

Florida Department of Education



School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Colleen Bevis Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Mrs. Tricia Simonsen	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Mrs. Circe MacDonald	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.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

Highly Qualified Administrators

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/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) progress.

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/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Mrs. Tricia Simonsen	B.S. Elem. Ed, M.A. Ed. Administration/Principal Certification/ESOL	13	13	07/08 A & AYP 08/09 A & AYP 09/10 A & AYP 10/11 A & AYP 11/12 A
Assistant Principal	Mrs. Melanie Cochrane	VE & Emotion. Handicap Certif. ESOL M.A. in Ed. Leadership	9	9	07/08 A & AYP 08/09 A & AYP 09/10 A & AYP 10/11 A & AYP 11/12 A

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. 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/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Lisa Monette	BA – Elem. Ed. M. Ed. – Reading Reading K – 12, ESOL	1	1	2009 – 2010 AYP & A (Walden Lake Elem.) 2010 – 2011 AYP & A (WLE) 2011 – 2012 AYP & A (WLE)

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	General Directors	June 2012	
2. Recruitment Fairs	Supervisor of Teacher Recruitment	Ongoing	
3. Map	Supervisor of Data Analysis	September 2012	
4. Performance Pay	General Director of Federal Programs	Fall 2012	
5. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	Ongoing	
6. District Peer Program	District Peers	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field (not ESOL certified) and not highly qualified.

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
---	---

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	
3	Continuing ESOL endorsements.

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
65	3%	9.2%	38%	49.2%	42%	100%	0%	30%	46%

Teacher Mentoring Program

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>Tamala Geiger</p>	<p>Sherri Holling</p>	<p>Mentor with EET Initiative. Strengths in mentoring and increasing student achievement.</p>	<p>Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.</p>
<p>Tamala Geiger</p>	<p>Cara Seibert</p>	<p>Mentor with EET Initiative. Strengths in mentoring and increasing student achievement.</p>	<p>Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.</p>

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Tricia Simonsen (Principal), Melanie Cochrane (AP), Shelli Bauer (School Psychologist), Tara Baker (Guidance Counselor), Megan Hurst (K), Beth Kordsmeier (1), Nicole Stanley (2), Dawn Mehaffey(3), Troy Smith (4), Kim Harris (5), Lisa Monette (Reading Coach), Michele Batchelder (ESE), Jo Jones (ESE), Jen Sims (ESE), Kathy Anderson (Speech Therapist), Sharon Smith (AGP teacher), Nora Nelson (Social Worker), Circe MacDonald (SAC Chair)

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

The purpose of the RtI team in our school is to provide high quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and use the performance and learning rate over time to make important educational decisions to guide instruction. The RtI team functions to address the progress of students identified by faculty and staff in the lower quartile and/or needing assistance in meeting AYP. Additionally, the team uses a problem solving approach to address strategies to provide support for identified students to have their needs met within the regular education setting. Decisions are data based with the academic and emotional needs of the child as the top priority. The RtI team works together to provide enrichment activities for high performing students identified as well.

Our RtI team works collaboratively with the PLC's and the SAC in the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model and progress monitoring. The team coordinates and collaborates with other site based working committees. The team assists in identifying professional development and resources. The RtI Team will meet two-three times a month for the following objectives:

- Oversee a multi-tiered model of service delivery
- Determine scheduling needs, curriculum, and intervention resources
- Review/interpret student data (behavior and academic)
- Organize and support systematic data collection
- Monitor interventions and data assessments in Tier 2 and Tier 3
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model and progress monitoring

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS 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 School Advisory Council Chair is a member of the RtI team.

The RtI team, SAC, and faculty were involved in the School Improvement Plan development activities that were conducted during preplanning for the 2012-2013 school year.

The SIP is the document which guides the work of the RtI team. The objectives and goals for the RtI team are outlined in the Action Steps, Evaluation Process, Evaluation Tool, and Professional Development of the SIP.

Since one of the main tasks of the RtI team is to monitor student data, effectiveness of the Action Steps will be monitored and modifications will be suggested as needed. The problem solving process utilizes current Tier 1 data to implement the problem identification and hypothesis for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructional intervention. The process is also implemented in PLC and specialized PSLT.

MTSS Implementation

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.

Common assessments provide diagnostic information to identify students' mastery of instructional content for core curriculum. Common assessments may be district generated content tests, PLC developed tests using the Achievement Series Scantron Testing Bank, chapter tests, and/or strand tests.

Students receiving instructional support or enrichment through Tier 2 or Tier 3 will use assessment tools identified previously in addition to teacher developed assessments focused on student needs. Data is obtained from FAIR, Curriculum Based Measure (CBM), SAT and FCAT. Bevis utilizes a database that tracks student progress through the RtI process.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

As the District's Problem Solving team develops resources and staff development courses on RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff as they become available. Professional Development sessions will occur during faculty meetings. Implementation will occur through the guidance of the PLCs and Vertical Teams

Describe plan to support MTSS.

In order to support MTSS at Bevis, we will:

- Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).
- Provide instructional staff with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.
- Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

1. Tricia Simonsen (Principal)
2. Melanie Cochrane (AP)
3. Lisa Monette (Reading Coach)
4. Teachers: Brown, Steinbacher, Stone, Dukes, Hamilton, Mehaffey, Kovalovich, Melovich, Lynch, Rudd, Haney, Filipek
5. Michele Wolfe (Media Specialist)
6. ESE: Baker, Anderson, Sims
7. Specialist: Franklin

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The LLT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading strategies on the SIP. The principal is the LLT chairperson. The reading coach is a member of the team and provides extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions. The reading coach and principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instruction support is provided to all teachers. The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

- Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading strategies across the content areas
- Professional development - Text Complexity, Creating Text Dependent Questions, Common Core
- Data analysis (ongoing)
- Implementation of K-12 Reading Plan

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).</p>	<p>1.1. Need for students to practice reading at home</p> <p>Need for professional development (varying degrees of teacher knowledge of NGSSS)</p> <p>Varying levels of parental involvement</p> <p>HOT question strategies: Need for more rigorous complexity in reading.</p>	<p>1.1. The school will implement grade level and course specific PLCs, provide reading information for home/parents via TrailBlazer (weekly newsletter).</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <p>Based upon data gathered through common assessments of core curriculum, PLCs will meet to decide which skills need to be re-taught, maintained or enriched, with a particular focus on main idea, as this is a skill that continues to need improvement based upon FCAT scores.</p> <p>PLCs meet to discuss and implement differentiated instructional strategies for teaching students who show mastery and non-mastery. Specific strategies include but are not limited to: reading enrichment groups, I-Station, Extended Learning</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u></p> <p>Principal</p> <p>AP</p> <p>Reading Coach</p> <p>Reading Vertical Team Leader</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>Administration reviews PLC logs and vertical team log for Reading and provides feedback.</p> <p>Principal and AP seek evidence of strategies during frequent walkthroughs.</p> <p>Reading Coach provides training at PLCs and faculty meetings.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>PLCs and teachers assess students using unit/chapter tests.</p> <p><u>PLC</u></p> <p>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart percentage of students reaching mastery (80%).</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>PLC logs and facilitators will report evaluative tools to LLT and Problem Solving Team. Information will be disseminated to RtI if applicable.</p> <p>Walk-through of PLC</p> <p>Monitoring of Vertical teams</p>	<p>1.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>FAIR</p> <p>Monitor school based instructional calendar, DRA2</p> <p>Chapter/Unit tests</p> <p>Vocabulary (Wordly Wise)</p> <p>Student participation in support and enrichment instructional strategies</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	---	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		Program and book clubs. The school will implement horizontal and vertical teams to facilitate communication of curriculum and articulation of student achievement.					
<u>Reading Goal #1:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 92% to 93%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	92%	93%					
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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>Need for students to practice independent reading at home.</p> <p>Need for professional development for varying degrees of teacher understanding of NGSSS.</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p><u>Strategy:</u></p> <p>At-school and tutor trainings to foster increased reading comprehension.</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <p>Battle of the Books, Read On Program (ELP), Mini Battle, Fairy Tale Bowl. (Intermediate Grades)</p> <p>Parent Involvement Night to highlight classroom emphasis on reading.</p> <p>Building Better Readers Training – tutor training for reading instruction emphasizing different tool to help literacy in young readers.</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>Principal AP Reading Coach Classroom teachers Reading Vertical Team Leader</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>Review of FAIR data by PLCs, Reading Coach and Reading Vertical Team</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p><u>PLC</u></p> <p>PLC logs will reflect reviewing of FAIR data and other evaluative measures.</p> <p>(Monitored by administration – RtI student data trends)</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>District baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u></p> <p>Chapter/Unit tests Vocabulary (Wordly Wise) Student participation in support and enrichment instructional strategies</p>		
---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><u>Reading Goal #2:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 76% to 77%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>76%</p>	<p>77%</p>					
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.</p>	<p>B.1. New students lacking background knowledge (vocabulary) Inconsistent student motivation. Varying levels of parental support.</p>	<p>B.1. <u>Strategy:</u> Effective remediation and communication with students, parents, teachers. <u>Action Steps:</u> Afterschool (ELP) instructional opportunities. Frequent communication with parents/stakeholders. PLC's document students for ELP, meet with administration, guidance and teachers to facilitate.</p>	<p>B.1. <u>Who</u> Principal AP Reading Coach Classroom teachers Reading Vertical Team Leader <u>How</u> Evaluation of ELP participants. FAIR data review by PLC, Vertical Team, Reading Coach and administration</p>	<p>B.1. See 1.1</p>	<p>B.1. See 1/1 <u>During Grading Period</u> Chapter/Unit tests Vocabulary (Wordly Wise) Student participation in support and enrichment instructional strategies</p>		
--	--	---	---	------------------------------	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><u>Reading Goal #3:</u></p> <p>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 85 points to 86 points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>85</p>	<p>86</p>					
		<p>B.2.</p>	<p>B.2.</p>	<p>B.2.</p>	<p>B.2.</p>	<p>B.2.</p>	
		<p>B.3.</p>	<p>B.3.</p>	<p>B.3.</p>	<p>B.3.</p>	<p>B.3.</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p>	<p>4.1.</p> <p>Lack of student motivation and parent involvement.</p>	<p>4.1.</p> <p><u>Strategy:</u></p> <p>See 1.1</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <p>Differentiated instruction for subgroups at each grade level.</p> <p>Teachers will participate in a school-wide book study on Text Complexity.</p> <p>ELP for Reading Intervention 2x year .</p>	<p>4.1.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>Principal</p> <p>AP</p> <p>Reading Coach</p> <p>Classroom teachers</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>See 1.1 – 3.1</p>	<p>4.1.</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>ELP</p> <p>I-station</p> <p>Small group and individual daily instruction per Tier.</p> <p>PLC: Monitoring of Assessment data.</p>	<p>4.1.</p> <p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>See 1.1 and 2.1</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u></p> <p>See previous reading goals.</p>		
--	---	--	--	--	---	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<u>Reading Goal #4:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 67 points to 68 points.	67	68					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	- - - - - - - - - - -	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 following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	92	93	94	95	96		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<u>Reading Goal #5:</u> N/A							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5A.1. White: Y Black: Y Hispanic: Y Asian: Y American Indian: N/A	5A.1. See Goals 1, 2, 3 and 4.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	White: Y Black: Y Hispanic: Y Asian: Y American Indian: N/A	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
	Y						
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
	-	5C.2.	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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5D:</u></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
<p>N/A</p>	<p>Y</p>						
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

Reading Professional Development

Hillsborough 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised July, 2012

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 Reading Coach, PLCs, Vertical Team Leader (Reading)	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
FAIR Data Review	K – 5	PLC Leader Reading Coach, PLCs, Vertical Team Leader (Reading)	All classroom teachers (Reading)	Three x’s per year	PLCs review data with Reading coach and LLT team.	Reading Coach, Administration
ELP	K – 5	Selected ELP classroom teachers	ELP instructors	Ongoing	Team Leaders, PLCs, Administration, Reading Coach	Administration
Wordly Wise	3 - 5	Intermediate Classroom Reading Teachers	Grade 4 and Grade 5 Teachers	Ongoing 2012 – 2013 School year	PLCs and Reading Coach	Grade level PLC leaders
Book Study – Complex Text	K – 5	Tim Filipek	Participating teachers	Spring 2013	Book study on complex text – follow-up from school wide teacher training.	Tim Filipek and Lisa Monette

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

CBM training	K – 5	ESE team	All classroom teachers	Ongoing	Follow-up from ESE team	Administration, ESE team
RtI Update	K-5	Betsy Lazega	All classroom teachers	Fall 2012	PLC and Administration	Administration
Creating Text Dependent Questions	K – 5	Tiffany Melovich	All classroom teachers	Spring 2013	PLC and Administration	Administration

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary School 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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Classroom balance between technology, manipulatives, teacher-instruction</p> <p>Access to technology “Think Central.”</p> <p>Student attendance</p> <p>Level of parental involvement (homework completion)</p> <p>Varying degrees of teacher understanding of new NGSSS and Common</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p><u>Strategy:</u></p> <p>Implementation of grade level and course specific PLC., PLC groups meet every 3 - 4 weeks to evaluate assessments.</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <p>Based upon data gathered through common assessment of core curriculum, PLCs will meet to decide which skills need to be re-taught, maintained or enriched.</p> <p>PLCs meet to discuss and implement differentiated instructional strategies for teaching students who show mastery and non-mastery.</p> <p>Web trainings – How to effectively utilize online resources</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>Principal</p> <p>AP</p> <p>Math Vertical Team Leader</p> <p>Math classroom teachers</p> <p>PLCs</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>Administration walkthrough of classrooms for evidence of best practices.</p> <p>FastMath data review</p> <p>Common assessment comparisons.</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>Ongoing formal and informal assessments</p> <p><u>PLC</u></p> <p>Review grade level data</p> <p>Plan ELP attendance and concepts</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>Administration review of PLC logs for problem solving strategies, data trends.</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>District Assessments</p> <p>FastMath</p> <p>Unit tests</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u></p> <p>Chapter tests</p> <p>Mid-chapter checkpoints</p> <p>FastMath data, Big Idea Tests, End of Year Go-Math tests. Anecdotal notes, Think-Central (Go-Math) online reviews</p>		
--	---	--	--	---	---	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	Core.	Update hardware and software					
<u>Mathematics Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 92% to 93%.							
	92%	93%					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

2012-2013 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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>Varying knowledge on how to differentiate instruction for enrichment utilizing the math series.</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p><u>Strategy:</u></p> <p>See 1.1</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <p>See 1.1</p> <p>PLC members share successful DI enrichment experiences.</p> <p>(Sharing manipulatives and resources gained at district and state trainings.)</p> <p>AGP teachers investigate enrichment opportunities through Renzulli Online Programs.</p> <p>Begin Math Club and Math League mid-September for 5th grade.</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>Administration</p> <p>Classroom math teachers</p> <p>Math Vertical Team</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>Review math series and enrichment activities.</p> <p>Administration walkthrough of classrooms for evidence of best practices.</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>AGP teachers confer on usage of Renzulli Online programming. Evaluate student data.</p> <p><u>PLC</u></p> <p>See 1.1</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>District Assessments</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u></p> <p>AGP teachers confer on usage of Renzulli Online programming. Evaluate student data.</p> <p>See Math Goal 1.</p>		
---	--	---	---	---	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><u>Mathematics Goal #2:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 71% to 72%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>71%</p>	<p>72%</p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	<p>B.1. Lack of knowledge of provided math series manipulative supplements. New standards implementation for grades 3 – 5. Common Core for Primary grades. Classroom technology availability (hardware and software).</p>	<p>B.1. <u>Strategy:</u> Increase teacher and student utilization of manipulatives. <u>Action Steps:</u> PLCs will meet to discuss manipulatives available at each grade level (New manipulatives available with math series at each grade level.) Teachers attend trainings with emphasis on math & manipulatives, problem solving, HOT math. ELP – Extended Learning Program for selected students Utilization of Item-</p>	<p>B.1. <u>Who</u> Principal AP Math Vertical Team Math Vertical Team Leader AGP teachers <u>How</u> Administration monitors PLC logs and vertical team logs. Administration evaluates usage of grade-specific manipulatives during walk-throughs</p>	<p>B.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> Evaluate student data <u>PLC/Department Level</u> Chart progress and monitor ELP attendance , information provided to RTI team for database <u>Leadership Team Level</u> PLC Team Leaders and Vertical Math Team Leader report to administration and Problem-Solving Team</p>	<p>B.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> District Assessments <u>During Grading Period</u> Chapter/Unit Tests Mid-chapter quizzes, Big Idea tests, End Of Year Assessments.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		Analysis provided by Achievement Series documenting student responses to district formative tests.					
<u>Mathematics Goal #3:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 82 points to 83 points.							
	82	83					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	
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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	<p>4.1.</p> <p>New frameworks necessitate assumption of mastery of previous material. (New standards)</p>	<p>4.1.</p> <p><u>Strategy:</u></p> <p>Familiarity of NGSSS and Common Core Standards. (Primary)</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <p>Attendance at school-site trainings of new math series.</p> <p>Align student abilities to their current needs.</p> <p>Base pacing and skill instruction on data from</p>	<p>4.1.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>Principal</p> <p>AP</p> <p>PLC Leaders</p> <p>Math classroom teachers</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>Review PLC logs</p> <p>Review inservice records</p>	<p>4.1.</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>See 1.1</p> <p><u>PLC</u></p> <p>Grade level PLCs will chart progress of bottom-quartile students., Database is provided and updated at RtI on weekly basis.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>See 1.1</p>	<p>4.1.</p> <p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>See Math Goal 1.1</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u></p> <p>See Math Goal 1.1.</p>		
--	---	--	---	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><u>Mathematics Goal #4:</u> Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 82 points to 83 points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>82</p>	<p>83</p>					
		<p>4.2.</p>	<p>4.2.</p>	<p>4.2.</p>	<p>4.2.</p>	<p>4.2.</p>	
		<p>4.3</p>	<p>4.3.</p>	<p>4.3.</p>	<p>4.3.</p>	<p>4.3.</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	92	93	94	95	96		
<u>Math Goal #5:</u>							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics	5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. See goals 1, 2 ,3 and 4.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<u>Math Goal #5A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<p>The percentage of White students scoring satisfactorily on the 2013 Math FCAT will increase from 93% to 94%.</p>							
<p>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring satisfactorily on the 2013 Math FCAT will increase from 89% to 90%.</p>							
<p>The percentage of Asian students scoring satisfactorily on the 2013 Math FCAT will increase from 92% to 93%.</p>							

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	White: 93 Black: Y Hispanic: 89 Asian: 92 American Indian: N/A	White: 94 Black: Hispanic: 90 Asian:93 American Indian: N/A					
		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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. See goals 1, 2, 3, and 4.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u></p> <p>The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring satisfactorily on the 2013 Math FCAT will increase 88% to 89%</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>89%</p>	<p>90%</p>					
		<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	
		<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u></p> <p>N/A</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
		<p>5C.2.</p>	<p>5C.2.</p>	<p>5C.2.</p>	<p>5C.2.</p>	<p>5C.2.</p>	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5D.1. Disability severity. Level of math exposure and ability.</p>	<p>5D.1. ELP RI tier 1,2 or 3 See goals 1, 2, 3, and 4.</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>		
--	---	--	--------------	--------------	--------------	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u></p> <p>The percentage of Students with Disabilities scoring satisfactorily on the 2013 Math FCAT will increase from 65% to 69%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>65%</p>	<p>69%</p>					
		<p>5D.2.</p>	<p>5D.2.</p>	<p>5D.2.</p>	<p>5D.2.</p>	<p>5D.2.</p>	
		<p>5D.3</p>	<p>5D.3</p>	<p>5D.3</p>	<p>5D.3</p>	<p>5D.3</p>	

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

**Mathematics Professional Development
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
---	-------------------------	--	---	--	-----------------------------------	---

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Training (PD) aligned with Math Series	K – 5	AGP teacher and Vertical Team Leader	All math teachers K – 5	Ongoing	PLC logs reflect utilization/discussion of Math Series	Administration and Math Vertical Team Leader
First-in-Math Orientation	K – 5	Cynthia Young	All math teachers K – 5	Fall 2012	Review of assessments/usage with PLC teams	PLC leaders/Cynthia Young/Circe MacDonald
Hot Talk, Cool Moves (Effective Teacher Communication in Math Training)	K – 5	Circe MacDonald Cynthia Young (AGP Teacher)	All math teachers K – 5	Fall 2012	Review of student test data. Mastery of daily lesson objectives.	Administration and participating teachers
MEATY Math (Fractions, Multiples, Factors, etc.)	K-5	District Trainers	All math teachers K – 5	Ongoing	Review of assessments/usage with PLC teams	PLC leaders, administration

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.</p>	<p>1.1. Limited technology training, resources, & funding</p> <p>1.1. Limited bandwidth for multi-user internet capabilities.</p> <p>1.1. Student Passwords not provided.</p> <p>1.1. Teacher knowledge and comfort with subject or content within new series</p>	<p>1.1. Strategy: Utilization of at-school and in-home technology for teachers and students.</p> <p>1.1. Action Steps: Vertical Teams and PLCs meet to share technology & science resources.</p> <p>1.1. Application for Grants.</p> <p>1.1. Implement web-based interactive program, www.learning.com, for students' use in school and at home.</p> <p>1.1. Based upon</p>	<p>1.1. Who Principal AP PLCs Science Vertical Team</p> <p>1.1. How Administration reviews PLC and Vertical Team logs. Science Teachers review usage of Learning.com student software program.</p>	<p>1.1. Teacher Level Analyze teacher and student use of science-related technology. Science Data Chat (Spring 2013)</p>	<p>1.1. 2-3x Per Year District Assessments FCAT Explorer During Grading Period Chapter/Unit assessments, Science Journals, Lab Reports, Mini-Benchmark Assessments.</p>		
--	---	---	--	--	---	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>data gathered through common assessments of core curriculum, PLCs will meet to decide which skills need to be re-taught, maintained or enriched.</p> <p>Teachers attend content specific professional development to learn curriculum.</p>					
<p><u>Science Goal #1:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 90% to 91%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	90	91					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. <u>Strategy:</u> See 1.1 — <u>Action Steps:</u> See 1.1	2.1. <u>Who</u> See 1.1 <u>How</u> — See 1.1 —	2.1. See 1.1 —	2.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> See 1.1 <u>During Grading Period</u> See 1.1		
<u>Science Goal #2:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 64% to 65%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

	64%	65%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

Science Professional Development

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
Inquiry and the 5E Instructional Model	K – 5	Science Vertical Team	All science teachers	Ongoing	Administrators walk-through to monitor 5 E Instructional Model lessons.	Administration Team

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

Writing/ Language Arts 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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.</p>	<p>I.1. Differing levels of background experiences and out of district writing instruction. Assessment topics for writing. New focus/terminology and scoring moodles.</p>	<p>I.1. <u>Strategy:</u> Additional Individual Conferencing with selected students. <u>Action Steps:</u> Implementation of PLC and Vertical teams. Based upon data gathered through common assessments of core curriculum and Bronco Writes, PLCs will meet to decide which skills need to be re-taught, maintained or enriched. ELP (Extended Learning Program) for Writing.</p>	<p>I.1. <u>Who</u> Principal AP PLC leaders Writing Contact <u>How</u> - Selected students attend ELP. Sharing of instructional strategies for differentiation. Teacher attendance at writing trainings and online writing rubric moodles. __</p>	<p>I.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> Conferencing with students <u>PLC/Department Level</u> Create ELP invitation list Review grade level data <u>Leadership Team Level</u> Review PLC and Vertical Team logs Walk-through of PLC meetings.</p>	<p>I.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> Demand Writes/ Prompt Writing Evaluation by teachers trained in recent Writing Rubric usage. <u>During Nine Weeks</u> Bronco Writes, Weekly writing folders (primary grades), Portfolio additions.</p>		
--	--	---	--	---	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Writing/LA Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 94% to 95%.							
	94%	95%					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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 Writing Liaison	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
Writing rubric scoring training (online MOODLE)	Grades 3 – 5	PLC Leader Writing Liaison	All teachers	Ongoing 2012 – 2013	Follow up for Online coursework.	PLC/Team leaders
In the Mood for Mode	3 – 5	District Trainers	Writing teachers	Ongoing	PLC data assessment, administration	Administration, PLC team leaders

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>1. Attendance</p>	<p>1.1. Personal and family issues.</p>	<p>1.1. Monitor daily student attendance. Implement action plan for students with excessive absences. ** Letters are sent home, administration monitors regularly, social worker is notified and home visits are planned if necessary. Attendance recognition – ongoing.</p>	<p>1.1. Administration Classroom Teachers Guidance Social Worker</p>	<p>1.1. Analyze monthly attendance reports.</p>	<p>1.1. District generated reports.</p>		
-----------------------------	---	---	--	---	---	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
<p>1. The attendance rate will be maintained at 97%..</p> <p>2 .The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10% - maintained at 4.</p> <p>3.The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.(Maintain at 0).</p>							
	97%	97%					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences</u> (10 or more)	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences</u> (10 or more)					
	4	4					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies</u> (10 or more)					
	0	0					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
---------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1.1. Student response to classroom behavior redirection and modification.	1.1. Monitor classroom discipline. Review/discuss students with behavior challenges at PLC/RtI/committees.	1.1. Administration All instructional staff Guidance Social Worker Psychologist	1.1. Monitor reports Discussions at PLC/RtI	1.1. District generated reports		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of	2013 Expected Number of					
	In-School Suspensions	In-School Suspensions					
1. Maintain the total number of In-School Suspensions <10.							
2. Maintain the total number of students receiving In-School Suspension <10.							
3. Maintain the total number of Out-of-School Suspensions <10.							
4. Maintain the total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year <10.							

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	6	5					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended</u> <u>In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended</u> <u>In-School</u>					
	3	3					
	<u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	2	2					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended</u> <u>Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended</u> <u>Out-of-School</u>					
	2	2					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

End of Suspension Goals

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

	Problem-Solving						
--	------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s)	Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool		
<p>1. Health and Fitness Goal</p>	<p>1.1. Differing levels of physical fitness outside of school.</p>	<p>1.1. Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5.</p>	<p>1.1. Principal</p>	<p>1.1. Classroom walk-through</p>	<p>1.1. Lesson plans document time planned daily for Teacher Directed PE and scheduled PE classes.</p>		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Health and Fitness Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
<p>During the 2012 – 2013 school year, the number of fifth grade students scoring in the “Healthy Fitness Zone” (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 43% on the Pretest to 70% on the Posttest</p>							
	43%	70%					
		<p>1.2. Use the playground or fitness course equipment; walk/jog/run activities in the designated areas; exercising to the outdoor activities such as those provided in the 150 minutes of Elementary Physical Education Folder on IDEAS.</p>	1.2.	1.2.	1.2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

Continuous Improvement 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						
---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	nt						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
1. Continuous Improvement Goal	1.1. Percentage of parents reading the weekly newsletter (Trailblazer).	1.1. Teachers encourage families to review weekly newsletter. Update class websites to inform parents of opportunities.	1.1. Administration Annual School Climate and Perception Survey – Parent Results	1.1. Review of results obtained by Annual School Climate Survey (community resources & programs), Parent Results	1.1. Annual report.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<u>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
Based upon the School Climate and Perception Survey (2012 – Parent Results), the percentage of parents who strongly agree that the school informs them about community resources (after school programs, crisis support, tutoring) will increase from 56% to 60%.	56%	58%					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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
Trailblazer	K – 5	Administration	All classroom teachers	Ongoing	School climate survey review	Administration, SAC, faculty
Classroom websites (RWD Training)	K – 5	Fasee Sollars/Circe MacDonald	All classroom teachers	Ongoing	School review/administration/ parents	Classroom teachers/ administration

End of Additional Goal(s)

NEW Goal(s) For the 2012-2013 School Year

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

<p>A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).</p>	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.		
<p><u>Reading Goal A:</u> N/A</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	
		A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	
B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Reading Goal B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
		B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	
		B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.</p>	<p>1.1. See Reading Goals</p>	<p>1.1. See Reading goals.</p>	<p>1.1. See Reading goals</p>	<p>1.1. See reading goals.</p>	<p>1.1. See Reading Goals.</p>	
<p><u>CELLA Goal #C:</u> The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 85% to 86%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u></p>					
	<p>85%</p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool	
			Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?		
D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1. See Reading goals.	2.1. See Reading goals.	2.1. See Reading goals.	2.1. See Reading goals.	2.1. See Reading goals.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><u>CELLA Goal #D:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 62% to 63%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u></p>					
	<p>62%</p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>
<p>Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>See Reading goals.</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>See Reading goals.</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>See Reading goals.</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>See Reading goals.</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>See Reading goals.</p>	
<p><u>CELLA Goal #E:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 46% to 48%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u></p>					
	<p>46%</p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.		
Mathematics Goal F: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	
		F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	
G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Mathematics Goal G:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
		G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	
		G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

Elementary, Middle and High Science Goals	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme						
---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	nt						
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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.		
<u>Science Goal J:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	
		J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).</p>	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.		
<p><u>Writing Goal M:</u> N/A</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
		M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	
		M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	

NEW Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

STEM 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	Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool
<p><u>STEM Goal #1:</u></p> <p>Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM electives.</p>	<p>1.1</p> <p>Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers</p> <p>Training for STEM Fair.</p>	<p>1.1</p> <p>Math and Science Vertical Team Meetings focusing on STEM projects and instruction.</p> <p>-Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.</p>	<p>1.1</p> <p>PLC or grade level lead</p>	<p>1.1</p> <p>Administrative walk-throughs</p>	<p>1.1</p> <p>STEM projects/instruction</p>
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development

Hillsborough 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised July, 2012

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

(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
On site-training	K – 5	Science vertical team	All science classroom teachers	December 2012	Stem Fair judging	Science vertical team and visiting judges

End of STEM Goal(s)

-

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
<p><u>CTE Goal #1:</u></p> <p>Maintain the attendance at JABiztown at greater than 95% of students.</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Time of year and scheduling of 5th grade field trip.</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Structured lesson planning from JA Biztown.</p> <p>Attend trainings offered by the funded program.</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>5th grade teachers and administration monitor attendance.</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Monitor attendance data.</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Record attendance at annual field trip.</p>
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

**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
JA Biztown Training	5 th	District	5 th Grade Teachers	October 2012	Log of events and attendance	Administration, 5 th grade team leader

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		
Priority	Focus	Prevent

- *Once the state has provided information, directions for how to upload the checklist will be posted on the School Improvement Icon.*

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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 members 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 the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the use of SAC funds.			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
All	Funds utilized for substitute teachers so instructional staff may engage in professional development opportunities.	2154.00	2154.00

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Final Amount Spent	2154.00		