and materials; participate in group activities; practice one-to-one correspondence, and develop social skills with peers. Parents will become familiar with the school campus, understand report cards and the grading system, and gain an understanding of the School Handbook as well as The Code of Conduct as a result of this two week program. This program is evaluated each year by the individuals involved as well as by the grant given. This year, we have plans to have the results evaluated by a local college. The Kindergarten Resource Teacher is also available to assist preschool students with low readiness issues.

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

***Grades 6-12 Only** Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

N/A

***High Schools Only**

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S., Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

N/A

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

April 2011

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals Title I Component #2, #9

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

READING GOALS			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
			1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading			1.1.Lack of motivation or interest and skills in reading	1.1.Incorporate multiple reading resources, read-alouds and modeling of think alouds
Reading Goal #1:							
By the Spring of 2012, FTE 2-3 AL 3 students will increase to percentage shown at the right as reported by INDV file.	<u>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	35% (91)	38%					
			1.2. Written response to reading selection is limited.	1.2.Written summarization aligned with grade level writing expectations	1.2. Classroom teacher, Reading Resource	1.2. Observations, lesson plans	1.2 ongoing progress monitoring
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading			2.1.lack of enrichment opportunities to maintain level 4 and above proficiency	2.1. enrichment opportunities using grade level/above grade level materials and ability groups.	2.1. Classroom teachers/ Reading Resource/ Administrations	2.1. Lesson plans, classroom observations	2.1. ongoing progress monitoring
<u>Reading Goal #2:</u>							
By the Spring of 2012, FTE2-3 AL 4 and 5 students will increase to percentage shown at the right as reported by INDV file.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	30% (78)	33%					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading			3.1.Interventions do not address specific student needs	3.1.Use progress monitoring data to match intervention to student needs	3.1.Classroom teachers, Reading Resource, & administration	3.1.Lesson plans, observations, diagnostic assessment reports	3.1.ongoing progress monitoring
<u>Reading Goal #3:</u>							
By the Spring of 2012, FTE2-3 3 RD -5 TH Grade students will increase to percentage shown at the right as reported by INDV File.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	62% (118)	65%					
			3.2.Lack of motivation or interest and skills in reading	3.2.Incorporatate multiple reading resources, read-alouds and modeling of think alouds	3.2.Classroom teacher, Reading Resource, Administration	3.2. Targeted Observations, lesson plans	3.2. ongoing progress monitoring
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading			4.1. Students enter school with limited expressive and receptive language	4.1. Stimulate oral language skills by use of variety of techniques and strategies	4.1. classroom teachers, Reading Resource, Administration	4.1.Lesson plans, observations	4.1. ongoing progress monitoring
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u>							

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

By the Spring of 2012, FTE2-3 3 RD -5 TH Grade students will increase to percentage shown at the right as reported by INDV File.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	62% (29)	65%					
			4.2.Limited time spent with “eyes on text” and engagement with text	4.2.Multiple opportunities for text exploration and reading of extended passages to assist in building reading endurance	4.2.Classroom teachers, Reading Resource & administration	4.2.Scheduling, Lesson plans, observations	4.2.ongoing progress monitoring
		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the applicable subgroup(s):			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading SINI - #1, #2 <u>Reading Goal #5A:</u>	Reading Goal #5A: Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)		5A.1. White:N/A Black:Weak critical thinking skills Hispanic: challenges due to the state increases in the proficiency target.	5A.1.Extended thinking and STEM activites, FCAT 2.0 Reading Quesitons	5A.1. Classroom Teachers, Reading Resoucre, Administration	5A.1. Classroom observation, lesson plans	5A.1. ongoing progress monitoring
By the Spring of 2012, subgroups will make AYP-Safe Harbor as indicated by the NCLB-AYP report.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*	Asian:N/A American Indian:N/A				
	White: N/A Black: 33% (23) Hispanic: 51% (42) Asian: American Indian:	White: N/A Black:40% Hispanic: 56% Asian: American Indian:					
			5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading SINI - #1, #2 Reading Goal #5B:	Reading Goal #5B: English Language Learners (ELL)		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
	2011 Current Level of Performance:* n/a	2012 Expected Level of Performance:* n/a				
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading SINI - #1, #2 Reading Goal #5C:	Reading Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)		5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
	2011 Current Level of Performance:* n/a	2012 Expected Level of Performance:* n/a				
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in	Reading Goal #5D: Economically Disadvantaged		5D.1. Students enter school with limited expressive and receptive language	5D.1. Stimulate oral language skills by use of variety of techniques	5D.1. classroom teachers, Reading Resource, Administration	5D.1. ongoing progress monitoring

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

reading SINI - #1, #2						
Reading Goal #5D:						
<i>By the Spring of 2012, subgroup will make AYP-Safe Harbor as indicated by the NCLB-AYP report.</i>	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	54% (122)	59%				
			5D.2.Students have limited access to reading material and technology at home	5D.2.Encourage book checkout from school library and encourage use of public library	5D.2. classroom teachers, Media Specialist, Reading Resource, Administration	5D.2. Lesson plans, Observations
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
School-wide reading comprehension plan	K-5	Reading Resource	Classroom teachers, resource teachers, & administration	Monthly Meetings	Observations, lesson plans, ARROW PD form completion	Administration, Reading Resource
Reading Instruction and strategies	K-5	Grade Chair	Classroom teachers, resource teachers & administration if needed	Weekly Meetings	Observations/lesson plans	Adminstration

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide support with the implementation of the School-wide Reading Comprehension Plan	Intervention Passport Kits Grades 3-5	General Fund	\$7,965.00
Provide support with the implementation of the School-wide Reading Comprehension Plan	Textbooks & Supplemental materials	General Fund	\$13,320.00
			Subtotal: \$21,285.00

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Technology			
	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide teachers with a high quality Reading Resource Teacher	Reading Resource Teacher	Title One	\$51,265.00
Provide support with the implementation of the School-wide Reading Comprehension Plan	Trade books at all levels and genres	General Fund	
			Subtotal: \$51,265.00
			Total:\$72,550.00

End of Reading Goals

Mathematics Goals **Title I Component #2, #9**

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g. 70% (35)).

MATHEMATICS GOALS	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students achieving proficiency (Level 3) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #1:	1.1. Fact Fluency	1.1. Build opportunities to practice math facts.	1.1. Classroom teacher/ Technology Resource/ Math Resource	1.1. Lesson plans, Fact Fluency reports, observations	1.1. ongoing progress monitoring

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

By the Spring of 2012, FTE2-3 AL 3 students will increase to percentage shown at the right as reported by INDV File.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	33% (96)	36%					
			1.2. Teacher content knowledge	1.2. Professional development in math content along with teaching strategies	1.2.MathResource/ Administration/ classroom teachers	1.2. Lesson plans, classroom observations,	1.2. ARROW PD form completion, ongoing progress monitoring
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students achieving above proficiency (Levels 4 and 5) in mathematics			2.1. Lack of enrichment instruction to maintain level 4 and above proficiency	2.1. enrichment opportunities using grade level/above grade level materials incorporating, higher order thinking skills, and written reflections	2.1. Classroom teachers/ Math Resource/ Administrations	2.1. Lesson plans, classroom observations, diagnostic assessment reports	2.1. ongoing progress monitoring
Mathematics Goal #2:							
By the Spring of 2012, FTE2-3 AL 4 and 5 students will increase to percentage shown at the right as reported by INDV File.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	27% (79)	30%					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics (excluding 9th grade; learning gains will not be available for this grade)			3.1. Fact Fluency	3.1. Build opportunities to practice math facts.	3.1. Classroom teacher/ Technology Resource/ Math Resource	3.1. Lesson plans, Fact Fluency reports, observations	3.1. ongoing progress monitoring
Mathematics Goal #3:							
By the Spring of 2012, FTE2-3 3 RD -5 TH Grade students will increase to percentage shown at the right as reported by INDV File.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012Expected Level of Performance:*					
	73% (138)	75%					
			3.2. Interventions do not address specific student needs	3.2. Use of progress monitoring data to match intervention to student needs	3.2.Classroom teacher/ Math Resource	3.2.Lesson plans, observations, diagnostic assessment reports	3.2. ongoing progress monitoring
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics			4.1.Need more time to master content	4.1. Multiple opportunities for review and practice and previewing	4.1. Classroom teachers/ Math Resource & administration	4.1.Scheduling, Lesson plans, observations	4.1.ongoing progress monitoring
Mathematics Goal #4:							
By the Spring of 2012, FTE2-3 3 RD -5 TH Grade students will increase to percentage shown at the right as reported by INDV File.	<u>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	65% (31)	68%					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the applicable subgroup(s):			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics SINI - #1, #2			5A.1. White:N/A	5A.1.Alternate instructional strategies, application of skills to real world situations, and use of progress monitoring data to match intervention to student needs	5A.1.Classroom Teachers/ Math Resource/ Administration	5A.1.Lesson plans, classroom observations	5A.1. ongoing progress monitoring
Mathematics Goal #5A: Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)			Black: challenges due to the state increases in the proficiency target and lack of real world application				
By the Spring of 2012, subgroups will make AYP-Safe Harbor as indicated by the NCLB-AYP report.	<u>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Hispanic: challenges due to the state increases in the proficiency target and lack of real world application				
	White: n/a Black:55% (38) Hispanic: 68% (56) Asian: American Indian:	White: n/a Black: 60% Hispanic: 70% Asian: American Indian:	Asian:N/A American Indian:N/A				

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics SINI - #1, #2 Mathematics Goal #5B:	Mathematics Goal #5B: English Language Learners (ELL)		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
	N/A	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*			
		N/A	N/A			
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics SINI - #1, #2 Mathematics Goal #5C:	Mathematics Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)		5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
	N/A	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*			
		N/A	N/A			
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool				
5D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics SINI - #1, #2 Mathematics Goal #5D:	Mathematics Goal #5D: Economically Disadvantaged	5D.1. Students enter school with limited math proficiency	5D.1. Use of math manipulatives, technology and differentiated instruction.	5D.1. Classroom teachers, Math Resource and Administration	5D.1. Lesson plans, classroom Observations	5D.1. ongoing progress monitoring				
	<i>By the Spring of 2012, subgroup will make AYP-Safe Harbor as indicated by the NCLB-AYP report.</i>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>68% (154)</td> <td>71%</td> </tr> </table>	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*	68% (154)	71%	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*									
68% (154)	71%									
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.				

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Next Generation Sunshine state standards and strategies	K-5	Math Resource/ Acaletics Representative/ Grade Chairs	Math Classroom Teachers	Monthly Grade Level Meetings and Scheduled Trainings	Observations, lesson plans, ARROW PD form completion	Administration, Math Resource

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide resources that address Next Generation Florida Math Standards	Everglades Next Generation Florida Math Standards	General Fund	\$2,194.00

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

				Subtotal: 2,194.00
Technology				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
				Subtotal:
Professional Development				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Provide ongoing Acaletics Math support and professional development for teachers	Ongoing professional development and support for instructional staff	General Fund	\$13,000.00	
Provide ongoing Acaletics Math support and professional development for teachers	Ongoing professional development and support for instructional staff	Title One	\$25,000.00	
				Subtotal:38,000.00
Other				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Provide teachers with a high quality math resource teacher	Math Resource Teacher	Title One	71,101.00	
				Subtotal:71,101.00
				Total:111,295.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Science Goals **Title I Component #2, #9**

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

SCIENCE GOALS			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science			1.1. Students and teachers possess a host of misconceptions of and about science	1.1. Identify misconceptions within topic and develop strategies to enhance acquisition and extended thinking lessons during ongoing monthly grade level meeting.	1.1. Science Resource/Administration	1.1. Classroom targeted observations along with coaching as needed to support teachers in specific areas specifically targeting ways to improve misconceptions to better align instruction.	1.1. Classroom/Teacher Observations, Ongoing Progress Monitoring.
Science Goal #1:							
<i>By Spring 2012, FTE2-3 5th</i>			2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*			

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><i>Graders will score a 2% increase in science proficiency as reported by INDV. File.</i></p>	43% (36)	45%					
			1.2. Teacher time Restraints	1.2. Teachers will integrate science into their daily instructional routine .	1.2. Science Resource /Administration	1.2. Classroom Observations	1.2.Administrative observations/lesson plans
			1.3.Lack of vocabulary and knowledge among students and teachers in the area of science	1.3.Providing teachers with professional developments which will enhance students background knowledge and vocabulary	1.3. Science Resource/ Administration	1.3. Classroom Observations, lesson plans	1.3. ongoing progress monitoring
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science</p> <p>Science Goal #2:</p>			2.1. Students are not provided opportunities to utilize their creativity and critical thinking skills	2.1. Provide enrichment opportunities that result in higher level thinking skills associated with science topics.	2.1.Science Resource/ Administration	2.1.Use of effective “higher order thinking” strategies to enhance reasoning abilities of students, lesson plans, classroom observations	2.1. ongoing progress monitoring
<p><i>By Spring 2012, FTE2-3, 5th Graders will score a 1% increase in ALA-5 science proficiency as reported by INDV. File.</i></p>	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		10% (8)	11%				
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Effective Science Strategies	5 th Grade Science	Science Resource	5 th Grade Science Teachers	Weekly	Classroom Observations/Lesson Plans/In-service follow -up	Administration/Science Resource
Effective Science Strategies	K-4	Science Resource/ Administration	K-4 Grade Science Teachers	Monthly	Classroom Observations/Lesson Plans/in-service follow-up	Administration/Science Resource
Effective Science Strategies	K-5	Science Resource/ Grade Level	K-5 Classroom teachers, Resource teacher,	Weekly and Monthly	Classroom Observations/Lesson Plans/in-service follow-up	Administration/Science Resource

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		administration			
--	--	----------------	--	--	--

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide support the NGSSS 2.0 Science Standards K-5	Science textbooks	General Fund	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide teachers with science resource teacher	Science resource teacher	Title One	\$ 48,009.00
			Subtotal: \$50, 009.00
			Total:

End of Science Goals

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Writing Goals **Title I Component #2, #9**

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

WRITING GOALS			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students achieving Adequate Yearly Progress (FCAT Level 4.0 and higher) in writing			1.1. Students with limited vocabulary and expressive language skills	1.1. Stimulate vocabulary and language development through: descriptive words, read alouds, explicit word choice instruction, shared writing modeling, & writing in all content areas.	1.1. Administration/Writing Resource Teacher	1.1. Teacher /classroom observations, lesson plans, weekly meetings with grade 4 teacher	1.1. Ongoing Progress Monitoring
Writing Goal #1:							
By Spring 2012 AYP Writing will be attained by scoring 90% or higher as reported by FCAT 2012 results.	<u>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	100%	90% or higher					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing SINI - #1, #2			2A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Writing Goal #2A:							
N/A	<u>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	N/A White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	N/A White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.			
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
2B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing SINI - #1, #2 Writing Goal #2B:	Writing Goal #2B: English Language Learners (ELL)	2B.1.	3B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.			
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table>	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*	N/A	N/A			
	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*							
	N/A	N/A							
N/A		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.			
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.			
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
2C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing SINI - #1, #2 Writing Goal #2C:	Writing Goal #2C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)	2C.1.	2C.1.	2C.1.	2C.1.	2C.1.			
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table>	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*	N/A	N/A			
	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*							
	N/A	N/A							
N/A		2C.2.	2C.2.	2C.2.	2C.2.	2C.2.			
		2C.3.	2C.3.	2C.3.	2C.3.	2C.3.			

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing SINI - #1, #2 Writing Goal #2D:	Writing Goal #2D: Economically Disadvantaged	2D.1.	2D.1.	2D.1.	2D.1.	2D.1.
	2011 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2012 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A	2D.2.	2D.2.	2D.2.	2D.2.
N/A		2D.3.	2D.3.	2D.3.	2D.3.	2D.3.

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Effective Writing Strategies	4 th Grade Writing	Writing Resource	4 th Grade Classroom Teachers	Weekly	Classroom Observations/Lesson Plans/In-service follow -up	Administration/Writing Resource
Effective Writing Strategies	K-3, 5th	Writing Resource/ Administration	K-3, 5 th Grade Classroom Teachers	Monthly	Classroom Observations/Lesson Plans/in-service follow-up	Administration/Writing Resource
Data Day	K-5	Writing Resource/ Administration	K-5 Classroom Teachers	September 19, 2011	Classroom Observations/Lesson Plans/in-service follow-up	Administration/Writing Resource

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide teaches with high quality writing resource teacher	Writing Resource Teacher	Title One	\$54,864.00
			Subtotal \$54,864.00
			Total: \$54,864.00

End of Writing Goals

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Attendance Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

ATTENDANCE GOAL(S)		Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance					
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:		1.1. The current economic hardships and high mobility rate within the city limits	1.1. Community Outreach program (Project Learn, Learn, Learn)	1.1. Community Outreach program (Project Learn, Learn, Learn).1. Community Outreach Committee	1.1. Ongoing monitoring of feedback from parents and of family attendance	1.1. Parent Evaluations and sign-in sheets, attendance and tardy monthly reports	
E By the end of the 2011-2012 school year, the attendance rates will be attained as reported by Genesis.	2011 Current Attendance Rate:*						2012 Expected Attendance Rate:*
	96%						97%
	2011 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)						2012 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
	Enter numerical data for current number of absences in this box.						Enter numerical data for expected number of absences in this box.
	2011 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)						2012 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
Enter numerical data for current number of students tardy in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected number of students tardy in this box.						
	1.2.	1.2. Attendance monitor will check tardies and attendance.	1.2. Diane Hoard	1.2. Daily attendance report	1.2. Monthly attendance reports		
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.		

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Staff Meeting Discussion on Attendance	K-5	Administration	Hillcrest instructional staff	2011-2012 school year	Group discussion/sharing	Administration
PLC's on strategies on effective home visits	K-5	Administration/ Behavior Specialist/ Teachers	Hillcrest instructional Staff	2011-2012 school year	Group discussion/sharing	Administration

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			N/A
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			N/A
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			N/A

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			N/A
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

SUSPENSION GOAL(S)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:			1.1. Lack of communication between school and home	1.1. Community Outreach (Ie: Project Learn, Learn, Learn, After School Programs), the Positive Behavior Support initiatives, and parent building capacity events throughout the year	1.1. Community Outreach Committee, Behavior Specialist, and administration	1.1. Monitoring of the Genesis Reports to include the Suspension rates for the 2011-2012 school year	1.1.Suspension Reports and graphs
By the end of the 2012 School Year, ISS and OSS rates will decrease as reported in the following columns. Source: Genesis	2011 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2012 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
	71	67					
	2011 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2012 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	71	67					
	2011 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2012 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
59	55						
2011 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2012 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School						
59	55						
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
--	--	------	------	------	------	------

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Monthly PBS Meetings	K-5	Behavior Specialist	Classroom Teachers, & administration	Monthly per the 2011-2012 staff calendar	Classroom observations, fidelity checks, and surveys	Behavior Specialist & Administration
Quarterly PBS Behavior Coaching Meetings for support	Behavior Specialist	District Coordinator	District Behavior Specialists	Quarterly Meetings	Sharing with Administration, classroom teachers, and PBS Team	District Coordinator & Administration

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			N/A
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			N/A
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			N/A
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			NA
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

DROPOUT PREVENTION GOAL(S)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention <u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2010-2011 school year.</i>			1.1. N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
N/A	2011 Current Dropout Rate:*	2012 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	N/A.	N/A					
	2011 Current Graduation Rate:*	2012 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A						

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			N/A
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			N/A
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			N/A
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			N/A
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s) Title I Component #6; SINI #8

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

PARENT INVOLVEMENT GOAL(S)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement
-----------------------------------	--

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		1.1 Lack of motivation to attend parent conferences or due to the current economic situation many parents do not have transportation	1.1. Frequent communication to encourage more parent conferences (IE: student agenda's, frequent Connect Ed calls)	1.1. Administration/Title One Facilitator	1.1. Title One Conference logs from K-5 grade teachers	1.1. End of Year Title One Family Involvement Summary
To increase the percentage of parent conferences by 3% as evidence by Title One End of the Year Family Involvement Summary & Refer to the inserted Parent Involvement Plan	2011 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2012 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*				
	90%	92%				
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.		1.2.	1.1.a. Make frequent reminders to all families using the Connect Ed phone calling system	1.1.a. Administration/Title One Facilitator	1.1.a. Monitoring of the Title One Conference Logs	1.1.a. End of Year Title One Family Involvement Summary
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Parent-Tchr. Conf.	All	PIF	Instructional Staff	Monthly Grade Level Meetings & ongoing	Monitoring Conference Logs	Administration/PIF

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Parent Involvement Budget

*** Please ensure that items included in the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) are outlined in the following budget section.**

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Frequent communication to encourage more parent conferences (IE: student agenda's, frequent Connect Ed calls)	Communication device between home and school : student agendas	Title One	\$3,500.00
			Subtotal: \$3,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: \$3,500.00
			Total: \$3,500.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

ADDITIONAL GOAL(S)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
			1. Additional Goal Additional Goal #1:			1.1.	1.1.
N/A <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2011 Current Level :*	2012 Expected Level :*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A						

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Additional Goal(s)

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

FINAL BUDGET (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total: : \$72,550.00
Mathematics Budget	Total: \$71,101
Science Budget	Total: \$50,009.00
Writing Budget	Total: \$54,864.00
Attendance Budget	Total: N/A
Suspension Budget	Total: N/A
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total: N/A
Parent Involvement Budget	Total: \$3,500.00
Additional Goals	Total: N/A
	Grand Total: \$252,024.00

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school’s DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. double click the desired box; 2.when the menu pops up, select “checked” under “Default Value” header; 3. Select “OK”, this will place an “x” in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status					
<input type="checkbox"/> Intervene	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Correct II	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent II	<input type="checkbox"/> Correct I	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent I	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

- *Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the “Upload” page*

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting “Yes” or “No” below.

Yes

No

If No, describe measures being taken to comply with SAC requirement.
N/A

Describe the activities of the School Advisory Council for the upcoming year.
To meet on a monthly basis and work collaboratively for the betterment of Hillcrest. The SAC Committee will make informed recommendations and suggestions that will affect the lives of children and their learning environment.

Describe projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
N/A	

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1