

# 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: Middleton High School | District Name: Hillsborough County |
| Principal: Owen Young              | Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia    |
| SAC Chair: Tessa Ward              | 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 (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year)  |
|---------------------|---------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Principal           | Owen Young    | EDs., Masters Ed Leadership                                | 5                                 | 15                                  | 11-12 MHS (Grade D, AYP )<br>10-11 MHS (Grade C, AYP )<br>09-10 MHS (AYP _87_%)<br>08-09 MHS (Grade D, AYP 64%)  |
| Assistant Principal | George Fekete | Masters Ed Leadership, BS Social Studies                   | 4                                 | 17                                  | 11-12 MHS (Grade D, AYP )<br>10-11 MHS (Grade C, AYP )<br>09-10 MHS (AYP _87_%)<br>08-09 Gaither HS (Grade B, AYP 79%)<br>07-08 Hillsborough HS (Grade A, AYP 79%)<br>06-07 Hillsborough HS (Grade C, AYP 67%) |
| Assistant Principal | Kim Moore     | Educational Specialist, Masters Administration BS- Biology | 5                                 | 8                                   | 11-12 MHS (Grade D, AYP )<br>10-11 MHS (Grade C, AYP )<br>09-10 MHS (AYP _87_%)  |

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

|                     |                  |  |   |    |   |
|---------------------|------------------|--|---|----|---|
|                     |                  |  |   |    | 08-09 MHS (Grade D, AYP 64%)  |
| Assistant Principal | Derrick Gaines   | Masters Ed Leadership  | 6 | 10 | 11-12 MHS (Grade D, AYP )<br>10-11 MHS (Grade C, AYP )<br>09-10 MHS (AYP _87_%)<br>08-09 MHS 08-09 (Grade D, AYP 64%)<br>07-08 MHS (Grade D, AYP 69%)<br>06-07 Tampa Bay Tech HS (Grade A, AYP 97%) |
| Assistant Principal | Robert Quinn     | Masters Ed Leadership, English Ed  | 5 | 6  | 11-12 MHS (Grade D, AYP )<br>10-11 MHS (Grade C, AYP )<br>09-10 MHS (AYP _87_%)<br>08-09 MHS (Grade D, AYP 64%)<br>07-08 Leto HS (Grade C, AYP 67%)   |
| Assistant Principal | Heather Holloway | Masters Ed Leadership,   | 3 | 6  | 11-12 MHS (Grade D, AYP )<br>10-11 MHS (Grade C, AYP )<br>09-10 Boca Ciega HS (AYP – 77%)<br>08-09 Boca Ciega HS ( Grade D, AYP 74%)<br>07-08 Boca Ciega HS (Grade D, AYP 69%)                      |
| Assistant Principal | Travian Smith    | EdS- Education Leadership,Masters in Curriculum and Instruction<br>BS Psychology | 2 | 6  | 11-12 MHS (Grade D, AYP )<br>10-11 Rampello K-8(Grade A, AYP )<br>09-10 Ferrell Middle (Grade C, AYP )<br>08-09 Memorial Middle (Grade B)   |

### 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 (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year) |
|--------------|-----------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Reading      | Karina Streeter | MA in Secondary English Education, FL Certification in English 6-12, Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum, ESOL & Reading Endorsed | 8                                 | 1   | 11-12 MHS (Grade D, AYP )<br>10-11 MHS (Grade C, AYP )<br>09-10 MHS (AYP _87_%)<br>08-09 MHS 08-09 (Grade D, AYP 64%)   |
| Science      | Traci Brown     | BS Natural Sciences w/ Biology, FL Cert-Biology 6-12, American Board Certified (Biology 6-12)                                     | 2                                 | 2   | 11-12 MHS (Grade D, AYP )<br>10-11 MHS (Grade C, AYP )<br>09-10 Bloomingdale HS (AYP 82%)<br>08-09 Bloomingdale HS (Grade A, AYP 82 %)                            |

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

|         |                   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|-------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Math    | Dorothy Schroeder | MA in Math Education ,<br>Math 6-12   | 3 | 2 | 11-12 MHS (Grade D, AYP )<br>10-11 MHS (Grade C, AYP )<br>09-10 MHS (AYP _87_%)<br>09-10 Lennard HS (Grade<br>09-10 Freedom HS (Grade<br>08-09 Freedom HS (Grade |
| Writing | Raoul Rodriguez   | Bs English Education, MEd Ed<br>Leadership, English 6-12,<br>Journalism K-12, Educational<br>Leadership K-12, gifted and<br>ESOL Endorsements | 9 | 1 | 11-12 MHS (Grade D, AYP )<br>10-11 MHS (Grade C, AYP )<br>09-10 MHS (AYP _87_%)<br>08-09 MHS 08-09 (Grade D, AYP 64%)  |

### 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<br>(If not, please explain why) |
|--|---|---------------------------|--|
| Teacher Interview Day  | General Directors                       | June 2012                 | Teacher Interview Day                          |
| Recruitment Fairs  | Supervisor of Teacher<br>Recruitment    | Ongoing                   | Recruitment Fairs                              |
| MAP  | Supervisor of Data Analysis             | July 2012                 | MAP  |
| Performance Pay  | General Director of Federal<br>Programs | July 2012                 | Performance Pay                                |
| Regular meetings of new teachers with members of the<br>administration | Assistant Principals                    | Ongoing                   |  |
| Partnering new teachers with veteran staff                             | Assistant Principals                    | 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-<br>of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective   |
|--|---|
| 10   | District ESOL classes<br>Professional Development support is outlined within the goal areas of the SIP<br>Subject Area Testing and College Credit Information |

### Staff Demographics

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

Hillsborough 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised July, 2012

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

\*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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 98                                  | 18% (18)                 | 24%(24)                                    | 39%(38)                                     | 18%(18)                                    | 42%(41)                             | 21%(21)                     | 21%(21)                     | 1%(1)                               | 15%(15)                  |

## 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              |
|------------------|------------------|--|---|
| Amy Samuels      | James Greene     | Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | TIP<br>Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels      | Brianne Reycraft | Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | TIP<br>Monthly Review with Administration |
| George Fekete    | Neil Maitland    | Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | PNE<br>Monthly Review with Administration |
| George Fekete    | Matt Penn        | Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | PNE<br>Monthly Review with Administration |
| Kim Moore        | Amy Dobson       | Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | PNE<br>Monthly Review with Administration |
| Travian Smith    | Gretchen Garber  | Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | PNE<br>Monthly Review with Administration |
| Derrick Gaines   | Leon Carson      | Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | TIP<br>Monthly Review with Administration |
| Heather Holloway | Laura Burger     | Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | TIP<br>Monthly Review with Administration |

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

|                  |                        |  |   |
|------------------|------------------------|--|---|
| Robert Quinn     | • Siobhan Harris       | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Heather Holloway | • David Hicks          | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels      | • Terrance Mitchell    | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • TIP<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Derrick Gaines   | • Jan Holden           | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels      | • Catrina Sanchez      | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • TIP<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| George Fekete    | • Roxanne Kloper       | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels      | • Derrick Rackard      | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • TIP<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels      | • Jenna Matte          | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • TIP<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Kim Moore        | • Shawn Luxton         | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Robert Quinn     | • Jonathan Elly        | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • TIP<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels      | • Metodija Stojanovski | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • TIP<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels      | • Joseph Zendigui      | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • TIP<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Heather Holloway | • Robyne Moore         | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels      | • Octavia Coleman      | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |

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

|             |                   |  |   |
|-------------|-------------------|--|---|
| Amy Samuels | • Erica Danaee    | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels | • Fred Lewis      | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels | • Silvia Schultz  | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels | • Constance Scott | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels | • Roxanne Simpson | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels | • Aaron Walker    | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels | • Maria White     | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels | • Kelsea Messina  | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |
| Amy Samuels | • Michael Peers   | • Content Pairing and Experience/Expertise | • PNE<br>• Monthly Review with Administration |

**Additional Requirements**

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

Title I, Part A  
Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school, weekend, and summer programs,

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

|  |
|--|
| quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors.   |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant   |
| Title I, Part D<br>The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice.   |
| Title II<br>The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training.  |
| Title III<br>Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.   |
| Title X- Homeless<br>The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)<br>SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs.   |
| Violence Prevention Programs<br>School Resource Officer coordinates school's anti-bullying program.  |
| Nutrition Programs<br>Healthy Student Program.   |
| Housing Programs<br>Partnership with Tampa Housing Authority   |
| Head Start<br>n/a  |
| Adult Education<br>School receives funding for Adult and Community Education.  |



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

|  |
|--|
| Career and Technical Education<br>Agribusiness and Natural Resources:<br>Agriscience and Natural Resources Education<br>Business Technology Education:<br>Customer Assistance Technology<br>Digital Design<br>Web Design<br>Industrial Education:<br>Architectural Drafting<br>Computer Systems Technology<br>Engineering<br>Public Service/Cosmetology:<br>Public Service Education/Teacher Assisting<br>IMPACT/Credit Recovery/GED<br>Technology Education:<br>JROTC and Leadership Training:<br>Air Force |
| Job Training   |
| See Career and Technical Education   |
| Other  |

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

| School-Based MTSS/Rti Team   |
|--|
| Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.<br>The Leadership team includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Principal</li><li>• Assistant Principal for Curriculum</li><li>• Assistant Principal for Administration</li><li>• MTSS/Rti Coordinator</li><li>• Guidance Counselor</li><li>• School Psychologist</li><li>• Social Worker</li><li>• Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, Writing &amp; Science)</li><li>• ESE Specialist</li><li>• SAC Chair</li><li>• ELP Coordinator</li><li>• ELL Representative</li></ul> |

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

(Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals and purpose for the meeting)

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 Leadership team meets weekly. Specific responsibilities include:

- Oversee the multi-layered model of instructional delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Create, manage and update the resource maps for the following areas: Reading, Writing, Math, Science, Attendance, Behavior, Credit Recovery
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) on core curriculum material.
- Ensure allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels
- Determine scheduling needs, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers 2/3
- Facilitate the implementation of specific programs (e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school; Saturday Academies) that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/chats conducted by the PLCs.
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Organize and support systematic data collection (e.g., district and state assessments; during-the-grading period school assessments/checks for understanding; in-school surveys)
- Assist and monitor Teacher's/PLCs use of SMART goals per unit of instruction. (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
  - Implementation and support of PLCs
  - Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
  - Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions.
  - Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences.
- On a monthly basis, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the month.
- Support the planning, implementation, and evaluation of outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions, in conjunction with PLCs
- Coordinate/collaborate/integrate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).

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 Leadership Team.
- The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams. 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, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the PLST monitors the effectiveness of instruction and intervention by reviewing student data as well as data related to implementation fidelity (teacher walk-through data).
- The PSLT communicates with and supports the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by distributing Leadership Team members across the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, the Leadership Team members who are part of the PLCs regularly report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger Leadership Team/PSLT.
- The Leadership Team/PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation

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

- to:
- Use the problem-solving model when analyzing data:
    1. What is the problem? (Problem Identification)
    2. Why is it occurring? (Problem Analysis and Barrier Identification)
    3. What are we going to do about it? (Action Plan Design and Implementation)
    4. Is it working? (Monitor Progress and Evaluate Action Plan Effectiveness)
  - Identify the problem (based on an analysis of the data disaggregated via data sorts) in multiple areas – curriculum content, behavior, and attendance
  - Develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers).
  - Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.
  - Identify appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at regular intervals matched to the intensity of the level of instructional/intervention support provided.
  - Review progress monitoring data at regular intervals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify intervention and/or enrichment support).
  - Assess the implementation of the strategies on the SIP using the following questions:
    1. Does the data show implementation of strategies are resulting in positive student growth?
    2. To what extent are we making progress toward the school’s SIP goals?
    3. If we are making progress, what can we do to sustain what is working?
    4. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?
    5. What should we do next? What should be our plan of action?

**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.

**Core Curriculum (Tier 1)**

| Data Source   | Database   | Person (s) Responsible                                   |
|---|--|--|
| FCAT released tests   | School Generated Excel Database                        | Reading Coach/Math Coach/MTSS Coordinator/AP             |
| Baseline and Midyear District Assessments   | Scantron Achievement Series<br>Data Wall               | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers               |
| Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science<br>Algebra 1 Formative A, B & C<br>Geometry Formative A, B & C<br>Biology Formative A, B & C<br>Semester Exams<br>Reading Formative on a Monthly Basis<br>Writing – Persuasive & Expository | Scantron Achievement Series<br>Data Wall<br>PLC Logs   | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers               |
| FAIR  | Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network<br>Data Wall | Reading Coach/ Reading Resource Teacher/MTSS Coordinator |

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

|   |                                     |   |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| CELLA   | Sagebrush (IPT)                     | ELL PSLT Representative   |
| Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas.<br>Algebra 1, Geometry, Reading & Biology Unit Assessments & FCIM | Ed-Line<br>PLC Database<br>PLC logs | Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC<br>Facilitators/Leadership Team Member |
| Reports on Demand/Crystal Reports   | District Generated Database         | Leadership Team/Specialty PSLT  |

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

| <b>Data Source</b>   | <b>Database</b>   | <b>Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring</b>    |
|--|---|---|
| Extended Learning Program (ELP)  | School Generated Database in Excel  | Leadership Team/ ELP Facilitator                |
| <b>Intensive Reading Classes:</b><br>AOR - Pre & Post Test; Ongoing Skill Assessments;<br>Individualized Skill Assessments<br>Read 180 - Computer Generated Reports<br>Journeys – Benchmark Unit Assessments | Individual teacher data base<br>PLC/Department data base  | Individual Teachers/Reading PLC/Leadership Team |
| FAIR OPM   | School Generated Database in Excel  | Leadership Team/Reading Coach                   |
| Ongoing assessments within Intensive Math Course   | Database provided by course materials (for courses that have one), School Generated Database in Excel | Math PLC/Individual Teachers/Leadership Team    |
| Other Curriculum Based Measurement   | School Generated Database in Excel  | Leadership Team/PLCs/Individual Teachers        |
| Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs  | Assessments included in computer-based programs   | PLCs/Individual Teachers                        |

Describe the plan to train staff on *MTSS*.

The Leadership Team/will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District's RtI Facilitators develop 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, as identified by teacher needs assessment and/or EET evaluation data, will occur during faculty meeting times, rolling faculty meetings or PLCs. The Leadership Team will send school team representatives to ongoing PS/RtI trainings/support sessions that are offered district-wide. 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 MTSS/RtI Coordinator/Leadership Teams/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI as they become available.

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 schools, 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, SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).
- Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.

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

- 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)

. The team is comprised of:

- Assistant Principal for Curriculum – Reading PLC Administrator
- Reading Coach
- Reading Resource Teacher
- Reading Department Head
- MTSS/RTI Coordinator
- Media Specialist
- Teachers across content areas (Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies and Electives) who have demonstrated effective reading instruction as reflected through positive student reading gains
- Department Heads/Content area Coaches
- SAC Chairperson

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 goals and strategies identified on the SIP.

The assistant principal is the LLT chairperson. The reading coach, writing coach and reading resource teacher are members of the team and provide extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions. The reading coach and assistant principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instructional 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 assistant 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.

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

- Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading goals/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)
- Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan

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

### NCLB Public School Choice

- Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

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

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

PD from Literacy Coach during departments' scheduled PLC on the CLOSE Reading model. Modeling/Observing by Literacy Coach and Resource Teacher throughout the school year. Department Heads monitor department implementation and collect lesson plans that incorporate sections of the CLOSE Reading Model

### \*High Schools Only

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

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

Courses and coursework are established in Small Learning Communities, Professional Learning Communities, Career Academies, Career Pathways, Program Completers, the Magnet Program and AVID classes to help students see the relationships both cross-curricular and within subjects to establish relevance to a student's future. Many of these programs help guide and establish a student for post secondary readiness (Industry Certifications, College credit, job skills, etc).

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

Courses and coursework are established in Small Learning Communities, Professional Learning Communities, Career Academies, Career Pathways, Program Completers, the Magnet Program and AVID classes to help students see the relationships both cross-curricular and within subjects to establish relevance to a student's future. Many of these programs help guide and establish a student for post secondary readiness (Industry Certifications, College credit, job skills, etc).

### Postsecondary Transition

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

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

Middleton High School has reflected over our *High School Feedback Report* Trends for the last three years. The following is a summary from our annual analysis.

Middleton High School's percentage of graduates completing a college prep curriculum is consistently higher than the state average. Over the past three years, Middleton's students completing their college prep curriculum have been 74.1%, 64.8%, and 71.3% which is substantially higher than the state percentages of 57.9%, 59.8%, and 60.2%. During that same time period, the district has remained stable with percentages varying from (64.2% - 65.7%). In addition, the number of graduates that enrolled in Algebra 1 prior to 9th grade, completed at least one Level 3 high school math course, completed at least one Dual Enrollment math course and completed at least one Level 3 or higher

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

science course and were all above the district and the state averages for the same three year period.

**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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?   | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?   | Student Evaluation Tool  |
| <b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).</b>  |  |   | 1.1<br>-Training all content area teachers on different check for understanding techniques that are aligned with measuring the learning objectives | <b>1.1. <u>Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas</u></b><br>Common Core<br>Teachers need to understand and use <b>checks for understanding</b> . Student reading comprehension improves when students are periodically assessed at critical intervals to determine their level of understanding. Teachers respond to the data and highlight what students are struggling with and what needs to be covered more thoroughly prior to moving on. These checks for understanding drive lesson development and differentiated instruction. <b>All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.</b><br><br><b>Action Steps</b><br>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans. | 1.1<br><br>Who:<br>Administration<br>Instructional Coaches<br>Resource Teachers<br>Department Heads<br><br>How:<br>PD from Literacy Coach → Modeling/Observing by Literacy Coach and Resource Teacher → Department Heads and administration monitor faculty implementation → Department PLC logs/Lesson Plan Template | 1.1<br><b>Teacher Level</b><br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br><br><b>PLC Level</b><br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress.<br><br><b>Leadership Team Level</b><br>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support | 1.1<br>Student Samples, FAI R 3x per year, Common assessments during the grading period. |
| <b>Reading Goal #1:</b><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 37% to 40%.                          | <b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b><br><b>37%</b> | <b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b><br><b>40%</b> |  |   |   |  |  |

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

|  |  |   |   |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>1.2<br/>-PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their learning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act “Instructional Unit” log.</p> | <p>1.2<br/><b>Strategy</b><br/>Student achievement improves through <b>teachers working collaboratively</b> to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the <b>Plan-Do-Check-Act</b> model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:<br/> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is it we expect them to learn?</li> <li>2. How will we if they have learned it?</li> <li>3. How will we respond if they don’t learn?</li> <li>4. How will we respond if they already know it?</li> </ol> <b>Actions/Details</b><br/>                     -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a <b>Plan-Do-Check-Act “Unit of Instruction” log</b> to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log.<br/>                     -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p> | <p>1.2<br/><b>Who</b><br/>-Administration<br/>Instructional Coaches<br/>Resource Teachers<br/>Department Heads<br/><br/><b>How</b><br/>PLC log instructional targeted benchmark and data.<br/>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br/>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress.</p> | <p>1.2<br/><b>Teacher Level</b><br/>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br/><br/><b>PLC Level</b><br/>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br/>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress.<br/><br/><b>Leadership Team Level</b><br/>-PLC facilitator/ Department Heads shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br/>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction</p> | <p>1.2<br/><u>3x per year</u><br/>FAIR<br/><br/><u>During the Grading Period</u><br/>Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p> |
|  |  | <p>1.3.<br/>-Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13.<br/>-Training all content area teachers</p>  | <p>1.3.<br/><b>Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas</b><br/>Teachers need to understand how to <b>design and deliver a close reading</b> lesson. Student reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in close reading instruction using complex text. Specific close reading strategies</p>   | <p>1.3<br/><b>Who</b><br/>Administration<br/>Instructional Coaches<br/>Resource Teachers<br/>Department Heads<br/>District Resource Teacher<br/><br/><b>How</b><br/>PLC log instructional targeted benchmark and data.<br/>-PLCs reflect on lesson</p>   | <p>1.3<br/><b>Teacher Level</b><br/>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br/><br/><b>PLC Level</b><br/>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to</p>   | <p>1.3<br/><u>3x per year</u><br/>FAIR<br/><br/><u>During the Grading Period</u><br/>Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p> |



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

|  |  |   |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|
|  |  |   | include: 1) multiple readings of a passage 2) asking higher-order, text-dependent questions, 3) writing in response to reading and 4) engaging in text-based class discussion. <b><u>All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.</u></b><br><br><b>Action Steps</b><br>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans. | outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress.   | drive future instruction.<br>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress.<br><br><u>Leadership Team Level</u><br>-PLC facilitator/ Department Heads shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction |  |
| 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><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?   |   |  |  |
| <b>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.</b>   |  | <b>See Reading Goals 1, 3 &amp; 4</b>                           |  |   |  |  |
| <u>Reading Goal #2:</u><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 20% to 23%.                          | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u><br><b>20%</b>       | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u><br><b>23%</b>       |  |   |  |  |
| 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><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?   | <b>Strategy Data Check</b><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | <b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>   |  |
| <b>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.</b>  |  | <b>See Reading Goals 1, 2 &amp; 4</b>                           |  |   |  |  |
| <u>Reading Goal #3:</u><br>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 61 to 64 points                           | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u><br><b>61 points</b> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u><br><b>64 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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |                         |
|--|---|--|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>  |   |  |                         | <b>See Reading Goals 1,2 &amp; 3</b> |   |  |                         |                         |
| Reading Goal #4:<br>Points earned from students in the Bottom Quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 62 to 65 points   | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*   |                         |                                      |   |  |                         |                         |
|  | <b>62 points</b>  | <b>65 points</b>   |                         |                                      |   |  |                         |                         |
| 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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>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   |   |  | <b>2011-2012<br/>34</b> | <b>2012-2013<br/>41</b>              | <b>2013-2014<br/>51</b>                                       | <b>2014-2015<br/>56</b>  | <b>2015-2016<br/>62</b> | <b>2016-2017<br/>67</b> |
| <b>5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>  |   |  |                         |                                      |   |  |                         |                         |
| Reading Goal #5:   |   |  |                         |                                      |   |  |                         |                         |
| <b>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>  |   |  |                         | <b>See Reading Goals 1-4</b>         |   |  |                         |                         |
| Reading Goal #5a:<br>The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 81% to 84%.<br><br>The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*   |                         |                                      |   |  |                         |                         |
|  | Black:25%<br>Hispanic:43%<br>White:82%<br>ELL: 23%<br>SWD: 28%<br>ECON DIS: 29% | Black:33%<br>Hispanic:49%<br>White:84%<br>ELL:31%<br>SWD: 35%<br>ECON DIS: 36% |                         |                                      |   |  |                         |                         |

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

|   |  |   |  |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 21% to 24%.<br><br>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 41% to ____%. |  |   |  |  |   |  |   |
| 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>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>   |  |   |  | <b>See Reading Goals 1-4</b>   |   |  |   |
| <u>Reading Goal #5B:</u><br><br>The percentage of ED students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 25% to 28%.                                     | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u><br><br><b>29%</b> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u><br><br><b>36%</b> |  |  |   |  |   |
| 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><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?   | <b>Strategy Data Check</b><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?   | <b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>   |   |
| <b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>   |  | 5C.1  | 5C.1   | 5C.1   | 5C.1  | 5C.1   |   |
| <u>Reading Goal #5C:</u><br><br>The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 9% to 12%.                                 | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u><br><br><b>23%</b> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u><br><br><b>31%</b> | -The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with strategies to support ELL acquisition in content areas. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by a District ELL Resource. | ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/standard improves through participation in the <b>Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)</b> strategy across Reading, Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science.<br><br><b>Action Steps</b><br>-ESOL Resource Teacher District ELL Resource provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core | <u>Who</u><br>-School based Administrators<br>-District Resource Teachers<br>-ESOL Resource Teachers<br>-Literacy coaches<br><br><u>How</u><br>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form<br><u>The CALLA Handbook,</u> | <u>Teacher Level</u><br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.<br><u>PLC Level</u><br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all | 5C.1<br>-FAIR<br>-CELLA<br><br><u>During the Grading Period</u><br>-Core curriculum end of segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance |

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

|   |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|
|   |   |  | <p>-Teachers implementation of CALLA is not consistent across core courses.</p> <p>-District ELL Resource models lessons using CALLA.</p> <p>-ERT observes content area teachers using CALLA and provides feedback, coaching and support.</p> <p>-District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of CALLA.</p> <p>-Core content teachers set SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming core curriculum assessments.</p> <p>-Core content teachers administer and analyze ELLs performance on assessments.</p> <p>-Teachers aggregate data to determine the performance of ELLs compared to the whole group.</p> <p>-Based on data core content teachers will differentiate instruction to remediate/enhance instruction.</p> | <p>p. 101, Table 5.4<br/>"Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction.</p>   | <p>classes/courses.</p> <p>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data.</p> <p>- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p> <p>-ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)</p> |   |   |
|   |   |  |   |   | 5A.3.  | 5C.3.   |   |
| <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>  |   |  | <b>Anticipated Barrier</b>  | <b>Strategy</b>   | <b>Fidelity Check</b>  | <b>Strategy Data Check</b>  | <b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>                          |
| <p><b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p> <p><b>Reading Goal #5D:</b><br/>The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 12% to 15%.</p> |   |  | <p>School struggles with providing a structure and procedure from regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both general education and ESE teacher.</p> <p>To address this barrier, the ESE specialist and school administration will set a system in</p>  | <p>Strategy<br/>SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modification and accommodations.</p> <p>-Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEP to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity.</p> <p>-Teachers (both individually and in</p> | <p><u>Who:</u><br/>Reading Coach<br/>ESE Specialist<br/>ESE Department Head<br/>Resource Teacher</p> <p><u>How</u><br/>PLC log/ ESE logs reflect on teachers implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modification</p>   | <p>Teacher Level:<br/>Reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-PLC reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive instruction.</p> <p>-Personnel assigned to fidelity check will meet monthly to discuss PLC/ESE logs.</p> | <p>5D.1<br/>-Progress Reports<br/>-Quarterly grades</p> |
|   | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p><b>28%</b></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p><b>35%</b></p> |   |   |  |   |   |

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

|  |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | place for this school year.  | PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.   | and accommodations.  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1.2<br>-PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum to meet the needs of their SWD students. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act “Instructional Unit” log that aligns with IEP goals and accommodations. | 1.2<br><b>Strategy</b><br>Student achievement improves through <u>teachers working collaboratively</u> to focus on student learning of SWD. Specifically, they use the <u>Plan-Do-Check-Act</u> model and log to structure their way of work.<br><br><b>Actions/Details</b><br>-Grade level/like-course PLCs use a <b>Plan-Do-Check-Act “Unit of Instruction” log</b> to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on PLC log. | 1.2<br><b>Who:</b><br>Reading Coach<br>ESE Specialist<br>ESE Department Head<br>Resource Teacher<br><br><b>How</b><br>PLC log/ ESE logs reflect on teachers’ implementation of students’ IEP goals, strategies, modification and accommodations. | 1.2<br>Teacher Level:<br>Reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-PLC reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive instruction.<br>-Personnel assigned to fidelity check will meet monthly to discuss PLC/ESE logs. | 1.2<br><u>3x per year</u><br>FAIR<br><br><u>During the Grading Period</u><br>Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) |

**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 | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |

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

|                     |                        |   |   |              |  |  |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|--------------|--|--|
|                     |                        |   |   | meetings)    |  |  |
| CLOSE Reading Model | 9-12 All subject areas | PD Facilitator – Literacy Coach<br>PLC Leader – Department Chairs | All Departments during their scheduled PLCs | October 2012 | Modeling/Observing by Literacy Coach and Resource Teacher throughout the school year. Department Heads monitor department implementation and collect lesson plans that incorporate sections of the CLOSE Reading Model | Literacy Coach, Resource Teacher, Department Heads, Administration and members of the LLT. |
|                     |                        |   |   |              |  |  |
|                     |                        |   |   |              |  |  |

*End of Reading Goals*

**Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals \*(Middle and High Schools ONLY)**

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

| Algebra EOC 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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?   | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?  | Student Evaluation Tool   |
| <b>Algebra students scoring Achievement Level 3 or higher on the 2013 Algebra EOC.</b>   |  | 1.1.<br>-Teachers at varying skills levels with the FCIM model.<br>-Teachers’ implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across math classes.<br>-Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide.<br>-Need additional training to learn how to implement effective PLCs | 1.1.<br><b>Tier 1</b> – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students’ math skills will improve through teachers using the <b>FCIM</b> strategy on identified tested benchmarks through district formatives ( <i>FCIMs typically done during the first 10 minutes of class.</i> )<br><br><u>Action Steps</u><br>1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, District Formative assessments, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks | 1.1.<br><u>Who</u><br>-Principal<br>-AP<br>-Teacher<br>-Math Coach<br>-Department Head<br><br><u>How</u><br>-PLC logs turned into administration.<br>Administration provides feedback.<br>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.<br>-Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration walk- | 1.1.<br>-PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in a course specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet) by individual teacher in OpenIDEAS online First Class math community.<br><br>-For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 60% mastery on each mini-assessment.<br><br>PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitator will share data with the Math Coach covered during the | 1.1.<br><u>2x per year</u><br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br><br>Formative A (Sept.), B (Nov.), and C (2 <sup>nd</sup> sem.) tests<br><br>-BOY test<br>-MYT tests<br>-EOY test<br><br><u>Semester Exams</u><br><br><u>During the Nine Weeks</u><br>-Benchmark mini assessments<br>-Unit and/or Segment assessments |
| <b>Algebra Goal #1:</b><br>The percentage of all curriculum students scoring level 3 or higher on the 2013 End-of-Course Algebra Exam will increase from 22_% to _25%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance: *<br><b>22%</b> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: *<br><b>25%</b>   |   |   |   |   |

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

|  |  |  |                                   |   |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
|  |  |  |                                   | <p>for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation.</p> <p>2. Based on the data, PLCs develop a 10 day projected timeline/calendar for re-teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum.</p> <p>3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons/assessments.</p> <p>4. Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments.</p> <p>5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>6. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/calendar. Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule.</p> <p>7. As a PLC, teachers develop a school-based assessment that covers all mini lesson skills taught within the nine week period or the teachers may choose to use a unit or semester test and identify the specific skills).</p> <p>8. PLCs record their work in logs.</p> | <p>throughs.</p> <p>-Another fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/ logs of targeted skills reviewed by the administration and/or Math Coach.</p> | <p>nine week period.</p>               | <p>- School-generated nine week assessment of all mini lesson skills covered during the nine weeks.</p> |
|  |  |  | 1.2.<br>Teachers do not regularly | 1.2.<br><b>Tier 1</b> – The purpose of this   | 1.2.<br><b>Who</b>   | 1.2.<br>PLCs examine student data from | 1.2.<br><b>2X per year</b>  |

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

|  |  |   |   |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>incorporate appropriate higher order questioning techniques into a daily lesson.</p>   | <p>strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through participation in <b>Costas Level Questioning</b> (input, process, and output). As a result, there will be increased use of higher-level questions versus lower level questions for both teachers and students.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The school uses prior year's College Board Rigor form from representative walk-throughs to determine data for 1) student use of higher level questions vs lower level questions and 2) teacher use of higher level questions vs. lower level questions.</li> <li>2. As a professional development activity, PLCs study Costas Level Questioning techniques.</li> <li>3. Teachers implement lessons using Costas Level Questioning.</li> <li>4. Teachers assess students by having them identify and create different levels of questions.</li> <li>5. Teachers bring student work and/or assessments to PLCs.</li> <li>6. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful.</li> <li>7. PLCs record their work on the PLC logs.</li> <li>8. HOTs training for site on an early release day.</li> </ol> | <p>Teacher<br/>-Math Coach/DH<br/>-AVID Coordinator<br/>-Administration Team<br/>-CollegeBoard</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-CollegeBoard Rigor walk-through form (see IDEAS AVID World Icon).<br/>-Use the forms to compute percentage of higher level vs. lower level and monitor improvement/growth<br/>-PSLT will create walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.</p> | <p>the Costas questioning experiences.</p> <p>With teachers, administration reviews CollegeBoard Rigor walk-through form.</p>   | <p>District Baseline and Mid-Year testing</p> <p><u>Semester Exams</u></p> <p><u>During the nine weeks</u><br/>-CollegeBoard Rigor walk-through form (for student data). This form demonstrates students' use of vocabulary and higher levels of learning.</p> |
|  |  | <p>1.3.<br/>-Lack of technology hardware (i.e. computer labs and laptop carts)<br/>-Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS<br/>-Lack of student exposure and daily use of technology in their home environment</p> | <p>1.3.<br/><b>Tier 1</b> – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through the use of <b>technology and hands-on</b> activities to implement the Common Core State Standards. In addition students will practice taking on-line assessments to prepare for on-line state testing.</p>  | <p>1.3.<br/><u>Who</u><br/>-Principal<br/>-AP<br/>-Teacher<br/>-Math Coach<br/>-Department Head<br/>-Technology Specialist</p> <p><u>How Monitored</u></p>   | <p>1.3.<br/>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.</p> <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will</p> | <p>1.3.<br/><u>2-3X per year</u><br/>District Baseline/Formative and Mid-year Testing</p> <p><u>Semester Exams</u></p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u><br/>-Chapter (Unit) Tests<br/>-Benchmark FCIM mini-assessments</p>                                  |



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

|  |  |   |  |   |   |                                |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--------------------------------|
|  |  | -Teacher lack of training in hands-on and collaborative learning activities | <p><b>Action Steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-As a professional development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time-sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling technology and hands-on strategies from their PLC discussions.</li> <li>-PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating strategies from their PLC discussions.</li> <li>-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</li> <li>-Teachers bring assessment data back to PLCs.</li> <li>-As a professional development activity, teachers use data to discuss strategies that were effective.</li> <li>-Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning technology and hands-on strategies.</li> <li>-PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-PLC logs turned into administration.</li> <li>Administration provides feedback.</li> <li>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.</li> <li>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.</li> <li>-EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</li> <li>-EET informal observation (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</li> <li>-School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</li> </ul> | review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per Grading Period.                                 |                                |
| 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><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?  | <b>Strategy Data Check</b><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | <b>Student Evaluation Tool</b> |
| <b>Algebra students scoring Achievement Level 4 or 5 on the Algebra EOC.</b>   |  | 2.1.  | 2.1.   | 2.1.  | 2.1.  | 2.1.                           |
| <b>Algebra Goal #2:</b>  | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>                                 | <b>See Goal #1.</b>  |   |   |                                |
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 Algebra EOC will increase from <u>3</u> % to <u>6</u> %.   | <b>3%</b>                                  | <b>6%</b>   |  |   |   |                                |
|  |  |   |  |   |   |                                |
|  |  | 2.2.  | 2.2.   | 2.2.  | 2.2.  | 2.2.                           |
|  |  | 2.3   | 2.3  | 2.3   | 2.3   | 2.3                            |

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

|   |  |   |                           |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|---------------------------|--|--|--|
|   |  |   |                           |  |  |  |
| <b>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>                                   |  |   | <b>See Math Goals 1-4</b> |  |  |  |
| <b>Math Goal :</b>  | <b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>                     | <b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>                   |                           |  |  |  |
| The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 Math will increase from 93% to 94%.  | Black:37%<br>Hispanic:60%<br>White:93%<br>ELL: 42%<br>SWD: 38% | Black:43%<br>Hispanic:61%<br>White:94%<br>ELL:42%<br>SWD: 44% |                           |  |  |  |
| The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 Math will increase from 37% to 43%.  | ECON DIS: 42%  | ECON DIS: 45%   |                           |  |  |  |
| The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 Math will increase from 60% to 61%.   |  |   |                           |  |  |  |
| 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: |  |   |                           |  |  |  |

*End of Algebra EOC Goals*

**Mathematics 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 |
| Math End of Course Assessments  | Algebra<br>Geometry | Math Coach/DH<br>APC             | Liberal Arts Math and Algebra and<br>Geometry Teachers             | Prior to the administration of the<br>test  | EOC testing                       | APC   |

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

|                                 |                  |  |  |   |  |                                   |
|---------------------------------|------------------|--|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Analyzing first semester exams  | Algebra Geometry | Math Coach/DH APC                                | Liberal Arts Math and Algebra and Geometry Teachers  | After the administration of the test                            | PLC logs   | APC                               |
| CCSS and Hands-On Activities    | Grades 9-12      | Math Coach/DH                                    | Math Department PLCs                                 | 3 extra hours during Professional Study Day during Pre-Planning | Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor Hands-On Activity implementation. | Administration Team               |
| ESE Accommodations Training     | Grades 9-12      | District ESE Supervisor                          | All fused ESE and General Ed teachers and Math Coach | Fall  | Administrative walk-throughs to observe vocabulary acquisition strategies.                 | Principal and Administrative Team |
| Raising the Rigor with H.O.T.S. | Grades 9-12      | District Academic Math, Reading, Science Coaches | Math Department PLC                                  | 2 extra hours on an Early Release day                           | Administrative walk-throughs to observe H.O.T.S. strategies.                               | Principal and Administrative Team |

### End of Mathematics Goals

## NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Biology EOC 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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?   | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?  | Student Evaluation Tool  |
| <b>K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third on Biology EOC exam.</b>  |   |   | 1.1.<br>-Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model. | 1.1.<br><b>Strategy</b><br>Students' science skills will improve through participation in the <a href="#">5E Instructional Model</a> .<br><br><b>Action Steps</b><br>-New teachers will attend District Science training.<br>-PLCs write SMART goals for each unit of instruction.<br>-Teachers will collaborate with their PLCs on creating 5E lesson plans that include activities/ learning experiences that promote student learning at the benchmarks' appropriate cognitive complexity.<br>-Both new and previously-trained teachers will write and implement unit lesson plans in their classrooms based on the 5E Instructional Model.<br>-PLCs will collaborate on common checks for | 1.1<br><b>Who</b><br>Principal<br>APC s and APs<br>Science Coach<br>Department Chair<br>PLC Teachers<br><br><b>How Monitored</b><br>-Science Coach and APCs will attend and facilitate PLCs.<br>-Administration and Science Coach/Department Head will conduct classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. | 1.1.<br><b>Teacher Level</b><br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the common formative assessment data, common unit assessment data, common checks for understanding data, and Achievement Series data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.<br><b>PLC Level</b><br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-For each class, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.<br><b>Leadership Team Level</b><br>-PLC facilitator/ Science Coach/ | 1.1.<br>1. District Formative Assessments (3x/yr)<br>2. Multiple Checks for Understanding/Formative Assessments during lessons<br>3. District Unit Mini Assessments<br>4. FCIM quizzes<br>5. Unit/Chapter Tests/Quizzes<br>6. Remediation/Enrichment Session data<br>7. Student notebooks/sample work<br>8. Semester Exam data |
| <b>Biology Goal K:</b><br>Percentage of 9 <sup>th</sup> -grade students scoring in the middle or upper third on Biology EOC exam will increase from last year's (2012) 46% to 60% this year (2013). | <b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b><br>Forty-six percent (46%) of 9 <sup>th</sup> -grade students scored in the middle- and upper third categories on the 2012 EOC exam. | <b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b><br>At least sixty percent (60%) of 9 <sup>th</sup> -grade students will score in the middle- and upper third categories on the 2013 EOC exam. |   |   |   |   |  |

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

|  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |   |   | <p>understanding/formative assessments to be integrated into their lessons in order to monitor, share, and respond to student achievement data.</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers will give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>-Teachers will bring common assessment data back to the PLCs to discuss the effectiveness of their 5E lesson plans as a means to drive future instruction, and to determine FCIM benchmark selection.</p> <p>-Individual PLC teachers will implement FCIMs in their classrooms based on their individual class data with respect to the lowest proficiency benchmarks.</p> <p>-Science Coach and PLC teachers will collaborate on writing Remediation/Enrichment lessons using the 5E Model of Instruction for teachers to implement in their classrooms as a response to Formative B and Unit Mini Assessment data.</p> |  | <p>Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>   |  |
|  |  | <p>1.2.<br/>-PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to facilitate student learning.</p> | <p>1.2.<br/><b>Strategy</b><br/>Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively using the <b>Plan-Do-Check-Act model</b> to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is it we expect them to learn?</li> <li>2. How will we know if they have learned it?</li> <li>3. How will we respond if they don't learn?</li> <li>4. How will we respond if they already know it?</li> </ol> <p><u>Actions/Details</u></p> | <p>1.2<br/><b>Who</b><br/>-Principal<br/>-APCs &amp; APs<br/>-Science Coach<br/>-PLC Teachers</p> <p><b>How</b><br/>-PLC logs turned into administration/science coach provides feedback<br/>-Science Coach and Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings.<br/>Science coach/PLC Facilitator(s) will review SMART goals and PLCs to ensure the Plan-Do-Check-Model is followed as a means to facilitate student learning.</p>  | <p>1.2.<br/>PLC Log to include: attendance, content of discussion, data used to drive discussion/future plans, etc.)</p> | <p>1.2.<br/>9. District Formative Assessments (3x/yr)<br/>10. District Unit Mini Assessments<br/>11. FCIM quiz data<br/>12. Unit/Chapter Tests/Quizzes (Edline reports)<br/>13. Remediation/Enrichment Session data<br/>14. Semester Exam data</p> |  |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |  | <p><i>PLCs will do the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Use a PLC log to guide their Plan-Do-Check-Act conversations and way of work.</li> <li>--Monitor the frequency of meetings.</li> <li>-Collaborate 2-3 times per week for curriculum planning, reflection, and data analysis.</li> <li>- Unpack the benchmark and identify what students need to understand, know, and do.</li> <li>--Plan common checks for understanding during the unit.</li> <li>--Plan common the End-of-Unit Assessments</li> <li>--Plan upcoming lessons/units using the 5E Instructional Model.</li> <li>--Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught</li> <li>--Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments.</li> <li>--Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group.</li> <li>-Generate SMART goals for upcoming units of instruction.</li> <li>-Report SMART goal data through their logs.</li> <li>- Adjust action plans based on teacher/coach walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team/Coaches meetings.</li> <li>-Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.</li> </ul> |   |  |
|  |  | <p>1.3<br/>-Teachers are either unfamiliar with or new to the Close Reading Model and how to implement it in their classrooms.</p> | <p>1.3.<br/><b>Strategy</b><br/>Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text (textbooks and other supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the <b>close reading model</b> (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least once</p>  | <p>1.3.<br/><b>Who</b><br/>Teacher<br/>Principal<br/>APCs and APs<br/>Science Coach<br/>District Academic Coach<br/>Reading Coach<br/>Reading Resource<br/>Teacher</p>                                   | <p>1.3.<br/>Science PLC<br/>Science Coach and Reading Coach/Resource Teacher meetings<br/><br/>PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing it to the baseline data (formative data).</p> | <p>1.3.<br/>District Formative Assessments (3x/yr)<br/>Unit Mini Assessments<br/>Semester Exams<br/>Edline reports</p> |

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

|  |  |   |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>for every Unit of the curriculum.</p> <p><b>Action Steps</b></p> <p><i>Professional Development</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The Science Coach and Reading Coach and/or Reading Resource Teacher collaborate to conduct small group departmental trainings to develop teachers' ability to use the close reading model.</li> <li>-The Reading Coach and/or Reading Resource Teacher attends science departmental PLCs to co-plan with teachers, developing lessons using the close reading model.</li> <li>-Teachers within departments attend professional development provided by the district/school on text complexity and close reading models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model.</li> </ul> <p><i>In PLCs/Department</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks.</li> <li>-PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile.</li> <li>-PLCs assign appropriate NGSSS benchmark to Close Reading passage</li> <li>-To increase stamina, teachers select high-Lexile, complex and rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous</li> <li>- Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons.</li> </ul> <p><i>During the lessons, teachers:</i></p> |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|

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

|  |  |   |   |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|
|  |  |   | <p>-Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text.</li> <li>• Stating an essential question and/or objective prior to reading.</li> <li>• Using questions to check for understanding.</li> <li>• Using question to engage students in discussion.</li> <li>• Requiring oral and written responses to text.</li> </ul> <p>-Ask text-based questions that require close reading of the text and multiple reads of the text.</p> <p><i>During the lessons, students:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grapple with complex text.</li> <li>• Re-read for a second purpose and to increase comprehension.</li> <li>• Engage in discussion to answer essential question and/or address learning objective using textual evidence.</li> <li>• Write in response to essential question using textual evidence.</li> </ul> |   |   |  |
| 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><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?  | <b>Strategy Data Check</b><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | <b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>                    |  |
| <b>L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology.</b>  | 2.1<br>-Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry | 2.1<br><b>Strategy</b><br>Students’ science skills will | 2.1<br><u>Who</u><br>Principal  | 2.1<br><u>Teacher Level</u><br>-Teachers reflect on lesson  | 2.1<br>15. District Formative Assessments (3x/yr) |  |

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

|  |  |   |                                      |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Biology Goal L:</b></p> <p>Percentage of 9<sup>th</sup>-grade students scoring in the upper third on Biology EOC exam will increase from last year's (2012) 26% to 30% this year (2013).</p> | <p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>Twenty-six percent<br/><b>(26%)</b> of 9<sup>th</sup>-grade students scored in the upper third on last year's (2012) Biology EOC exam.</p> | <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>Thirty percent<br/><b>(30%)</b> of 9<sup>th</sup>-grade students will score in the upper third on this year's (2013) Biology EOC exam.</p> | <p>and the 5E lesson plan model.</p> | <p>improve through participation in the <b>5E Instructional Model.</b></p> <p><b>Action Steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-New teachers will attend District Science training.</li> <li>-PLCs write SMART goals for each unit of instruction.</li> <li>-Teachers will collaborate with their PLCs on creating 5E lesson plans that include activities/ learning experiences that promote student learning at the benchmarks' appropriate cognitive complexity.</li> <li>-Both new and previously-trained teachers will write and implement unit lesson plans in their classrooms based on the 5E Instructional Model.</li> <li>-PLCs will collaborate on common checks for understanding/formative assessments to be integrated into their lessons in order to monitor, share, and respond to student achievement data.</li> <li>-At the end of the unit, teachers will give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</li> <li>-Teachers will bring common assessment data back to the PLCs to discuss the effectiveness of their 5E lesson plans as a means to drive future instruction, and to determine FCIM benchmark selection.</li> <li>-Individual PLC teachers will implement FCIMs in their classrooms based on their individual class data with respect to the lowest proficiency benchmarks.</li> <li>-Science Coach and PLC teachers will collaborate on writing Remediation/Enrichment lessons using the 5E Model of Instruction for teachers to implement in their classrooms as a response to Formative B and Unit Mini Assessment data.</li> </ul> | <p>APC s and APs<br/>Science Coach<br/>Department Chair<br/>PLC Teachers</p> <p><b>How Monitored</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Science Coach and APCs will attend and facilitate PLCs.</li> <li>-Administration and Science Coach/Department Head will conduct classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.</li> </ul> | <p>outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Teachers use the common formative assessment data, common unit assessment data, common checks for understanding data, and Achievement Series data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.</li> </ul> <p><b>PLC Level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.</li> <li>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.</li> <li>-For each class, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.</li> </ul> <p><b>Leadership Team Level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-PLC facilitator/ Science Coach/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</li> <li>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>16. Multiple Checks for Understanding/Formative Assessments during lessons</li> <li>17. District Unit Mini Assessments</li> <li>18. FCIM quizzes</li> <li>19. Unit/Chapter Tests/Quizzes</li> <li>20. Remediation/Enrichment Session data</li> <li>21. Student notebooks/sample work</li> <li>22. Semester Exam data</li> </ul> |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|



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

|  |  |  |   |  |   |   |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|
|  |  | <p>2.2<br/>-PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to facilitate student learning.</p> | <p>2.2.<br/><b>Strategy</b><br/>Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively using the <b>Plan-Do-Check-Act model</b> to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is it we expect them to learn?</li> <li>2. How will we know if they have learned it?</li> <li>3. How will we respond if they don't learn it?</li> <li>4. How will we respond if they already know it?</li> </ol> <p><u>Actions/Details</u><br/><i>PLCs will do the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Use a PLC log to guide their Plan-Do-Check-Act conversations and way of work.</li> <li>--Monitor the frequency of meetings.</li> <li>-Collaborate 2-3 times per week for curriculum planning, reflection, and data analysis.</li> <li>- Unpack the benchmark and identify what students need to understand, know, and do.</li> <li>--Plan common checks for understanding during the unit.</li> <li>--Plan common the End-of-Unit Assessments</li> <li>--Plan upcoming lessons/units using the 5E Instructional Model.</li> <li>--Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught</li> <li>--Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments.</li> <li>--Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group.</li> </ul> | <p>2.2<br/><b>Who</b><br/>-Principal<br/>-APCs &amp; APs<br/>-Science Coach<br/>-PLC Teachers</p> <p><b>How</b><br/>-PLC logs turned into administration/science coach provides feedback<br/>-Science Coach and Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings.<br/>Science coach/PLC Facilitator(s) will review SMART goals and PLCs to ensure the Plan-Do-Check-Model is followed as a means to facilitate student learning.</p> <p>-Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team<br/>-Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.</p> | <p>2.2.<br/>School has a system for PLCs to record and report during...</p> | <p>2.2.<br/>23. District Formative Assessments (3x/yr)<br/>24. District Unit Mini Assessments<br/>25. FCIM quiz data<br/>26. Unit/Chapter Tests/Quizzes (Edline reports)<br/>27. Remediation/Enrichment Session data<br/>28. Semester Exam data</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|

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

|  |  |  |  |   |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|
|  |  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Generate SMART goals for upcoming units of instruction.</li> <li>-Report SMART goal data through their logs.</li> <li>- Adjust action plans based on teacher/coach walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data.</li> </ul>  |   |  |   |
|  |  | <p>2.3<br/>-Teachers are either unfamiliar with or new to the Close Reading Model and how to implement it in their classrooms.</p> | <p>2.3<br/><b>Strategy</b><br/>Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text (textbooks and other supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the <b>close reading model</b> (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least once for every Unit of the curriculum.</p> <p><b>Action Steps</b><br/><b>Professional Development</b><br/>-The Science Coach and Reading Coach and/or Reading Resource Teacher collaborate to conduct small group departmental trainings to develop teachers' ability to use the close reading model.<br/>-The Reading Coach and/or Reading Resource Teacher attends science departmental PLCs to co-plan with teachers, developing lessons using the close reading model.<br/>-Teachers within departments attend professional development provided by the district/school on text complexity and close reading models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model.</p> | <p>2.3<br/><b>Who</b><br/>Teacher<br/>Principal<br/>APCs and APs<br/>Science Coach<br/>District Academic Coach<br/>Reading Coach<br/>Reading Resource<br/>Teacher</p> | <p>2.3<br/>Science PLC<br/>Science Coach and Reading Coach/Resource Teacher meetings</p> <p>PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing it to the baseline data (formative data).</p> | <p>2.3<br/>District Formative Assessments (3x/yr)<br/>Unit Mini Assessments<br/>Semester Exams<br/>Edline reports</p> |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <p><b><i>In PLCs/Department</i></b><br/>         -Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks.<br/>         -PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile.<br/>         -PLCs assign appropriate NGSSS benchmark to Close Reading passage<br/>         -To increase stamina, teachers select high-Lexile, complex and rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous<br/>         - Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons.</p> <p><b><i>During the lessons, teachers:</i></b><br/>         -Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text.</li> <li>• Stating an essential question and/or objective prior to reading.</li> <li>• Using questions to check for understanding.</li> <li>• Using question to engage students in discussion.</li> <li>• Requiring oral and written responses to text.</li> </ul> <p>-Ask text-based questions that require close reading of the text and multiple reads of the text.</p> |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

|  |  |  |   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <p><i>During the lessons, students:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grapple with complex text.</li> <li>• Re-read for a second purpose and to increase comprehension.</li> <li>• Engage in discussion to answer essential question and/or address learning objective using textual evidence.</li> </ul> <p>Write in response to essential question using textual evidence.</p> |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|

**Science 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                           |
| Inquiry and the 5E Instructional Model  | 9-12                | Science Coach and District Academic Coach   | Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs                 | On-going in science PLCs  | Administrators /Science coach conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor 5 E Instructional Model lessons. | Administration Team   |
| Close Reading   | 9-12                | Reading Coach, Reading Resource Teacher, Science Coach, and Science District Academic Coach | Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs                 | Ongoing in science PLCs   | Science Coach, Reading Coach, and Reading Resource Teacher walk-throughs                                 | Administration Team & Science Coach, and Reading Coach/Resource Teacher |

**Writing Goals**

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

| <b>Writing Goals</b>  | <b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>                  |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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   |
| <b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>   | 1A.1.<br>-Teachers across all content areas are not using to writing to support | 1A.1.<br>-Students’ reading, writing, language, and listening /speaking | 1A.1.<br><u>Who</u><br>Principal              | 1A.1.<br>- PLCs will identify trends (deficiencies and growth) in | 1A.1.<br>Student achievement on activities implementing writing |

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

| Writing Goal #1A:   | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* |   |   |  |  |   |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| <p><b>In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing will increase from 73% to 76%.</b></p> | <p><b>73%</b></p>                   | <p><b>76%</b></p>                    | <p>higher order thinking.<br/>- Teachers across all content areas are not consistently following best practices in lesson design.</p> | <p>skills improve through lessons/activities/tasks that promote high levels of thinking supported by teachers' participation in PLCs and the alignment with best practices, instructional calendars, differentiated instruction, and effective holistic scoring methods.</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u><br/>1. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs will discuss content specific writing to identify trends and needs, and will collaborate with the writing coach to develop instruction targeting student needs.<br/>2. As a Professional Development activity, writing coach will facilitate professional development through PLCs to support writing in all content areas.<br/>3. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.<br/>4. Writing coach will provide coaching, modeling, and feedback to support writing initiatives across all content areas.</p> | <p>APC<br/>Academic Coaches<br/>Department Heads<br/>PLCs<br/>District Academic Writing Coach<br/>Writing Resource</p> <p><u>How</u><br/>- PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.<br/>- Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy<br/>administration walk-throughs.<br/>-HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool).<br/>Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.<br/>- Springboard Walk-Through Observation Form</p> <p><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>-PLC logs<br/>-Class Achievement</p> <p><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>-PLC logs<br/>-Class Achievement</p> <p><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>-PLC logs<br/>-Class Achievement</p> | <p>student writing performance and collaborate to modify instructional delivery provide differentiated instruction as appropriate.</p> <p>- Writing Coach will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.</p> <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u><br/>-Review PLC logs and student achievement in courses</p> <p><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/><i>Review student achievement</i></p> <p><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/><i>Review student achievement</i></p> <p><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/><i>Review student achievement</i></p> | <p>for higher order thinking.</p> <p><u>Monthly</u><br/>PLC logs to ensure fidelity</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u><br/>Review student achievement data to assess the effectiveness of the strategies.</p>  |
|   |                                     |                                      | <p>1A.2.<br/>- Teachers may not have familiarity with the rigor of the revised FCAT Writing requirements.</p>                         | <p>1A.2.<br/>- Students' writing skills will improve through participation in best practices for teaching writing. Best practices include PLC instructional calendars, Differentiated Instruction, and effective holistic scoring methods.</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u><br/>1. As a Professional Development activity, teachers new to the profession and/or content area are required to attend district level trainings.<br/>2. As a Professional Development activity, teachers participate in assessment and rubric refresher</p>  | <p>1A.2.<br/><u>Who</u><br/>Principal<br/>APC<br/>LA PLCs<br/>District Academic Writing Coach<br/>School Writing Coach<br/>Writing Resource</p> <p><u>How</u><br/>- PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.<br/>- Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy<br/>administration walk-throughs.<br/>-HCPS Informal Observation</p>  | <p>1A.2.<br/>- PLCs will participate in rubric norming sessions to identify teacher barriers impeding effective holistic scoring.</p> <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u><br/>-Review essays in PLCs to ensure that essays are scored consistently</p> <p><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/><i>Review consistency of essay scoring in PLCs</i></p> <p><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/><i>Review consistency of essay scoring in PLCs</i></p>  | <p>1A.2.<br/>Review formal writing data in PLCs to ensure consistent scoring.</p> <p><u>Monthly</u><br/>PLC logs to ensure fidelity</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u><br/>Review student achievement data to assess the effectiveness consistency of scoring.</p> |

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

|  |   |   |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
|  |   | <p>courses and practice scoring within PLCs.</p> <p>3. As a Professional Development activity, Language Arts DH, writing coach, and grade level PLC chairs will facilitate advanced scoring sessions.</p> <p>4. As a Professional Development activity PLCs, along with writing coach, will discuss student writing to identify trends and needs, and will collaborate to develop instruction targeting student needs.</p> <p>5. Teachers provide additional support to students not demonstrating proficiency (i.e., pull-out, small group instruction, ELP, Saturday Academy etc.).</p> | <p>Pop-In Form (EET tool).<br/>Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.</p> <p>- Springboard Walk-Through<br/>Observation Form</p> <p><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>-Baseline and scheduled common writing assessments and data reviews</p> <p><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>-Scheduled common writing assessments and data reviews</p> <p><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>-Scheduled common writing assessments and data reviews</p>   | <p><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>Review consistency of essay scoring in PLCs</p>   |   |
|  | <p>1A.3.<br/>- Teachers are not providing regular feedback to students.</p> | <p>1A.3.<br/>- Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing and writing portfolios.</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u><br/>1. Teachers will utilize student work as an instructional tool, display exemplars models earning a 4, 5, or 6, and create and maintain writing portfolios.</p>  | <p>1A.3.<br/><u>Who</u><br/>Principal<br/>APC<br/>LA PLCs<br/>District Academic Writing Coach<br/>School Writing Coach<br/>Writing Resource</p> <p><u>How</u><br/>- PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.<br/>- Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy<br/>administration walk-throughs.<br/>- HCPS Informal Observation<br/>Pop-In Form (EET tool).<br/>Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.<br/>- Springboard Walk-Through<br/>Observation Form<br/>-Writing portfolios</p> <p><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>-Baseline and scheduled common writing assessments and data reviews<br/>-Portfolio writing conferences</p> <p><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period Check</u></p> | <p>1A.3.<br/>- PLCs will review portfolios and writing conference data to plan instruction around student needs.</p> <p>- PLCs will review writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric.</p> <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u><br/>-Review portfolios and writing conference documentation to ensure students are receiving support.</p> <p><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>Review portfolios to ensure consistency across PLCs</p> <p><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>Review portfolios to ensure consistency across PLCs</p> <p><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>Review portfolios to ensure consistency across PLCs</p> | <p>1A.3.<br/>Formal and informal student writing and writing conferencing documentation</p> <p><u>Monthly</u><br/>PLC logs to ensure fidelity</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u><br/>Review student achievement data to assess the effectiveness of portfolios on improving student achievement.</p> |

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

|  |  |   |           |   |           |       |
|--|--|---|-----------|---|-----------|-------|
|  |  |   |           | -Scheduled common writing assessments and data reviews<br>-Portfolio writing conferences  |           |       |
|  |  |   |           | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grading Period Check<br>-Scheduled common writing assessments and data reviews<br>- Portfolio writing conferences |           |       |
| <b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b> |  | 1B.1. N/A   | 1B.1. N/A | 1B.1. N/A   | 1B.1. N/A | 1B.1. |
| <b>Writing Goal #1B:</b>   | <b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>                         | <b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>                         |           |   |           |       |
| N/A  | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. |           |   |           |       |
| Not enough to qualify for a subgroup...  |  |   | 1B.2.     | 1B.2.   | 1B.2.     | 1B.2. |
|  |  |   | 1B.3.     | 1B.3.   | 1B.3.     | 1B.3. |

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

**Writing 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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)   | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring                 | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring          |
| Best practices in content PLCs (CIS writing, writing in the content areas and Quick-write )                               | 9-2                 | Raoul Rodriguez                  | All teachers   | Ongoing and as needs are identified by coaches and department heads at weekly coaches meetings and department head meetings | Walk-throughs<br>Modeling<br>Cooperative planning | Administration<br>Academic coaches<br>Department heads |
|   |                     |                                  |  |   |   |  |
|   |                     |                                  |  |   |   |  |

*End of Writing Goals*

**Attendance Goal(s)**

| <b>Attendance Goal(s)</b>   |  |  | <b>Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</b>   |   |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: |  |  | <b>Anticipated Barrier</b>  | <b>Strategy</b>   | <b>Fidelity Check</b><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?      | <b>Strategy Data Check</b><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?  | <b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>                               |
| <b>1. Attendance</b>  |  |  | 1.1.<br>There is not a system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance<br><br>Students require mentoring, advisement, and monitoring to support consistent attendance at school. | 1.1. Students will attend school consistently and accrue less than 10 absences per school year.<br><br>Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, guidance and social work collaborate to assure that a letter is sent home to parents outlining the state statute that requires parents to send students to school. If a student’s absences in a 20 day period a positive letter is sent home to the parent regarding the | 1.1.<br>Attendance Committee, Social Worker<br>Guidance Counselor<br>PSLT | 1.1<br>PSLT/ Attendance Committee will disaggregate attendance data for the “Tier 2” group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children | 1.1<br>Instructional Planning Tool<br>Attendance/Tardy data. |
| <b>Attendance Goal #1:</b>  |  | <u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>                                       |   |   |   |  |  |
| The attendance rate will increase from 91.50% in 2011-2012 to 92.00 % in 2012-2013.   |  | <b>92%</b>   | Data chats with students do not currently include sufficient information regarding the impact of attendance on school   |   |   |  |  |
|   |  | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u> |   |   |   |  |  |



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

|  |   |            |  |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>The number of students who have 10 or more <b>unexcused</b> absences throughout the school year will decrease from 257 in 2011-2012 to 225 in 2012-2013.</p> <p>The number of students who have 10 or more <b>unexcused</b> tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease from 421 in 2011-2012 to 350 in 2012-2013.</p> |   | <b>225</b> | <p>success (e.g., course completion, graduation).</p>  | <p>increase in their child's attendance.</p>  |  |  |  |
|  | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u> | <b>350</b> | <p>Reinforcement for consistent attendance and on-time arrival to school occurs infrequently and is insufficient to encourage and reinforce student's attendance at school.</p> <p>At-risk students are minimally involved in extra-curricular activities which negatively impact their motivation to regularly attend school.</p> | <p>2.School Leadership Team provides guidance for teachers on how to discuss the impact of attendance on school success during regularly scheduled data chats.</p> <p>3.School Leadership Team creates a positive behavior support system to provide frequent positive reinforcement for consistent attendance and on-time arrival to school including individual, grade-level, and whole school rewards.</p> <p>4.School Leadership Team determines the percent of at-risk students who are involved in extra-curricular activities.</p> |  |  |  |
|  |   |            | <p>1.2. Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance.</p>   | <p>1.2. An attendance referral is generated. The social worker and other relevant personnel (e.g., guidance counselor, school psychologist, SRO) communicates with the family to create an Attendance Improvement Plan.</p>   | <p>1.2. Social Worker Attendance Committee School Security - SRO</p> | <p>1.2. Social Worker/PSLT (Attendance Committee) review data monthly on Tier 3 students (provided by social worker)</p>   | <p>1.2 Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data</p>                               |
|  |   |            | <p>1.3.1.3 Staff needs to have visual common school-wide expectations and rules and provide explicit</p>   | <p>1.3 PSLT will assign a subgroup to develop school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey</p>  | <p>1.3 PSLT subgroup Attendance Committee</p>                        | <p>1.3 Attendance Committee/ PSLT will review data on Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) and out of school suspensions</p> | <p>1.3 "UNTIE" ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data</p> |

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

|  |  |   |   |  |           |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|-----------|--|
|  |  | instruction to students on the expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior. | and discussion, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations. |  | monthly.. |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|-----------|--|

*End of Attendance Goals*

**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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?     | Student Evaluation Tool  |
| <b>1. Suspension</b>  |                                |                                | 1.1. Staff needs to have visual common school-wide expectations and rules and provide explicit instruction to students on the expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior. | 1.1 PSLT will assign a subgroup to develop school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey and discussion, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations. PBS Sub-Group will be implemented to offer positive behavior supports. | 1.1. PSLT subgroup  | 1.1 PSLT subgroup will review data on Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) and out of school suspensions monthly.. | 1.1. “UNTIE” ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data |
| Suspension Goal #1:   | <u>2012</u>                    | <u>2013</u>                    |  |  |   |  |  |
| The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease from 500 in 2011-2012 to 400 or lower in 2012- 2013.                      | ISS total number<br><b>500</b> | ISS total number<br><b>400</b> |  |  |   |  |  |
|   | ISS Students                   | ISS Students                   |  |  |   |  |  |
|   | <b>300</b>                     | <b>250</b>                     |  |  |   |  |  |
|   | ATOSS total number             | ATOSS total number             |  |  |   |  |  |
| The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension will decrease from 300 in 2011-2012 to 250 or lower in 2012-2013.     | ATOSS Students                 | ATOSS Students                 |  |  |   |  |  |
|   | <b>274</b>                     | <b>225</b>                     |  |  |   |  |  |
| The total number of Out-of-Suspensions (including ATOSS) will decrease from 400 in 2011-2012 to 300 or lower in                   |                                |                                | 2. School has not developed or implemented a school-wide positive behavior program to define, teach, and reinforce appropriate student behavior.   | 1.2.1.2.Strategy<br>Students will engage in pro-social, appropriate behavior which results in and maintains positive relationships with peers and adults.<br><u>Action Step 1.1: School</u>  | 1.2.  | 1.2.   | 1.2.   |

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

|   |  |   |   |      |      |      |
|---|--|---|---|------|------|------|
| <p>2012-2013.</p> <p>The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspension will decrease from 274 in 2011-2012 to 225 or lower in 2012- 2013.</p> |  | <p>Some students require on-going mentoring, monitoring, and guidance to support their social/emotional development, increase their engagement in pro-social, appropriate behavior, and decrease their engagement in inappropriate behavior</p> | <p>Leadership Team presents attendance and discipline data to staff in order to increase buy-in to RtI/PBS-Behavior plan.</p> <p><u>Action Step 1.2:</u> School Leadership Team provides professional development for school faculty and staff on the school's Positive Behavior Support program.</p> <p><u>Action Step 1.3:</u> School Leadership Team provides coaching for teachers whose student discipline data indicates a need for support for behavior management.</p> <p><u>Action Step 1.4:</u> Teachers are provided with professional development and on-going coaching on strategies for reducing classroom disruption and responding to inappropriate student behaviors including alternatives to office discipline referrals and suspensions.</p> <p><u>Action Step 1.5:</u> School Leadership Team identifies students with 5 or more office discipline referrals and/or 2 or more suspensions during a one quarter period. School Leadership Team provides high risk students with on-going mentoring, monitoring, and guidance to support their social/emotional development, increase their engagement in pro-social, appropriate behavior, and decrease their engagement in inappropriate behavior.</p> |      |      |      |
|   |  | 1.3.  | 1.3.  | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

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

**Suspension 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                  |
| Problem Solving Leadership Team (PSLT)  | All levels          | RtI Coach                        | PSLT Committee   | Meets weekly on day 1 during 3 <sup>rd</sup> period   | Agenda, Minutes, Debriefing of topics weekly with committee | Principal, Assistant Principals, RtI Coach, District RtI, FDOE |
|   |                     |                                  |  |   |   |  |
|   |                     |                                  |  |   |   |  |

*End of Suspension Goals*

**Dropout Prevention Goal(s)**

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

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

| <b>DROPOUT PREVENTION GOAL(S)</b>   |                                |                                 | <b>Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention</b>  |  |   |   |   |  |                             |                              |             |    |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|----|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:   |                                |                                 | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring   | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy             | Evaluation Tool                                       |  |                             |                              |             |    |
| <b>1. Dropout Prevention</b>  |                                |                                 | 1.1. High numbers of absences with students that are disinterested with school. Specific core courses result in more than 20% failure rates.<br><br>9th grade students require more intense and frequent advisement, mentoring, and monitoring.<br><br>More than 50% of 12th grade students require credit recovery or grade forgiveness to get back on-track for graduation. | 1.1. Students who need additional support to stay on track to earn high school credits will engage in credit checks with guidance counselors.<br><b>Action Step 1.1:</b> School Leadership Team identifies courses that result in 20% or greater failure rates.<br><b>Action Step 1.2:</b> School Leadership Team plans course recovery, personnel support, and tutoring schedule options for classes with high failure rates.<br><b>Action Step 1.3:</b> School | 1.1. Asst. Principal for Student Affairs, SRO, APC, Teachers, Guidance Counselors, College and Career Specialist, RtI Coach | 1.1. Utilize Early Warning System (EWS) data to track students. | 1.1. High School Graduation Rates and Drop Out Rates. |  |                             |                              |             |    |
| <b>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</b><br><i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>  |                                |                                 |   |  |   |   |   |  |                             |                              |             |    |
| <table border="1"> <tr> <td rowspan="2">The dropout rate will decrease from 2.12% in 2011-2012 to 1.5% in 2012-2013.</td> <td>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</td> <td>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TBD (11-12)</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">The graduation rate will increase from TBD in 2011-2012 to 70% in 2012-2013</td> <td>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</td> <td>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TBD</td> <td>70%</td> </tr> </table> |                                |                                 |   |  |   |   |   | The dropout rate will decrease from 2.12% in 2011-2012 to 1.5% in 2012-2013. | 2012 Current Dropout Rate:* | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* | TBD (11-12) | 1% |
| The dropout rate will decrease from 2.12% in 2011-2012 to 1.5% in 2012-2013.  | 2012 Current Dropout Rate:*    | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*    |   |  |   |   |   |  |                             |                              |             |    |
|   | TBD (11-12)                    | 1%                              |   |  |   |   |   |  |                             |                              |             |    |
| The graduation rate will increase from TBD in 2011-2012 to 70% in 2012-2013   | 2012 Current Graduation Rate:* | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* |   |  |   |   |   |  |                             |                              |             |    |
|   | TBD                            | 70%                             |   |  |   |   |   |  |                             |                              |             |    |

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

|  |  |  |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | Students require more support and monitoring to successfully complete credit recovery/grade forgiveness courses.   | Leadership Team identifies all students in need of credit recovery according to the Pupil Progression Plan guidelines.<br><u>Action Step 1.4:</u> Guidance counselors enroll all 12th graders with credit issues in Credit Recovery Courses.<br><u>Action Step 1.5:</u> School Leadership Team/Freshman Intervention Team (FIT) identifies all high risk 9th graders at the end of 1st 6 weeks utilizing data walls and Early Warning System (EWS).<br><u>Action Step 1.6:</u> School Leadership Team/FIT assigns adult mentor for all identified high risk 9th graders and monitor progress monthly. |   |   |   |
|  |  |  | 1.2. Students are behind in credits and are not graduating.  | 1.2. Credit Recovery programs will be offered to students to meet their graduation requirements. The programs include: IMPACT Credit Recovery Program, Virtual School, and Night School.  | 1.2. Asst. Principal for Student Affairs, SRO, APC, Teachers, Guidance Counselors, College and Career Specialist, RtI Coach | 1.2. Utilize Early Warning System (EWS) data to track students. | 1.2. High School Graduation Rates and Drop Out Rates  |
|  |  |  | 1.3. 9 <sup>th</sup> grade is a pivotal year for students; it is when many students begin to miss school, perform inadequately, not accumulate necessary credits and put themselves in jeopardy of not graduating. | 1.3. Implement a Freshman Academy and Freshman Intervention Team (FIT)  | 1.3. Asst. Principal for Student Affairs, SRO, APC, Teachers, Guidance Counselors, RtI Coach                                | 1.3. Utilize Early Warning System (EWS) data to track students. | 1.3. 9 <sup>th</sup> grade absenteeism rates, retention rates, credit counts, course failure rates and GPAs |

| 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 | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |

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

|                       |      | PLC Leader  | school-wide) | Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) |                                 |   |
|-----------------------|------|---|--------------|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Early Warning Systems | 9-12 | Asst. Principal for Student Affairs, RtI Coach, Principal, Area 4 RtI Facilitator | All Staff    | Fall 2011                               | Early Warning System (EWS) Data | Asst. Principal for Student Affairs, RtI Coach, Principal, Area 4 RtI Facilitator |

### Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)

| Strategy | Description of Resources                     | Funding Source           | Amount   |
|----------|--|--------------------------|----------|
|          | 9 <sup>th</sup> Grade Advisor                | School Improvement Grant | \$2,757  |
|          | 9 <sup>th</sup> Grade Summer Transition Camp | School Improvement Grant | \$30,331 |

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

*End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*

### Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

| Additional Goal(s)   |                       |                        | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |                                 |   |   |                           |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:  |                       |                        | Anticipated Barrier                                     | Strategy                        | Fidelity Check<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?        | Student Evaluation Tool   |
| <b>1. Health and Fitness Goal</b>  |                       |                        | 1.1. Students not dressed out to play                   | 1.1. Hardship PE uniform        | 1.1. Teacher checks daily                                     | 1.1. Tracking of number of students dressing out daily- checking of participation to make adjustments in strategies | 1.1. Teacher observations |
| <b>Health and Fitness Goal #1:</b><br>During the 2012 -2013 school year, 100% of the students taking PE and AFJROTC will participate in physical fitness curriculum. | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | Students not motivated                                  | Motivate students via incentive | Dept Head checks  |   | Student Grades (Edline)   |
|  | <b>96%</b>            | <b>100%</b>            | Student obesity   | Free AFJROTC PE uniforms        | Principal   |   |                           |
|  |                       |                        | Student obesity   | Educate to boost self-esteem    | Guidance Counselors   |   |                           |
|  |                       |                        | Performance fear  | Mix up games and sports         | APC   |   |                           |
|  |                       |                        | Low self-esteem   | Coed games and sports           |   |   |                           |
|  |                       |                        | Lack of uniform money                                   | Survey students                 |   |   |                           |
|  |                       |                        | Student inactive lifestyle                              | Grades linked to participation  |   |   |                           |
|  |                       |                        | Mental Health Issues                                    |                                 |   |   |                           |

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

|  |  |  |                 |                                  |      |      |      |
|--|--|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|------|------|------|
|  |  |  | Poor attendance | Non-participation actions sheets |      |      |      |
|  |  |  | 1.2.            | 1.2.                             | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
|  |  |  | 1.3.            | 1.3.                             | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

**Health and Fitness Goals 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 |
| Dept PLCs   | All levels          | Major Mistretta                  | PLC  | Weekly meetings for 2 hours August 2012 through May 2013                                      |                                   |   |
| CIS Workshop  | All levels          | Mrs. Ruel                        | PE Dept  | 8 hours August 8, 2012  |                                   |   |
| JROTC Professional Day  | All levels          | District Supervisor              | PE Dept  | 8 hours August 15, 2012   |                                   |   |
| PE Dept Head Workshops  | All levels          | District Supervisor              | PE Dept  | 1 Per Quarter   |                                   |   |

**Continuous Improvement Goal(s)**

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

| <b>Additional Goal(s)</b>   | <b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b> |                 |  |   |                                |
|---|--|-----------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
|   | <b>Anticipated Barrier</b>                                     | <b>Strategy</b> | <b>Fidelity Check</b><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | <b>Strategy Data Check</b><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | <b>Student Evaluation Tool</b> |
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: |  |                 |  |   |                                |
| <b>1. Continuous Improvement Goal</b>   | 1.1.   | 1.1.            | 1.1.<br>Administration   | 1.1. PTSA enrollment and attendance at meetings; Parent Edline Activation   | 1.1.                           |

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

|   |                       |                        |                                   |  |   |   |      |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|------|
| <b>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</b><br><br>During the 2012 -2013 school year, 25% of the parents at Middleton High will become involved in volunteer efforts and extracurricular activities as measured by: PTSA enrollment and attendance at meetings; Parent Edline Activation Percentage; Parent Attendance of Conference Nights. | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | See Parent Involvement Plan (PIP) | Hours will be tracked by sign-in sheets and documented for all events where parents attend and are involved in their student's academic progress | Parent Liaison<br>SAC Chair<br>PTSA<br>Teachers | Percentage; Parent Attendance of Conference Nights. |      |
|   | <b>30%</b>            | <b>50%</b>             |                                   |  |   |   |      |
|   |                       |                        |                                   |  |   |   |      |
|   |                       |                        | 1.2.                              | 1.2.   | 1.2.  | 1.2.  | 1.2. |
|   |                       |                        | 1.3.                              | 1.3.   | 1.3.  | 1.3.  | 1.3. |

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

### NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

|   |                                     |                                      |  |  |  |   |                                 |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <b>A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).</b>  |                                     |                                      | A.1. Wide range of ability levels in one class | A.1. SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. | A.1. Administrators (during formal and informal walk-throughs) | A.1. Teacher Level  | A.1. FAA                        |
| <b>Reading Goal A:</b><br><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* |  |  |  |   |                                 |
|   | <b>95%</b>                          | <b>96%</b>                           |  |  |  |   |                                 |
|   |                                     |                                      | A.2. Health Issues (lack of attendance)        | A.2. Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD students review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity.              | A.2. ESE Teacher   | A.2. PLC/Departmental Level   | A.2. Brigance                   |
|   |                                     |                                      | A.3. There are no test                         | A.3. Teachers (both  | A.3. ESE Department Head                                       | A.3. 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , and 3 <sup>rd</sup> grading periods. | A.3. Teacher made Pre/Post-test |



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

|  |   |   |   |                          |  |  |  |                     |                    |          |
|--|---|---|---|--------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------|--------------------|----------|
|  |   | item specs for the FAA to help guide classroom instruction on which Access Points will be covered on the end of the year assessment.                        | individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons                     |                          |  |  |  |                     |                    |          |
| <p><b>B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</b></p> <p><b>Reading Goal B:</b></p> <p>The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 3%.</p> |   |   |   |                          |  |  |  |                     |                    |          |
|  | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>7%</b></td> <td><b>10%</b></td> </tr> </table> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*  | <b>7%</b>                | <b>10%</b>   | B.1. Wide range of ability levels in one class | B.1. SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. | B.1. Administrators | B.1. Teacher Level | B.1. FAA |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:*  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*  |   |   |                          |  |  |  |                     |                    |          |
| <b>7%</b>  | <b>10%</b>  |   |   |                          |  |  |  |                     |                    |          |
|  |   | B.2. Health Issues (lack of attendance)   | B.2. Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD students review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity.   | B.2. ESE Teachers        | B.2. PLC/Departmental Level  | B.2. Brigance                                  |  |                     |                    |          |
|  |   | B.3. There are no test item specs for the FAA to help guide classroom instruction on which Access Points will be covered on the end of the year assessment. | B.3. Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons | B.3. ESE Department Head | B.3. 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> grading periods | B.3. Teacher made Pre/Post-test                |  |                     |                    |          |

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

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

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

| 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   | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| <b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>   |   | 1.1.   | <b>See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, and 5C.3</b> | 1.1.  | 1.1.  | 1.1.            |
| <u>CELLA Goal #1:</u>  | <u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u> |  |  |   |   |                 |
| The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 73% to 75%. | <b>73%</b>  | 1.2.   |  | 1.2.  | 1.2.  | 1.2.            |
|  |   | 1.3.   | 1.3.   | 1.3.  | 1.3.  | 1.3.            |
| Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.   |   | Anticipated Barrier                                      | Strategy   | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| <b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>  |   | 2.1.   | <b>See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, and 5C.3</b> | 2.1.  | 2.1.  | 2.1.            |
| <u>CELLA Goal #2:</u>  | <u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u>            |  |  |   |   |                 |
| The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 22% to 24%.            | <b>22%</b>  | 2.2.   |  | 2.2.  | 2.2.  | 2.2.            |
|  |   | 2.3.   | 2.3.   | 2.3.  | 2.3.  | 2.3.            |

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

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.                                     |   | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy                                     | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---------------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| <b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>   |   | 2.1.                | <b>See Writing Goal 1A.1, 1A.2, and 1A.3</b> | 2.1.  | 2.1.  | 2.1.            |
| <b>CELLA Goal #3:</b>   | <b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</b> |                     |  |   |   |                 |
| The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 31% to 33%. | <b>31%</b>  | 2.2.                |  | 2.2.  | 2.2.  | 2.2.            |
|   |   | 2.3.                | 2.3.   | 2.3.  | 2.3.  | 2.3.            |

**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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|-------------------------|
| <b>F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).</b>   |  |   | F.1. Wide range of ability levels in one class | F.1 .SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students’ IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. | F.1. Administrators   | F.1. Teacher Level   | F.1. FAA                |
| <b>Mathematics Goal F:</b>   | <b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> | <b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> |  |  |   |  |                         |
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.  | <b>95%</b>                                 | <b>96%</b>                                  |  |  |   |  |                         |
|  |  |   | F.2. Health Issues (lack of attendance)        | F.2. Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD students review students’ IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity.              | F.2. ESE Teachers   | F.2. PLC/Departmental Level  | F.2. Brigance           |

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

|  |   | F.3. There are no test item specs for the FAA to help guide classroom instruction on which Access Points will be covered on the end of the year assessment. | F.3. Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons | F.3. ESE Department Head | F.3. 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , and 3 <sup>rd</sup> grading periods | F.3. Teacher made Pre/Post-test |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|---|--------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| <p><b>G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b></p> <p><b>Mathematics Goal G:</b></p> <p>The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 3%.</p> |   | G.1. Wide range of ability levels in one class  | G.1. SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations.                              | G.1. Administrators      | G.1. Teacher Level   | G.1. FAA                        |  |  |  |  |
|  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>8%</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>11%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*  | <b>8%</b>                | <b>11%</b>   |                                 |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:*  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*  |   |   |                          |  |                                 |  |  |  |  |
| <b>8%</b>  | <b>11%</b>  |   |   |                          |  |                                 |  |  |  |  |
|  |   | G.2. Health Issues (lack of attendance)   | G.2. Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD students review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity.   | G.2. ESE Teachers        | G.2. PLC/Departmental Level  | G.2. Brigance                   |  |  |  |  |
|  |   | G.3. There are no test item specs for the FAA to help guide classroom instruction on which Access Points will be covered on the end of the year assessment. | G.3. Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons | G.3. ESE Department Head | G.3. 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , and 3 <sup>rd</sup> grading periods | G.3. Teacher made Pre/Post-test |  |  |  |  |

**NEW Geometry End-of-Course Goals \*(High School ONLY)**

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

| <b>Geometry EOC Goals</b>   |   |  | <b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b> |                                   |  |   |                                |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 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><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | <b>Strategy Data Check</b><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | <b>Student Evaluation Tool</b> |
| <b>H. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry.</b>   |   |  | 1.1.   | <b>See Algebra Goals 1 and 2.</b> | 1.1.   | 1.1.  | 1.1.                           |
| <b>Geometry Goal H:</b><br>The percentage of all curriculum students scoring in the Middle and Upper Thirds on the 2013 Geometry EOC will increase from ___% to ___%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance: *<br><b>_52%</b> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: *<br><b>_55_ %</b> | 1.2.   |                                   | 1.2.   | 1.2.  | 1.2.                           |
|   |   |  | 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:    |   |  | <b>Anticipated Barrier</b>                                     | <b>Strategy</b>                   | <b>Fidelity Check</b><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | <b>Strategy Data Check</b><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | <b>Student Evaluation Tool</b> |
| <b>I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.</b>  |   |  | 2.1.   | <b>See Algebra Goals 1 and 2.</b> | 2.1.   | 2.1.  | 2.1.                           |
| <b>Geometry Goal H:</b><br>The percentage of all curriculum students scoring in the Upper Third on the 2013 Geometry EOC will increase from ___% to ___%.             | 2012 Current Level of Performance: *<br><b>_23%</b> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: *<br><b>_26_ %</b> | 2.2.   |                                   | 2.2.   | 2.2.  | 2.2.                           |
|   |   |  | 2.3.   |                                   | 2.3.   | 2.3.  | 2.3.                           |
|   |   |  |  |                                   |  |   |                                |

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

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

**NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal**

| Elementary, Middle and High 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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool         |
| <b>J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).</b>  |                                     |                                      | J.1. Wide range of ability levels in one class  | J.1. SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations.                              | J.1. Administrators   | J.1. Teacher Level   | J.1. FAA                        |
| Science Goal J:<br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 2%.   | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* |   |   |   |  |                                 |
|  | 94%                                 | 96%                                  |   |   |   |  |                                 |
|  |                                     |                                      | J.2. Health Issues (lack of attendance)   | J.2. Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD students review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity.   | J.2. ESE Teachers   | J.2. PLC/Departmental Level  | J.2. Brigance                   |
|  |                                     |                                      | J.3. There are no test item specs for the FAA to help guide classroom instruction on which Access Points will be covered on the end of the year assessment. | J.3. Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons | J.3. ESE Department Head                                      | J.3. 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , and 3 <sup>rd</sup> grading periods                                 | J.3. Teacher made Pre/Post-test |

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

**NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals**

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

| Biology EOC 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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?   | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?  | Student Evaluation Tool  |
| <b>K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third on Biology EOC exam.</b>  |   |   | 1.1.<br>-Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model. | 1.1.<br><b>Strategy</b><br>Students' science skills will improve through participation in the <b>5E Instructional Model</b> .<br><br><b>Action Steps</b><br>-New teachers will attend District Science training.<br>-PLCs write SMART goals for each unit of instruction.<br>-Teachers will collaborate with their PLCs on creating 5E lesson plans that include activities/ learning experiences that promote student learning at the benchmarks' appropriate cognitive complexity.<br>-Both new and previously-trained teachers will write and implement unit lesson plans in their classrooms based on the 5E Instructional Model.<br>-PLCs will collaborate on common checks for understanding/formative assessments to be integrated into their lessons in order to monitor, share, and respond to student achievement data.<br>-At the end of the unit, teachers will give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.<br>-Teachers will bring common assessment data back to the PLCs to discuss the effectiveness of their 5E lesson plans as a means to drive future instruction, | 1.1<br><b>Who</b><br>Principal<br>APC s and APs<br>Science Coach<br>Department Chair<br>PLC Teachers<br><br><b>How Monitored</b><br>-Science Coach and APCs will attend and facilitate PLCs.<br>-Administration and Science Coach/Department Head will conduct classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. | 1.1.<br><b>Teacher Level</b><br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the common formative assessment data, common unit assessment data, common checks for understanding data, and Achievement Series data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.<br><b>PLC Level</b><br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-For each class, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.<br><b>Leadership Team Level</b><br>-PLC facilitator/ Science Coach/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | 1.1.<br>29. District Formative Assessments (3x/yr)<br>30. Multiple Checks for Understanding/Formative Assessments during lessons<br>31. District Unit Mini Assessments<br>32. FCIM quizzes<br>33. Unit/Chapter Tests/Quizzes<br>34. Remediation/Enrichment Session data<br>35. Student notebooks/sample work<br>36. Semester Exam data |
| <b>Biology Goal K:</b><br>Percentage of 9 <sup>th</sup> -grade students scoring in the middle or upper third on Biology EOC exam will increase from last year's (2012) 46% to 60% this year (2013). | <b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b><br>Forty-six percent (46%) of 9 <sup>th</sup> -grade students scored in the middle- and upper third categories on the 2012 EOC exam. | <b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b><br>At least sixty percent (60%) of 9 <sup>th</sup> -grade students will score in the middle- and upper third categories on the 2013 EOC exam. |   |  |   |   |  |

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

|  |  |   |   |   |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|
|  |  |   |   | <p>and to determine FCIM benchmark selection.</p> <p>-Individual PLC teachers will implement FCIMs in their classrooms based on their individual class data with respect to the lowest proficiency benchmarks.</p> <p>-Science Coach and PLC teachers will collaborate on writing Remediation/Enrichment lessons using the 5E Model of Instruction for teachers to implement in their classrooms as a response to Formative B and Unit Mini Assessment data.</p>  |  |   |  |
|  |  | <p>1.2.<br/>-PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to facilitate student learning.</p> | <p>1.2.<br/><b>Strategy</b><br/>Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively using the <b>Plan-Do-Check-Act model</b> to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. What is it we expect them to learn?</li> <li>6. How will we know if they have learned it?</li> <li>7. How will we respond if they don't learn?</li> <li>8. How will we respond if they already know it?</li> </ol> <p><u>Actions/Details</u><br/><i>PLCs will do the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Use a PLC log to guide their Plan-Do-Check-Act conversations and way of work.</li> <li>--Monitor the frequency of meetings.</li> <li>-Collaborate 2-3 times per week for curriculum planning, reflection, and data analysis.</li> <li>- Unpack the benchmark and identify what students need to understand, know, and do.</li> <li>--Plan common checks for</li> </ul> | <p>1.2<br/><u>Who</u><br/>-Principal<br/>-APCs &amp; APs<br/>-Science Coach<br/>-PLC Teachers</p> <p><u>How</u><br/>-PLC logs turned into administration/science coach provides feedback<br/>-Science Coach and Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings. Science coach/PLC Facilitator(s) will review SMART goals and PLCs to ensure the Plan-Do-Check-Model is followed as a means to facilitate student learning.<br/>-Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team/Coaches meetings.<br/>-Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.</p> | <p>1.2.<br/>PLC Log to include: attendance, content of discussion, data used to drive discussion/future plans, etc.)</p> | <p>1.2.<br/>37. District Formative Assessments (3x/yr)<br/>38. District Unit Mini Assessments<br/>39. FCIM quiz data<br/>40. Unit/Chapter Tests/Quizzes (Edline reports)<br/>41. Remediation/Enrichment Session data<br/>42. Semester Exam data</p> |  |



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

|  |  |   |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|
|  |  |   | <p>understanding during the unit.<br/>         --Plan common the End-of-Unit Assessments<br/>         --Plan upcoming lessons/units using the 5E Instructional Model.<br/>         --Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught<br/>         --Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments.<br/>         --Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group.<br/>         -Generate SMART goals for upcoming units of instruction.<br/>         -Report SMART goal data through their logs.<br/>         - Adjust action plans based on teacher/coach walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data.</p>   |   |   |  |
|  |  | <p>1.3<br/>         -Teachers are either unfamiliar with or new to the Close Reading Model and how to implement it in their classrooms.</p> | <p>1.3.<br/> <u>Strategy</u><br/>         Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text (textbooks and other supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the <u>close reading model</u> (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least once for every Unit of the curriculum.<br/><br/> <u>Action Steps</u><br/> <i>Professional Development</i><br/>         -The Science Coach and Reading Coach and/or Reading Resource Teacher collaborate to conduct small group departmental trainings to develop teachers' ability to use the close reading model.<br/>         -The Reading Coach and/or Reading Resource Teacher attends science departmental</p> | <p>1.3.<br/> <u>Who</u><br/>         Teacher<br/>         Principal<br/>         APCs and APs<br/>         Science Coach<br/>         District Academic Coach<br/>         Reading Coach<br/>         Reading Resource<br/>         Teacher</p> | <p>1.3.<br/>         Science PLC<br/>         Science Coach and Reading Coach/Resource Teacher meetings<br/>         PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing it to the baseline data (formative data).</p> | <p>1.3.<br/>         District Formative Assessments (3x/yr)<br/>         Unit Mini Assessments<br/>         Semester Exams<br/>         Edline reports</p> |

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

|  |  |  |   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <p>PLCs to co-plan with teachers, developing lessons using the close reading model.</p> <p>-Teachers within departments attend professional development provided by the district/school on text complexity and close reading models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model.</p> <p><b><i>In PLCs/Department</i></b></p> <p>-Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks.</p> <p>-PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile.</p> <p>-PLCs assign appropriate NGSSS benchmark to Close Reading passage</p> <p>-To increase stamina, teachers select high-Lexile, complex and rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous</p> <p>- Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons.</p> <p><b><i>During the lessons, teachers:</i></b></p> <p>-Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text.</li> <li>• Stating an essential question and/or objective prior to reading.</li> <li>• Using questions to check for</li> </ul> |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|

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

|   |  |  |   |   |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
|   |  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>understanding.</li> <li>Using question to engage students in discussion.</li> <li>Requiring oral and written responses to text.</li> </ul> <p>-Ask text-based questions that require close reading of the text and multiple reads of the text.</p> <p><b>During the lessons, students:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grapple with complex text.</li> <li>Re-read for a second purpose and to increase comprehension.</li> <li>Engage in discussion to answer essential question and/or address learning objective using textual evidence.</li> <li>Write in response to essential question using textual evidence.</li> </ul> |   |   |   |
| 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><br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?  | <b>Strategy Data Check</b><br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?   | <b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>  |
| <b>L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology.</b>   |  | 2.1<br>-Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model.   | 2.1<br><b>Strategy</b><br>Students’ science skills will improve through participation in the <b>5E Instructional Model.</b><br><br><b>Action Steps</b><br>-New teachers will attend District Science training.<br>-PLCs write SMART goals for each unit of instruction.<br>-Teachers will collaborate with their PLCs on creating 5E lesson plans that include activities/ learning experiences that promote student learning at the benchmarks’ appropriate cognitive complexity.<br>-Both new and previously-   | 2.1<br><b>Who</b><br>Principal<br>APC s and APs<br>Science Coach<br>Department Chair<br>PLC Teachers<br><br><b>How Monitored</b><br>-Science Coach and APCs will attend and facilitate PLCs.<br>-Administration and Science Coach/Department Head will conduct classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. | 2.1<br><b>Teacher Level</b><br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the common formative assessment data, common unit assessment data, common checks for understanding data, and Achievement Series data to calculate their students’ progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.<br><b>PLC Level</b><br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future | 2.1<br>43. District Formative Assessments (3x/yr)<br>44. Multiple Checks for Understanding/Formative Assessments during lessons<br>45. District Unit Mini Assessments<br>46. FCIM quizzes<br>47. Unit/Chapter Tests/Quizzes<br>48. Remediation/Enrichment Session data<br>49. Student notebooks/sample work<br>50. Semester Exam data |
| <b>Biology Goal L:</b><br><br>Percentage of 9 <sup>th</sup> -grade students scoring in the upper third on Biology EOC exam will increase from last year’s (2012) 26% to 30% this year (2013). | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u><br><br>Twenty-six percent<br><b>(26%)</b> of<br>9 <sup>th</sup> -grade students scored in the upper third on last year’s (2012) Biology EOC exam. | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u><br><br>At least thirty percent<br><b>(30%)</b> of<br>9 <sup>th</sup> -grade students will score in the upper third on this year’s (2013) Biology EOC exam. |   |   |   |   |

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

|  |  |   |  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|
|  |  |   | <p>trained teachers will write and implement unit lesson plans in their classrooms based on the 5E Instructional Model.</p> <p>-PLCs will collaborate on common checks for understanding/formative assessments to be integrated into their lessons in order to monitor, share, and respond to student achievement data.</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers will give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>-Teachers will bring common assessment data back to the PLCs to discuss the effectiveness of their 5E lesson plans as a means to drive future instruction, and to determine FCIM benchmark selection.</p> <p>-Individual PLC teachers will implement FCIMs in their classrooms based on their individual class data with respect to the lowest proficiency benchmarks.</p> <p>-Science Coach and PLC teachers will collaborate on writing Remediation/Enrichment lessons using the 5E Model of Instruction for teachers to implement in their classrooms as a response to Formative B and Unit Mini Assessment data.</p> |  | <p>instruction.</p> <p>-For each class, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-PLC facilitator/ Science Coach/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p> |   |
|  |  | <p>2.2</p> <p>-PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to facilitate student learning.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> <p><b>Strategy</b></p> <p>Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively using the <b>Plan-Do-Check-Act model</b> to structure their way of work.</p> <p>Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:</p> <p>5. What is it we expect them to learn?</p> <p>6. How will we know if they</p>   | <p>2.2</p> <p><b>Who</b></p> <p>-Principal</p> <p>-APCs &amp; APs</p> <p>-Science Coach</p> <p>-PLC Teachers</p> <p><b>How</b></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration/science coach provides feedback</p> <p>-Science Coach and Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings.</p> <p>Science coach/PLC</p> | <p>2.2.</p> <p>School has a system for PLCs to record and report during...</p>  | <p>2.2.</p> <p>51. District Formative Assessments (3x/yr)</p> <p>52. District Unit Mini Assessments</p> <p>53. FCIM quiz data</p> <p>54. Unit/Chapter Tests/Quizzes (Edline reports)</p> <p>55. Remediation/Enrichment Session data</p> <p>56. Semester Exam data</p> |

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

|  |   |   |   |  |   |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|
|  |   |   | <p>7. How will we respond if they don't learn it?<br/>             8. How will we respond if they already know it?</p> <p><u>Actions/Details</u><br/> <i>PLCs will do the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Use a PLC log to guide their Plan-Do-Check-Act conversations and way of work.</li> <li>--Monitor the frequency of meetings.</li> <li>-Collaborate 2-3 times per week for curriculum planning, reflection, and data analysis.</li> <li>- Unpack the benchmark and identify what students need to understand, know, and do.</li> <li>--Plan common checks for understanding during the unit.</li> <li>--Plan common the End-of-Unit Assessments</li> <li>--Plan upcoming lessons/units using the 5E Instructional Model.</li> <li>--Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught</li> <li>--Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments.</li> <li>--Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group.</li> <li>-Generate SMART goals for upcoming units of instruction.</li> <li>-Report SMART goal data through their logs.</li> <li>- Adjust action plans based on teacher/coach walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data.</li> </ul> | <p>Facilitator(s) will review SMART goals and PLCs to ensure the Plan-Do-Check-Model is followed as a means to facilitate student learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team</li> <li>-Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.</li> </ul> |   |  |
|  | <p>2.3<br/>             -Teachers are either unfamiliar with or new to the Close Reading Model and how to implement it in their classrooms.</p> | <p>2.3<br/> <u>Strategy</u><br/>             Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text</p> | <p>2.3<br/> <u>Who</u><br/>             Teacher<br/>             Principal<br/>             APCs and APs<br/>             Science Coach<br/>             District Academic Coach</p>  | <p>2.3<br/>             Science PLC<br/>             Science Coach and Reading Coach/Resource Teacher meetings<br/>             PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close</p>   | <p>2.3<br/>             District Formative Assessments (3x/yr)<br/>             Unit Mini Assessments<br/>             Semester Exams<br/>             Edline reports</p> |  |

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

|  |  |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
|  |  | <p>(textbooks and other supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the <b>close reading model</b> (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least once for every Unit of the curriculum.</p> <p><b>Action Steps</b><br/> <b>Professional Development</b><br/>         -The Science Coach and Reading Coach and/or Reading Resource Teacher collaborate to conduct small group departmental trainings to develop teachers' ability to use the close reading model.<br/>         -The Reading Coach and/or Reading Resource Teacher attends science departmental PLCs to co-plan with teachers, developing lessons using the close reading model.<br/>         -Teachers within departments attend professional development provided by the district/school on text complexity and close reading models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model.</p> <p><b>In PLCs/Department</b><br/>         -Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks.<br/>         -PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile.<br/>         -PLCs assign appropriate NGSSS benchmark to Close Reading passage<br/>         -To increase stamina, teachers select high-Lexile, complex and rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous</p> | <p>Reading Coach<br/>         Reading Resource<br/>         Teacher</p> | <p>Reading passage comparing it to the baseline data (formative data).</p> |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

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

|  |  |  |   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <p>- Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons.</p> <p><b>During the lessons, teachers:</b></p> <p>-Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text.</li> <li>• Stating an essential question and/or objective prior to reading.</li> <li>• Using questions to check for understanding.</li> <li>• Using question to engage students in discussion.</li> <li>• Requiring oral and written responses to text.</li> </ul> <p>-Ask text-based questions that require close reading of the text and multiple reads of the text.</p> <p><b>During the lessons, students:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grapple with complex text.</li> <li>• Re-read for a second purpose and to increase comprehension.</li> <li>• Engage in discussion to answer essential question and/or address learning objective using textual evidence.</li> </ul> <p>Write in response to essential question using textual evidence.</p> |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|

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

**Science 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                           |
| Inquiry and the 5E Instructional Model  | 9-12                | Science Coach and District Academic Coach   | Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs                 | On-going in science PLCs  | Administrators /Science coach conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor 5 E Instructional Model lessons. | Administration Team   |
| Close Reading   | 9-12                | Reading Coach, Reading Resource Teacher, Science Coach, and Science District Academic Coach | Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs                 | Ongoing in science PLCs   | Science Coach, Reading Coach, and Reading Resource Teacher walk-throughs                                 | Administration Team & Science Coach, and Reading Coach/Resource Teacher |

**NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal**

**Writing Goals**

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

| <b>Writing Goals</b>   |  |   | <b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>  |  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| 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   |
| <b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>  |  |   | 1A.1.<br>-Teachers across all content areas are not using to writing to support higher order thinking.<br>- Teachers across all content areas are not consistently following best practices in lesson design. | 1A.1.<br>-Students’ reading, writing, language, and listening /speaking skills improve through lessons/activities/tasks that promote high levels of thinking supported by teachers’ participation in PLCs and the alignment with best practices, instructional calendars, differentiated instruction, and effective holistic scoring methods.<br><br><u>Action Steps:</u><br>1. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs will discuss content specific writing to identify trends and needs, and will collaborate with the writing coach to develop instruction targeting student needs. | 1A.1.<br><u>Who</u><br>Principal<br>APC<br>Academic Coaches<br>Department Heads<br>PLCs<br>District Academic Writing Coach<br>Writing Resource<br><br><u>How</u><br>- PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.<br>- Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy<br>administration walk-throughs.<br>-HCPS Informal Observation | 1A.1.<br>- PLCs will identify trends (deficiencies and growth) in student writing performance and collaborate to modify instructional delivery provide differentiated instruction as appropriate.<br><br>- Writing Coach will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.<br><br><u>PLC/Department Level</u><br>-Review PLC logs and student | 1A.1.<br>Student achievement on activities implementing writing for higher order thinking.<br><br><u>Monthly</u><br>PLC logs to ensure fidelity<br><br><u>During Grading Period</u><br>Review student achievement data to assess the effectiveness of the strategies. |
| <u>Writing Goal #1A:</u><br><b>In grade 10, the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing will increase from 73% to 76%.</b> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u><br><b>73%</b> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u><br><b>76%</b> |   |  |  |   |   |



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

|  |  |   |   |   |  |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|
|  |  |   | <p>2. As a Professional Development activity, writing coach will facilitate professional development through PLCs to support writing in all content areas.</p> <p>3. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.</p> <p>4. Writing coach will provide coaching, modeling, and feedback to support writing initiatives across all content areas.</p>   | <p>Pop-In Form (EET tool).<br/>Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.<br/>- Springboard Walk-Through Observation Form</p> <p><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>-PLC logs<br/>-Class Achievement</p> <p><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>-PLC logs<br/>-Class Achievement</p> <p><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>-PLC logs<br/>-Class Achievement</p>  | <p>achievement in courses</p> <p><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/><i>Review student achievement</i></p> <p><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/><i>Review student achievement</i></p> <p><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/><i>Review student achievement</i></p>  |   |
|  |  | <p>1A.2.<br/>- Teachers may not have familiarity with the rigor of the revised FCAT Writing requirements.</p> | <p>1A.2.<br/>- Students' writing skills will improve through participation in best practices for teaching writing. Best practices include PLC instructional calendars, Differentiated Instruction, and effective holistic scoring methods.</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <p>1. As a Professional Development activity, teachers new to the profession and/or content area are required to attend district level trainings.</p> <p>2. As a Professional Development activity, teachers participate in assessment and rubric refresher courses and practice scoring within PLCs.</p> <p>3. As a Professional Development activity, Language Arts DH, writing coach, and grade level PLC chairs will facilitate advanced scoring sessions.</p> <p>4. As a Professional Development activity PLCs, along with writing coach, will discuss student writing to identify trends and needs, and will collaborate to develop instruction targeting student needs.</p> <p>5. Teachers provide additional support to students not demonstrating proficiency (i.e.,</p> | <p>1A.2.<br/><u>Who</u><br/>Principal<br/>APC<br/>LA PLCs<br/>District Academic Writing Coach<br/>School Writing Coach<br/>Writing Resource</p> <p><u>How</u><br/>- PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.<br/>- Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy administration walk-throughs.<br/>-HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool).<br/>Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.<br/>- Springboard Walk-Through Observation Form</p> <p><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>-Baseline and scheduled common writing assessments and data reviews</p> <p><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/>-Scheduled common writing assessments and data reviews</p> <p><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period Check</u></p> | <p>1A.2.<br/>- PLCs will participate in rubric norming sessions to identify teacher barriers impeding effective holistic scoring.</p> <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u><br/>-Review essays in PLCs to ensure that essays are scored consistently</p> <p><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/><i>Review consistency of essay scoring in PLCs</i></p> <p><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/><i>Review consistency of essay scoring in PLCs</i></p> <p><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br/><i>Review consistency of essay scoring in PLCs</i></p> | <p>1A.2.<br/>Review formal writing data in PLCs to ensure consistent scoring.</p> <p><u>Monthly</u><br/>PLC logs to ensure fidelity</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u><br/>Review student achievement data to assess the effectiveness consistency of scoring.</p> |

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

|  |  |   |   |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|
|  |  |   | pull-out, small group instruction, ELP, Saturday Academy etc.).   | -Scheduled common writing assessments and data reviews   |  |   |
|  |  | 1A.3.<br>- Teachers are not providing regular feedback to students. | 1A.3.<br>- Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing and writing portfolios.<br><br><u>Action Steps:</u><br>1. Teachers will utilize student work as an instructional tool, display exemplars models earning a 4, 5, or 6, and create and maintain writing portfolios. | 1A.3.<br><u>Who</u><br>Principal<br>APC<br>LA PLCs<br>District Academic Writing Coach<br>School Writing Coach<br>Writing Resource<br><br><u>How</u><br>- PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.<br>- Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy<br>administration walk-throughs.<br>- HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool).<br>Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.<br>- Springboard Walk-Through Observation Form<br>-Writing portfolios<br><br><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br>-Baseline and scheduled common writing assessments and data reviews<br>-Portfolio writing conferences<br><br><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br>-Scheduled common writing assessments and data reviews<br>-Portfolio writing conferences<br><br><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br>-Scheduled common writing assessments and data reviews<br>- Portfolio writing conferences | 1A.3.<br>- PLCs will review portfolios and writing conference data to plan instruction around student needs.<br><br>- PLCs will review writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric.<br><br><u>PLC/Department Level</u><br>-Review portfolios and writing conference documentation to ensure students are receiving support.<br><br><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br><u>Review portfolios to ensure consistency across PLCs</u><br><br><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br><u>Review portfolios to ensure consistency across PLCs</u><br><br><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period Check</u><br><u>Review portfolios to ensure consistency across PLCs</u> | 1A.3.<br>Formal and informal student writing and writing conferencing documentation<br><br><u>Monthly</u><br>PLC logs to ensure fidelity<br><br><u>During Grading Period</u><br>Review student achievement data to assess the effectiveness of portfolios on improving student achievement. |

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <b>Writing Goals</b> | <b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?  | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool         |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <b>M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).</b>   |                                     |                                      | M.1. Wide range of ability levels in one class  | M.1. SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations.                              | M.1. Administrators  | M.1. Teacher Level   | M.1. FAA                        |
| <b>Writing Goal M:</b><br><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.                              | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* |   |   |  |  |                                 |
|  | *                                   | 96%                                  |   |   |  |  |                                 |
|  |                                     |                                      |   | M.2. Health Issues (lack of attendance)   | M.2. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD students review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. | M.2. ESE Teachers  | M.2. PLC/Departmental Level     |
|  |                                     |                                      | M.3. There are no test item specs for the FAA to help guide classroom instruction on which Access Points will be covered on the end of the year assessment. | M.3. Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons | M.3. ESE Department Head   | M.3. 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> grading periods                                   | M.3. Teacher made Pre/Post-test |

**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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>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

|   |  |   |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| <b>STEM Goal #1:</b><br>Increase enrollment of qualified students.                                    | 1.1.<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School perception</li> <li>Middle school participation</li> </ul> | 1.1.<br>Increase the number of middle school visits, competitions, and events | 1.1<br>STEM APC , Principal, Lead Teacher for Magnet Programs.      | 1.1.<br>Enrollment indicated by the applicant data reports                  | 1.1.<br>Applicant data reports                          |
|   | 1.2.   | 1.2.  | 1.2.  | 1.2.  | 1.2.  |
|   | 1.3.   | 1.3.  | 1.3.  | 1.3.  | 1.3.  |
| <b>STEM Goal #2:</b><br>Improve Student success in Stem courses through cross curriculum integration. | 2.1.<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Different pacing between core and STEM courses</li> </ul>         | 2.1.<br>Increase curriculum integration and AD HOC PLC's                      | 2.1.<br>STEM APC, APC, Principal, Lead Teacher for Magnet Programs. | 2.1.<br>Student performance on high stakes tests and summative assessments. | 2.1.<br>Test Score Reports (A.P. Exams, EOC, ECA, etc.) |

## STEM Professional Development

| <b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b><br>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 |
| CIS Model  | 9-12                | Traci Brown                      | Science PLC  |   |                                   | Traci Brown, Derrick Gaines, Kim Moore        |
|  |                     |                                  |  |   |                                   |   |
|  |                     |                                  |  |   |                                   |   |

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

## NEW Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

| CTE Goal(s)   | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
|   | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy   | Fidelity Check<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?                   | Strategy Data Check<br>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: |  |  |   |  |   |
| <b>CTE Goal #1:</b><br>Increase enrollment in CTE.                                      | 1.1.<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative approval</li> <li>Class coverage</li> <li>Time</li> </ul>  | 1.1.<br>Establish an effective elective fair                     | 1.1.<br>STEM APC , Department Head, Principal, Lead Teacher for Magnet Programs | 1.1.<br>Increase in enrollment in CTE electives  | 1.1.<br>The enrollment should be maintained at a steady number (Students should not withdraw) |
|   | 1.2.<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative approval</li> <li>Class coverage</li> <li>Time</li> <li>Scheduling (of 8<sup>th</sup> grade</li> </ul> | 1.2.<br>Develop/Participate in 8 <sup>th</sup> grade campus tour | 1.2.<br>STEM APC , Department Head, Principal, Lead Teacher for Magnet Programs | 1.2.<br>Increase in enrollment in CTE electives  | 1.2.<br>The enrollment should be maintained at a steady number (Students should not withdraw) |

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

|  |  |   |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
|  | students during the articulation process)  |   |   |  |  |
|  | 1.3.   | 1.3.  | 1.3.  | 1.3.   | 1.3.   |
| <b>CTE Goal #2:</b><br>Understand student data.  | 2.1.<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying professional development classes</li> <li>Class coverage</li> <li>Time</li> <li>Teacher buy-in</li> </ul>                               | 2.1<br>Participate in professional development focused on student data regarding reading scores, writing scores, etc. | 2.1.<br>APC , Department Head, Principal      | 2.1.<br>N/A  | 2.1.<br>N/A  |
| <b>CTE Goal #3:</b><br>Increase the number of CTE teachers trained in Cater/NG CARPD from 25% -100%. | 3.1.<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of professional development classes focused on Cater/NG CARPD</li> <li>Class coverage</li> <li>Time</li> <li>Teacher buy-in</li> </ul> | 3.1.<br>Enroll in Cater/NG CARPD professional development   | 3.1.<br>STEM APC , Department Head, Principal | 3.1.<br>Number of teachers that are Cater/NG CARPD trained | 3.1.<br>Increase in Common Core State scores from students enrolled in CTE electives |

**CTE 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  |
| CIS Model   | 9-12                | Michael Mistretta                | CTE PLC  | End of each 9 weeks to implement the CIS. Meetings are held every day 1 during period 14      | First quarter of each 9 weeks     | Michael Mistretta, Heather Holloway, Kim Moore |
|   |                     |                                  |  |   |                                   |  |
|   |                     |                                  |  |   |                                   |  |

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

**Differentiated Accountability**

**School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance**

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

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.                               |  |                  |              |
|--|--|------------------|--------------|
| Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan | Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement | Projected Amount | Final Amount |
| Attendance   | Teacher Minigrants:  |                  |              |
| Suspension   | Matt Penn- Teleprompter for Morning Show (\$899.00 plus shipping & handling)     |                  |              |
| Academic Rigor   | Jessica Copeland- Travel and lodging for FFA Students (\$500)                    |                  |              |
|  | Dorothy Schroeder- 60 Math Calculators for Geometry EOC (\$706.20)               |                  |              |
|  | Akilah GrahamAllen- Storytelling Project (\$700)                                 |                  |              |
| Final Amount Spent   |  |                  | 3, 067. 20   |