

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



## School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

### 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

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

**PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION**

School Name: Walden Lake Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough County
Principal: Dina V. Wyatt	Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia
SAC Chair: Katina S. Berrios	Date of School Board Approval:

**Student Achievement Data:**

**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	Dina V. Wyatt	M. Ed. / Educational Leadership	17	13	08/12 A 09/11 A 85% AYP 09/10 A 97% AYP 08/09 A 97% AYP 07/08 A 100% AYP 06/07 A 100% AYP
Assistant Principal	Lisa Hendricks	M. Ed. Educational Leadership B.S. /Education Grades 1-6 Specific Learning Disabilities Grades K-12 ESOL	3	3	09/12 A 09/11 A 85% AYP 09/10 B 69% AYP 08/09 A 92% AYP 07/08 B 77% AYP

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

**Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches**

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	Kelly Arias	B.S./Elementary Education Grades 1-6	1	1	n/a

**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	District Staff	June 2013	
2. Performance Pay	General Director of Federal Programs	July 2013	
3. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Administration	On-going	
4. Regular time for teacher collaboration	Administration	On-going	

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

**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-of-field/ and who are not highly qualified.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
7 Teachers are out-of-field	The teachers will attend trainings to achieve expected criteria and goals, striving to learn effective ways to meet the needs of all students.

**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)	(1) 2%	(12) 18%	(31) 48%	(21) 32%	(14) 22%	(58) 89%	(0)	(3) 5%	(43) 66%

**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
Maria Place	Karen Bendorf	Support to new teachers by the District	Weekly meetings scheduled by Mentor provided by the District
Maria Place	Kelsey Johnson	Support to new teachers by the District	Weekly meetings scheduled by Mentor provided by the District
Maria Place	Stephanie Calkins	Support to new teachers by the District	Weekly meetings scheduled by Mentor provided by the District
Maria Place	Kayla Scarlett	Support to new teachers by the District	Weekly meetings scheduled by Mentor provided by the District
Maria Place	Nicole Reneau	Support to new teachers by the District	Weekly meetings scheduled by Mentor provided by the District
Maria Place	Meghan Trivunovich	Support to new teachers by the District	Weekly meetings scheduled by Mentor provided by the District

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

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

#### School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

##### Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Principal: Dina V. Wyatt, Assistant Principal: Lisa Hendricks, Guidance Counselor: Bea Hilbrands, Psychologist: Caroline Bell, Social Worker: Blas Acevedo, Reading Coach: Kelly Arias, ESE teacher: Linda Davis, Representatives from PLC's: K- Kelsey Johnson, 1- Katina Berrios, 2-Donya Huddy, 3-Connie Holland,, 4-Lorrie Hudson, 5-Allison Bragg, SAC Chair: Katina Berrios, ELL Representative: Eileen McCurdy, Speech Specialist: Alida O'Donovan

##### 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 PSLT is considered the main leadership team in our school. The PSLT will meet weekly and use the problem solving process to:

- Oversee the multi-layered model of service delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Based on student data, recommend, coordinate and implement supplemental services (Tiers 2 and 3) that match students' non-mastery of skills through:
  - Tutoring during the day in small group pull-outs in reading, math and science
  - Extended Learning Programs during and after school
- Determine scheduling needs, curriculum materials and intervention resources based on identified needs derived from data analysis
- Works with PLC's to determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Review and interpret student data (academic, behavior and attendance) at the school and grade levels
- Organize and support systematic data collection as needed
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
  - Implementation and support of PLCs
  - Use of Mini Assessments (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)
  - Use of *Common Core Assessments* at the end of segments/chapters (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)
  - Implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions (e.g., Differentiated Instruction)
  - Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences
- Work with PLC's to assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the nine weeks.
- Assist with planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) and F-CIM (Florida Continuous Improvement Model on specific tested benchmarks) and progress monitoring.

##### 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 Chair of SAC is a member of the PSLT.
- The PSLT and SAC were involved in the School Improvement Plan development that was initiated prior to the end of the 2011-12 school year and during preplanning for the 2012-13 school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the PSLT. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, and Attendance.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the PSLT will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies developed in problem solving plans by reviewing student data as well as data related to various levels of fidelity. Using data gathered from PLCs, the team will monitor the data and make progress statements on the School Improvement Plan as determined by the PSLT. The PSLT will use the following rubric to evaluate Strategy Fidelity of Implementation and Strategy Effectiveness:

The PSLT will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning PSLT members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger PSLT team through the subject area PSLT

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.

The following table contains a summary of the assessments used to measure student progress in core, supplemental and intensive instruction and their sources and management:

**Core Curriculum (Tier 1)**

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released test	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach, teachers, administration
Stanford 10	School Generated Excel Database	Grades 1-2
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Charts	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing and Science	Scantron Achievement Series Data Charts	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers, administration
Program Generated Assessments	Software	Individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Common Assessments* ( <i>see below</i> ) of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources	Subject Area Generated Database	Individual teachers, PSLT

A Common Assessment covers a “chunk” of instruction within the District adopted curriculum. It covers all of the skills taught within a certain time period. The purpose of the Common Assessment is to assess students’ knowledge of the core curriculum as determined in PLC’s. The results of the Common Assessment are used to:

Determine if the lesson plans and teaching strategies used to teach the core curriculum were effective or need to be modified.

Determine which skills need to be taught with alternative strategies.

Determine which skills need to be re-taught within the core curriculum and which skills need to be moved to the Reinforcement Instructional Calendar.

Determine which students need Differentiated Instruction within the classroom and which students might need Supplemental Services.

**Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)**

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP)* ( <i>see below</i> ) Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials)	School Generated Database	PSLT/ ELP Facilitator/Teachers
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database	PSLT/ Reading Coach/Teachers
Daytime ELP/Soar to Success	School Generated Database	PSLT/Reading Coach/Teachers

Students receiving pull-out tutoring during the school day or Extended Learning Program (ELP) after school will receive instruction on the specific skills they have not mastered in the core curriculum. As students work on these specific skills, they will be assessed during tutoring and ELP to ensure mastery of skills. In order to make this process effective, a communication system between classroom teacher and the tutor/ELP teacher will be developed by the PSLT and monitored for effectiveness throughout the school year.

### Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff received overview training over the course of several faculty meetings during the 2011-2012 school year. PSLT members who attended the district level RtI trainings served as consultants to the PLCs to guide the process of data review and interpretation. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues. As the District's Problem Solving Team develops resources and staff development trainings on PS/RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions will occur during Tuesday faculty meeting times or faculty meetings. Our school will invite our area RtI Facilitator to visit as needed to review our progress in implementation of PS/RtI and provide on-site coaching and support to our PSLT/PLCs.

### Describe plan to support MTSS.

Response to Intervention (RtI) has also been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions. In order to support MTSS in our school, 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, school-wide behavior management plans).
- Provide designated school personnel 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

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

Principal: Dina V. Wyatt

Assistant Principal: Lisa Hendricks

Reading Coach: Kelly Arias

Reading Teachers: D. Coton, K. Gifford, S. Roberts, S. Scharf, N. Schmidt, S. Smith, M. Trivunovich, A. Warren

Media Specialist: Sharon Field

#### 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, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the Problem Solving Leadership team's support plan. Additionally the principal ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students.

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

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
- Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas
- Data analysis (on-going)
- Implement K-12 Reading Plan



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

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient/satisfactory in reading (Level 3-5)			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<p>Reading Goal #1:</p> <p>The percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 72% to 83%.</p>			<p>-Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.</p> <p>-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.</p> <p>-Number of transient students not enrolled for both FTE's</p> <p>-Alignment between assessments and curriculum</p>	<p>Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas</p> <p>Reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in complex text. Teachers need to understand how to select/identify complex text, shift the amount of informational text used in the content curriculum, and share complex texts with all students. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation. Teachers implement STEM questioning techniques throughout daily instruction and through intensive guided reading.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>	<p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Principal -AP -Reading Coach -PLC Facilitators (Team Leaders)</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool), informal Domain tools, and the Formal observation tool. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.</p>	<p>PLCs will review evaluation data at PLC meetings.</p> <p>PLC logs will be used to record data.</p> <p>PLCs will review assessment data for positive trends.</p> <p>The Problem Solving Leadership Team reviews FAIR/ OPM data to determine the positive trends.</p> <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.</p>	<p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>-District Reading Form Tests modeled after FCAT 2.0 assessments -DRA2 Assessments</p> <p><u>3x per year</u></p> <p>- FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension</p> <p><u>During Nine Weeks</u></p> <p>- Course unit assessments -Monthly EasyCBM Fluency Checks -Running Records</p>
	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p><b>72%</b></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p><b>83%</b></p>					

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

		1.2. Time Management with large number of students	1.2. Strategy Implement Soar to Success at end of first quarter-Step to intervention program developed to meet the academic needs of all students grades K-5. The goal of the program is to provide intense interventions for Tier level 1, level 2, and level 3 learners. The primary focus is on the core curriculum and incorporating DI strategies focusing on reading strategies, sight word analysis, phonemic awareness, phonics, comprehension, and fluency.  <u>Action Steps</u>  PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions/steps for this strategy are outline on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.2. <u>Who</u> PSLT/Teachers/ Administration  <u>How</u> Daily Grouping	1.2. Review Student Success/OPM tools used by teachers	1.2. Every 20-30 days
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. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading		2.1  See 1.1	2.1  See 1.1	2.1  See 1.1	2.1  See 1.1	2.1  See 1.1
<u>Reading Goal #2:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of</u>				

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

The percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 45% to 47%.	Performance:*	Performance:*					
	<b>45%</b>	<b>47%</b>					
			2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2
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. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in Reading			3.1.  See 1.1	3.1.  See 1.1	3.1.  See 1.1	3.1.  See 1.1	3.1.  See 1.1
Reading Goal #3:  Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 74 points to 76 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<b>74 points</b>	<b>76 points</b>					

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

		3.2. See 1.2	3.2. See 1.2	3.2. See 1.2	3.2. See 1.2	3.2. See 1.2
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. FCAT 2.0 Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.		4.1. See 1.1	4.1. See 1.1	4.1. See 1.1	4.1. See 1.1	4.1. See 1.1
Reading Goal #4:  Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 76 points to 79 points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
	<b>76 points</b>	<b>79 points</b>				
		4.2. See 1.2	4.2. See 1.2	4.2. See 1.2	4.2. See 1.2	4.2.

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

						See 1.2
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):  Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) Reading and Math Performance Target		Anticipated Barrier  2011-2012	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</b>	<b>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</b>	<b>Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>5 Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%</b>						
<u>Reading Goal #5:</u>						
<b>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>		5A.1. See 1.1	5A.1. See 1.1	5A.1. See 1.1	5A.1. See 1.1	5A.1. See 1.1

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

Reading Goal #5A:  The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 78% to 83%.  The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 52% to 68%.  The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 61% to 64%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White:78% Black:52% Hispanic:61% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	White:83% Black:74% Hispanic:64% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A					
			5A.2. See 1.2	5A.2. See 1.2	5A.2. See 1.2	5A.2. See 1.2	5A.2. See 1.2
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. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B2 See 1.1	5B2 See 1.1	5B2 See 1.1	5B2 See 1.1	5B2 See 1.1
Reading Goal #5B:  The percentage of	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 59% to 63%.	<b>59%</b>	<b>63%</b>					
			See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2
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. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
			See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1
Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 40% to 47%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>40%</b>	<b>47%</b>					

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

			See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2
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
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5D.1.  See 1.1	5D.1.  See 1.1	5D.1.  See 1.1	5D.1.  See 1.1	5D.1.  See 1.1
Reading Goal #5D:  The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 52% to 54%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<b>52%</b>	<b>54%</b>					



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

			See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2
--	--	--	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

**Reading Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
PLC's/Grade level and Curriculum	K-5	PLC grade level facilitators (Team Leaders)	All teachers school wide	PLC meetings	PLC logs posted on Walden Lake Internal	Principal, PSLT, and Administrative Team
Soar to Success	K-5	PLC grade level facilitators (Team Leaders)	All teachers school wide	PLC meetings	PLC logs posted on Walden Lake Internal/Data sort meetings by grade levels	Principal, PSLT, and Administrative Team
Easy CBM	K-5	Administration Guidance School Psychologist	All teachers school wide	Beginning of school year  PLC meetings	Data sort meetings by grade levels	Principal, PSLT, and Administrative Team

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals**

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	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool
<b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in mathematics (Level 3-5).</b>			1.1 -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.	1.1 <u>Strategy</u> Students' math achievements improves through the use of technology (Go Math, online interventions), guided math groups, ELP, Saturday Academy, model lessons by district, more problem solving strategies in primary grades, and hands-on activities to implement the Common Core State Standards. In addition, student practice taking on-line assessments to prepare students for on-line state testing.	1.1 <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -PLC Facilitators (Team Leaders)	1.1 PLCs will review evaluation data at PLC meetings.  PLC logs will be used to record data.	1.1 <u>2-3x Per Year</u>
<u>Mathematics</u> <b>Goal #1:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u> <b>58%</b>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u> <b>72%</b>	-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.	-Number of transient students not enrolled for both FTE's	<u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	PLCs will review assessment data for positive trends.	<u>2x per year</u> <u>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</u>
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 58% to 72%.			-Alignment between curriculum and assessments	-calendar pacing	Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool), informal Domain tools, and the Formal observation tool. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.	The Problem Solving Leadership Team reviews data trends/results.  PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.	<u>BOY test</u> <u>MYT test</u> <u>EOY test</u>
				<u>Action Steps</u> -PLCs use their core curriculum information to learn more about hands-on and technology activities.			<u>During Nine Weeks</u> - Course unit assessments
				-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans. 1. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, and teaching, researched-based best-practice strategies. 2. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from			

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

				<p>their PLC discussions.</p> <p>3. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>4. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>5. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective.</p> <p>6. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.</p> <p>7. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).</p> <p>8. PLCs record their work in log</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:			<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b>	<b>Strategy Data Check</b>	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<p>Mathematics Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 31% to 34%.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance</p>	<p>2013 Level of Performance</p>	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1
	<b>31%</b>	<b>34%</b>					

**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	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool
<b>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1
Mathematics Goal #3:  Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 68 points to 72 points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>68 points</b>	<b>72 points</b>					

**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	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>		See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1
<u>Mathematics</u>	See 2.1.	See 2.1.				
Goal #4:						
Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 51 points to 54 points.	<b>51 points</b>	<b>54 points</b>				

**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 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														
<p><b>5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b></p> <p>Math Goal #5:</p>																				
<p><b>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics</b></p>	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1															
<p>Mathematics Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2012 Current</td> <td>2013 Expected</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level of Performance:</td> <td>Level of Performance:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White:67%</td> <td>White:70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black:38%</td> <td>Black:46%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic:39%</td> <td>Hispanic:51%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian:N/A</td> <td>Asian: N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>American Indian: N/A</td> <td>American Indian: N/A</td> </tr> </table>	2012 Current	2013 Expected	Level of Performance:	Level of Performance:	White:67%	White:70%	Black:38%	Black:46%	Hispanic:39%	Hispanic:51%	Asian:N/A	Asian: N/A	American Indian: N/A	American Indian: N/A					
2012 Current	2013 Expected																			
Level of Performance:	Level of Performance:																			
White:67%	White:70%																			
Black:38%	Black:46%																			
Hispanic:39%	Hispanic:51%																			
Asian:N/A	Asian: N/A																			
American Indian: N/A	American Indian: N/A																			
<p>Math will increase from 67% to 70%.</p> <p>The percentage of Black students scoring</p>		See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1														

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

proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 38% to 46%.  The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 39% to 51%.										
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:		<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b>	<b>Strategy Data Check</b>	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>				
<b>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>		See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1				
Mathematics Goal #5B:  The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 40% to 53%.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>2012 Current</u> Level of Performance:</td> <td><u>2013 Expected</u> Level of Performance:</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>40%</b></td> <td><b>53%</b></td> </tr> </table>	<u>2012 Current</u> Level of Performance:	<u>2013 Expected</u> Level of Performance:	<b>40%</b>	<b>53%</b>					
<u>2012 Current</u> Level of Performance:	<u>2013 Expected</u> Level of Performance:									
<b>40%</b>	<b>53%</b>									

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

			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?	
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>							
Mathematics	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
Goal #5C:	Level of Performance:	Level of Performance:					
The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 23% to 40%.	<b>23%</b>	<b>40%</b>					
			See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1



## 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 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
<b>5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1
Mathematics Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactorily on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 42% to 52%.	<b>42%</b>	<b>52%</b>					

## 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
PLC's/Grade level and Curriculum	K-5	PLC grade level facilitators (Team Leaders)	All teachers school wide	PLC meetings	PLC logs posted on Walden Lake Internal	Principal, PSLT, and Administrative Team

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

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

End of Mathematics Goals

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**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	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool
<p><b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance (Level 3-5) in science.</b></p>			<p>1.1 Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.</p>	<p>1.1 <u>Strategy</u> The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum through hands on science investigations, problem solving, and differentiated Instruction.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>1. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, and teaching, researched-based best-practice strategies.</p> <p>2. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.</p> <p>3. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common</p>	<p>1.1 <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -PLC Facilitators (Team Leaders)</p> <p><u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form</p>	<p>1.1 PLCs will review evaluation data at PLC meetings.  PLC logs will be used to record data.  PLCs will review assessment data for positive trends.  PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for</p>	<p>1.1 <u>2x per year</u>  District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  <u>During Nine Weeks</u>  - Course unit assessments</p>
<p>Science Goal #1:  The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 58% to 70%.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:  <b>58%</b></p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:  <b>70%</b></p>	<p>-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.</p> <p>-Number of transient students not enrolled for both FTE’s</p>				

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

				<p>assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>4. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>5. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective.</p> <p>6. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.</p> <p>7. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).</p> <p>8. PLCs record their work in logs.</p>	(EET tool), informal Domain tools, and the Formal observation tool. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.	positive trends.	
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:			<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b>	<b>Strategy Data Check</b>	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
					Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	
<b>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.</b>			See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1
<b>Science Goal #2:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u>	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:</u>					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 19%	<b>19%</b>	<b>22%</b>					

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

to 22%.							
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**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
PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	K-5	PLC grade level facilitators (Team Leaders)	All teachers school wide	PLC meetings	PLC logs posted on Walden Lake Internal	Principal, PSLT, and Administrative Team

*End of Science Goals*

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**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	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level <u>3.0</u> or higher in writing.			Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Number of transient students not enrolled for both FTE's -How new state scoring standards will impact student writing proficiency -How the number of scorers of FCAT Writes will impact proficiency on 2013 writing test. -Rapid change in state writing standards	<u>Strategy</u> Student performance outcomes increase with teacher modeling and intensive instruction on a daily basis. RTI groups based on students' strengths and weaknesses in various elements of writing. Writers Workshop is incorporated daily within each writing classroom. ELP/Saturday Academy for writing based on students' needs. <u>Action Steps</u> 1. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, and teaching, researched-based best-practice strategies. 2. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 3. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.	<u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -PLC Facilitators (Team Leaders)  <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool), informal Domain tools, and the Formal observation tool. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.	PLCs will review evaluation data at PLC meetings. PLC logs will be used to record data. PLCs will review assessment data for positive trends. Observation Form	<u>2-3x Per Year</u> - Student monthly demand writes, student drafts and conferencing notes <u>During Nine Weeks</u> Student monthly demand writes - Conferencing while writing with students (Teachers)
Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 96% to 96% (3.0 or higher).	2012 Current Level of Performance: <b>96%</b>	2013 Expected Level of Performance: <b>96%</b>					

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

				<p>4. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>5. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective.</p> <p>6. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.</p> <p>7. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).</p> <p>8. PLCs record their work in logs.</p>			

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

**Writing/Language Arts 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
<b>PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum</b>	<b>K-5</b>	<b>PLC grade level facilitators (Team Leaders)</b>	<b>All teachers school wide</b>	<b>PLC meetings</b>	<b>PLC logs posted on Walden Lake Internal</b>	<b>Principal, PSLT, and Administrative Team</b>

*End of Writing/Language Arts Goals*

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**  
**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**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	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?			
1. Attendance			1.1 -Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance. -Lack of time to focus on attendance -Lack of staff to focus on attendance	The Administration Team along with other appropriate staff will meet weekly to review the school's Attendance to 1) ensure that all steps are being implemented with fidelity and 2) discuss targeted students. A data base will be maintained for students with excessive unexcused absences and tardies. This data base will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of attendance interventions and to identify students in need of support beyond school wide attendance initiatives	1.1 Monthly monitoring of District Attendance reports  Social Worker and Guidance Counselor will maintain data base	1.1 Administration Team and subset of PSLT will examine data monthly	1.1 Attendance Report Tardy Report
Attendance Goal #1:  1. The attendance rate will increase from 93% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013.	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>  <b>95.82%</b>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>  <b>96%</b>					
2. The attendance rate will increase from 95.82% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013.							
The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10%	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>  <b>49</b>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>  <b>39</b>					
3.The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Unexcused Tardies</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Unexcused</u>					



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

	(10 or more)	Tardies (10 or more)					
	<b>150</b>	<b>140</b>					

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	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus
PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum

*End of Attendance Goals*

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1  
Suspension Goal(s)**

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	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.	1.1	1.1.	1.1	1.1.
<p><b>Suspension Goal #1:</b></p> <p>1. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension will decrease from 3% in 2011-2012 to 2% in 2012-2013.</p> <p>2. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspension will decrease from 7% in 2011-2012 to 5% in 2012-2013.</p>	<p><u>2012 Total</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>In-School</u> <u>Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013</u> <u>Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>In-School</u> <u>Suspensions</u></p>	<p>There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.</p> <p>Wide variation in students' behavioral needs</p>	<p>Support student with fidelity/providing equal opportunity for all students.</p> <p>Motivation Programs for students</p>	<p>Teachers, administration, guidance and social worker</p>	<p>PSLT "Managing and Motivating" subgroup with review data on Office Discipline Referrals</p>	<p>Suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data</p>
<p><u>2012 Total</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students</u> <u>Suspended</u> <u>In-School</u></p>	<p><u>2013</u> <u>Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students</u> <u>Suspended</u> <u>In-School</u></p>						
<p>3</p>	<p>2</p>						
<p><u>2012 Number</u> <u>of Out-of-</u> <u>School</u> <u>Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013</u> <u>Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Out-of-School</u> <u>Suspensions</u></p>						
<p>7</p>	<p>5</p>						

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

**Suspension 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
PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum

*End of Suspension Goals*

**Health and Fitness Goal(s)**

ADDITIONAL GOAL(S)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
			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 the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:									
<p><b>1. Additional Goal</b></p> <p><u>Additional Goal #1:</u></p>			1.	1. Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5.	1. Principal	1. Classroom walk-throughs  Class schedules	1.	Classroom teachers document in their lesson plans the ninety (90) minutes of "Teacher Directed" physical education that students have per week. This is also reflected in the Master Schedule. Physical Education teachers' schedules reflect the remaining sixty (60) minutes of the mandated 150 Minutes of Elementary Phys. Ed.	
During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 65% on the Pretest to 75% on the Posttest.		2012 Current Level:							2013 Expected Level:
		59%							69%
				2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the Principal's designee.	2. Principal's designee.	2. Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ)		2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	

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

			3. Use of the playground or fitness course equipment; walk/jog/run activities in designated areas; and exercising to the outdoor activities such as the ones provided in the <i>150 Minutes of Elem. Physical Education</i> folder on IDEAS.	3. Physical Education Teacher	3. Lesson plans of Physical Education Teacher	3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.

**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
PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum

**Continuous Improvement Goal(s)**

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

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	Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Additional Goal</b> Additional Goal #1:			1.1. Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.	1.1 PLC's meet bi-weekly.	1.1. PLC Logs	1.2 PLST will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process.	1.1 PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach (Anne Jolly)
Based on the 2012-2013 School Climate and Perception Survey for the Instructional Staff, the percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their student's learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning)" will increase from 57% in 2012 to 65% in 2013.	2012 Current Level :	2013 Expected Level :	-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.				
	57%	65%					
			1.2 -Not enough time to meet in PLCs.	1.2 Leadership team will use teacher survey information every nine weeks to determine next steps for PLC professional development.	1.2 Who Leadership team  How	1.2 "Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training.	1.2 PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach (Anne Jolly)

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

				Leadership team aggregates the data		
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------	--	--

**Continuous Improvement 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 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
PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum	PLC's/Grade Level and Curriculum

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

**Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals**

**Editor Note: Data for this goal can be found on The Office of Assessment’s SIP Evaluation and Development Report**

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	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool
<b>C. Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in Listening/Speaking.</b>		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<u>CELLA Goal #C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u>	<b>Attendance Home Life Transitions Migrant Population Socioeconomic</b>	<b>See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1</b>			
The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 33% to 35%.	<b>33%</b>					



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

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
<b>D. Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in Reading.</b>		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<u>CELLA Goal #D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u>	<b>Attendance Home Life Transitions Migrant Population Socioeconomic</b>	<b>See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1</b>			
The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 21% to 23%.	<b>21%</b>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Students write in English at grade level 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?	

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

<b>E. Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in Writing.</b>		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #E:  The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 18% to 20%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :		<b>See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1</b>			
	<b>18%</b>					

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

**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>Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science.</p>	<p>1.1. Need common planning time for math, science, and technology.</p>	<p>1.1 <u>Strategy</u> The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum through hands on science investigations, math problem solving, and technology through differentiated instruction. <u>Action Steps</u> 1. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, and teaching, researched-based best-practice strategies. 2. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI</p>	<p>1.1 <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -PLC Facilitators (Team Leaders) <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool), informal Domain tools, and the Formal observation tool.</p>	<p>1.1 PLCs will review evaluation data at PLC meetings. PLC logs will be used to record data. PLCs will review assessment data for positive trends. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.</p>	<p>1.1 <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing <u>During Nine Weeks</u> - Course unit assessments</p>

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

		<p>strategies from their PLC discussions.</p> <p>3. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>4. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>5. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective.</p> <p>6. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.</p> <p>7. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).</p> <p>8. PLCs record their work in logs.</p>	<p>-Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.</p>		
	1.3	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

**STEM 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
Project-based learning	6-8	SALs	Science, math, ELA and technology teachers PLCs	On-going	Administrator walk-throughs	Administration
PLC's/Grade level and Curriculum	K-5	PLC grade level facilitators (Team Leaders)	All teachers school wide	PLC meetings	PLC logs posted on Walden Lake Internal	Principal, PSLT, and Administrative Team

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

**Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)**

CTE 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 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
<b>CTE Goal #1:</b> Increase student interest in career opportunities and program selection prior to middle school. The school will continue to offer career opportunities and explanations at least once a year to each child in each grade level.	1.1.	1.1. Fieldtrips to local businesses.	1.1. Assistant Principal/Guidance	1.1.	1.1. Sign In Logs
	1.2.	1.2. Implement special speakers to visit and share with students about career opportunities/interests throughout the year and during the Great American Teach In.	1.1. Assistant Principal/Guidance	1.1.	1.1. Sign In Logs

**CTE 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	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
Integration of career opportunities in core academic areas			Teachers			

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

## 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"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.
--------------------------------

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

Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
Reading Goal	To be determined	\$600	
Math Goal	To be determined	\$600	
Writing Goal	To be determined	\$600	
Science Goal	To be determined	\$600	
Final Amount Spent			\$2400



**Differentiated Accountability**