

# Florida Department of Education



## School Improvement Plan (SIP)

# Form SIP-1

## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

### PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Lennard High School	District Name: Hillsborough County
Principal: Craig Horstman	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Marianne Sprouse	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

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

List your school's highly qualified administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Craig Horstman	Masters in Educational Leadership	6	11	AYP Data: 11/12- No grade available; 10/11- B Year Achievement Gains Bottom 25% 11/12 R- 37% M- 49% W-81% R- 61% M- 50% R- 71% M- 50% 10/11 R- 32% M- 68% W-66% R- 44% M- 69% R-49% M- 69%
Assistant Principal	Mrs. Mary Freitas	Masters in Educational Leadership	1	7	AYP Data: 11/12- No grade available; 10/11- B Year Achievement Gains Bottom 25% 11/12 R- 37% M- 49% W-81% R- 61% M- 50% R- 71% M- 50% 10/11 R- 32% M- 68% W-66% R- 44% M- 69% R-49% M- 69%
Assistant Principal	Mr. John Guarisco	Master's in Ed Leadership	2	5	AYP Data: 11/12- No grade available; 10/11- B Year Achievement Gains Bottom 25% 11/12 R- 37% M- 49% W-81% R- 61% M- 50% R- 71% M- 50% 10/11 R- 32% M- 68% W-66% R- 44% M- 69% R-49% M- 69%
Assistant Principal	Mr. Rory Beauford	Masters in Educational Leadership	5	5	AYP Data: 11/12- No grade available; 10/11- B Year Achievement Gains Bottom 25% 11/12 R- 37% M- 49% W-81% R- 61% M- 50% R- 71% M- 50% 10/11 R- 32% M- 68% W-66% R- 44% M- 69% R-49% M- 69%
Assistant Principal	Ms. Jennifer Davis	Masters in Educational Leadership	3	3	AYP Data: 11/12- No grade available; 10/11- B Year Achievement Gains Bottom 25% 11/12 R- 37% M- 49% W-81% R- 61% M- 50% R- 71% M- 50% 10/11 R- 32% M- 68% W-66% R- 44% M- 69% R-49% M- 69%

## Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

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

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Tracy Stanley	Masters in Reading Education	5	5	AYP Data: 11/12- No grade available; 10/11- B Year Achievement Gains Bottom 25% 11/12 R- 37% M- 49% W-81% R- 61% M- 50% R- 71% M- 50% 10/11 R- 32% M- 68% W-66% R- 44% M- 69% R-49% M- 69%
Reading	Ashlee Predmore	BA Business Administration Marketing Reading Endorsement	6	2	AYP Data: 11/12- No grade available; 10/11- B Year Achievement Gains Bottom 25% 11/12 R- 37% M- 49% W-81% R- 61% M- 50% R- 71% M- 50% 10/11 R- 32% M- 68% W-66% R- 44% M- 69% R-49% M- 69%
Math	Diana Wohlgamuth	BA Finance MA Educational Leadership Math 6-12	6	2	
Writing	Allyson Wulfert	English 6-12 ESOL	6	2	

## Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	General Directors	<u>June 2013</u>	
2. Recruitment Fair	Supervisor of Teacher Recruitment	Ongoing	
3. MAP	Supervisor of Data Analysis	<u>October 2012</u>	
4. Performance Pay	General Director of Federal Programs	<u>July 2013</u>	

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

5. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal, Assistant Principal of Curriculum, and Department Head	Principal, Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Department Head	Ongoing	
6. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
7. Advanced Placement passing score pay	Supervisor of Assessment	<u>February 2013</u>	

**Non-Highly Qualified Instructors**

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
12 are out of field. Of those 12, 4 are not highly qualified.	<p>8 of the out of field teacher are out of field because they are teaching English/Reading and do not have ESOL requirements finished. All are working toward it. The others are completing agreements to earn.</p> <p>Depending On the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented.</p> <p>Administrators: Meet with teachers to discuss progress on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Completing classes needed for certification (8 of our out of field teachers need ESOL)</li> <li>● Preparing and taking certification exams.</li> </ul>

**Staff Demographics**

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

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

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

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
113	10% (11)	32% (36)	46% (52)	12% (14)	34% (38)	96% (109)	14% (16)	4% (5)	19% (21)

## 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
Quiahna Williams	Candice Metcalf, Yolanda Sams, Jesus Garza, Bradley Campbell, Genna Himelfarb, Mark Marchant, Christopher Kriz, Lauren Moore, Joseph Pawlikowski, Elise Garza.	District Assigned	Group meetings regarding lesson planning, classroom management, paperwork, one on one counseling as needed.

## 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.

<p>Title I, Part A  Services are provided to ensure students are provided with support services through afterschool and summer programs, professional development will be offered using these funds in workshop such as Foundations of Professional Learning Communities and FCIM training, Lunch and Learn, etc.</p>
---

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

<p>Title I, Part C- Migrant</p> <p>The Migrant Education Program at Lennard High serves migratory children ages 3 to 21 and their families by providing supplemental services. These services are: identification and recruitment, advocacy, health and social services, academic support and credit recovery, parental involvement and family literacy. Our purpose is to ensure that the special educational needs of migrant students are identified and addressed. We try to reduce the impact of educational disruptions, cultural and language barriers, social isolation, various health problems, and any other factor that may hinder migrant students' ability to do well academically. We also ensure that our students are not penalized by the school for their migrancy (moving from state to state following different crops).</p>
<p>Title I, Part D</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Title II</p> <p>We receive funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training. These funds are used to provide training such as PLCS/FCIM, CRISS Level I and II, Lunch and Learn, World Series of Best Practices, and Demonstration Classrooms. All trainings are designed to aide teachers in how to best use, collaborate, and implement research-based strategies to promote student achievement and classroom rigor.</p>
<p>Title III</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Title X- Homeless</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)</p> <p>SAI funds are used to support extended learning opportunities.</p>
<p>Violence Prevention Programs</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Nutrition Programs</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Housing Programs</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Head Start</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Adult Education</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Career and Technical Education</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Job Training</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Other</p> <p>N/A</p>

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

Hillsborough 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised July, 2012

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

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

- A. **Craig Horstman—Principal**
- B. **Mary Freitas—Assistant Principal for Curriculum**
- C. **Pat Canavan—School Psychologist**
- D. **Joseph Sandfrey—Guidance Counselors**
- E. **Teresa D’Acunto—Department Head for Social Studies**
- F. **Allyson Wulfert—Department Head for Language Arts**
- G. **Marie Perrella—Science Department**
- H. **Michelle Grinstead—Department Head for Consumer Science**
- I. **Jim Wilt—Department Head for P.E**
- J. **Amy McIntosh—ESE Specialist**
- K. **Marianne Sprouse—School Advisory Council Chair**
- L. **Mary Ferguson- Migrant Resource Teacher**
- M. **Robert Haskins- ESOL Teacher**
- N. **Beverly Adams- School Social Worker**
- O. **Adrian Sarmiento- Drop-Out Prevention Specialist**



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

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

The purpose of the PSLT in our school is to ensure high quality instruction and intervention strategies; matched to student needs and utilizing various data sources to assist in the development and delivery of intervention, learning, and behavioral outcomes. The PSLT reviews school-wide data to address the progress of low-performing students and determine the enrichment and acceleration needs of high performing students. The major goal is for all students to achieve adequate yearly progress and improve other long-term outcomes (behavior, attendance, etc.). The team uses various models (Collaborative Culture Problem Solving Model, High Schools that Work, ASCA National Model, etc) to help initiate, document, and monitor student growth.

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

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

The Leadership team meets regularly (once per month) with coordination with the Child Study Team. Specific responsibilities include:

- Oversee and monitor MTSS intervention strategies in content areas

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

- Provide support and feedback to intervention strategies
- Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Identify areas within the master schedule to foster and allow for delivery of intervention strategies
- Promote exchange between service and support provides, using data collection (classroom performance, attendance, testing information, etc)
- Strengthen Tier 1 support through use of ELP Programs, SES Tutoring, and intervention classes (Intensive Math, Intensive Reading, Academic Intervention Plans, etc)
- Determine professional development needs of the staff, as it pertains to intervention strategies, data collection, and the RtI/MTSS process
- Organize and support systematic data collection (district and state assessments, student grade performance, 'at-risk' student populations, credit checks, surveys, etc)
- Review and interpret data sources on academic, behavioral, and attendance measures
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
  - Support departmental interventions and PLC goals
  - Review documentation for RtI interventions, including county forms (intervention planning forms, cumulative records review, etc)
  - Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions. (as outlined in our SIP)
  - Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences.
- On a quarterly, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the month.
- Support the planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs and Specialty PSLT.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) on core curriculum material.

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

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

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

Indicator	Strategy Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check
Not Evident	Teacher monitoring indicates strategy implementation has not begun.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing no positive effect on student achievement.
Emerging	Some (25-75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates early or preliminary stages of implementation.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing minimal or poor effect on student achievement.
Operational	Most (>75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates active implementation.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is mostly showing a positive effect on student achievement.
Highly Functional	Teacher monitoring indicates that all of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence exists that the strategy is fully integrated and effectively/consistently implemented.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing a significant positive effect on student achievement.

Data Source	Database	Person(s) Responsible
Algebra I, Geometry EOC	Computer based	Teachers

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

Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
District generates assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing, and Science	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
FAIR	Progressing Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach/Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	View Point	ELL PSLT Representative
Common Assessments of chapter tests using adopted curriculum resources	School Generated Database	Department Heads/PLC Facilitators/PSLT member
Mini-Assessments on specific tested benchmarks	Florida Achieves District Generated	Individual math teacher
PSAT	paper based	Teacher
Longhorn Leadership (ELP related)	School Generated Database Frequency Chart (Attendance)	Teachers
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database	PSLT/Reading Coach

- The PSLT will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning PSLT members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger PSLT team through the subject area PSLT representatives.
- The PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process: Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
  - review and analyze screening and collateral data
  - develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers)
  - develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses
  - establish methods to track students’ progress with appropriate progress monitoring assessments at intervals matched to the intensity of the interventions and/or enrichment
  - develop progress monitoring goals 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 interventions and/or enrichments)
  - review goal statements to ensure they are ambitious, time-bound and meaningful (e.g., SMART goals)
  - assess the fidelity of instruction/intervention implementation and other PS/RtI processes

**Elementary/Middle/High**

- The Chair of SAC is a member of the Leadership Team/PSLT.
- The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.

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

- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the Leadership Team/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 Leadership Team/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 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.
  - Develop grading period or units of instruction//intervention goals that are ambitious, time-bound, and measurable (e.g., SMART goals).
  - 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).
  - Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring.
  - 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

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

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. The following table contains a summary of the assessments used to measure student progress in core, supplemental and intensive instruction and their sources and management:

### Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released test	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach, LA SAL, Math SAL, Science SAL, APC
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing and Science	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
Program Generated Assessments	Software	Individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Common Assessments* ( <i>see below</i> ) of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources	Subject Area Generated Database	SALS, individual teachers, PSLT
Nine Week Exams	Subject Area Generated Excel Database	SALS, individual teachers, PSLT
Semester Exams	Subject Area Generated Excel Database	SALS, individual teachers, PSLT
Mini-Assessments on specific tested Benchmarks	Subject Area Generated Excel Database	Individual teachers

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

- Determine if the lesson plans and teaching strategies used to teach the core curriculum were effective or need to be modified.
- Determine which skills need to be taught with alternative strategies.
- Determine which skills need to be re-taught within the core curriculum and which skills need to be moved to the Reinforcement Instructional Calendar.
- Determine which students need Differentiated Instruction within the classroom and which students might need Supplemental Services.

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

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

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP) * (see below) Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Longhorn Leadership</li> <li>SES Tutoring</li> </ul>	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/ ELP Facilitator: LEP Coordinator
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/ Reading Coach
Ongoing assessments within Intensive Courses	Database provided by course materials (for courses that have one), School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/PLC/Individual Teachers
Other Curriculum Based Measurement** (see below)	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/PLCs

\*Students receiving pull-out tutoring during the school day or Extended Learning Program (ELP) after school will receive instruction on the specific skills they have not mastered in the core curriculum. As students work on these specific skills, they will be assessed during tutoring and ELP to ensure mastery of skills. In order to make this process effective, a communication system between classroom teacher and the tutor/ELP teacher will be developed by the PSLT and monitored for effectiveness throughout the school year. As student's progress through Supplementary Support and Intensive Instruction, the number/type of supplemental services, time spent in the supplemental services and frequency of assessment will increase in duration.

\*\* In addition to Core assessments, progress monitoring the outcomes of intensive interventions requires additional Curriculum Based Measures (CBM) that:

- assess the same skills over time
- have multiple equivalent forms
- are sensitive to small amounts of growth over time.

### Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released tests	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach/Math Coach/AP
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers

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

District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability <b>Biology EOC</b> <b>Geometry EOC</b> <b>Algebra EOC</b>	Scantron Achievement Series	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science <b>Biology Formative</b> <b>Algebra Formative</b> <b>Geometry Formative</b> <b>Writing Assessment</b>	Scantron Achievement Series <b>PLC Logs</b>	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers, Math Coach, Science Coach
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network	Reading Coach/ <b>Reading Resource Teacher/</b> Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. <b>-Core Subject Areas; English, Math, Science, Reading, Social Studies</b>	<b>Ed-Line</b> <b>PLC Database</b> <b>PLC logs</b>	Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/ <b>Leadership Team Member</b>

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

<b><i>Data Source</i></b>	<b><i>Database</i></b>	<b><i>Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring</i></b>
Extended Learning Program (ELP)* (see below) Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Algebra EOC</li> <li>● Geometry EOC</li> <li>● Biology EOC</li> <li>● United States History EOC</li> <li>● PSAT</li> </ul>	School Generated Database in Excel State Generated Score Reports PSAT Score Reporting Data	Leadership Team/ ELP Facilitator Testing Chair Department Chair (per curriculum) PSAT Coordinator
Differentiated mini assessments based on core curriculum assessments.	Individual teacher data base PLC/Department data base	Individual Teachers/PLCs
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/Reading Coach
Ongoing assessments within Intensive Courses (Middle/High)	Database provided by course materials (for courses that have one), School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/PLC/Individual Teachers



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

Other Curriculum Based Measurement	easyCBM* School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/PLCs/Individual Teachers
Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Liberal Arts Math (Algebra EOC)</li> <li>● Math for College Readiness (PERT)</li> </ul>	Assessments included in computer-based programs	PLCs/Individual Teachers Math Department Chair
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.</p> <p>Staff received overview training at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year, conducted through the assistance of the Area 8 RtI Facilitator. The PSLT will meet with the Area 8 MTSS facilitator to review our progress in implementation of MTSS and provide coaching and support to our PSLT/PLCs. Trainings will continue throughout the 2012-2013 school year. The PSLT will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The PSLT will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.</p> <p>As the District PSLT develops resources and staff development trainings on MTSS, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions will occur during faculty meetings. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and MTSS as they become available. All teachers will complete a state perceptions MTSS survey midyear and at the end of the year to determine their development skills and knowledge related to MTSS. Team members will be report back with departmental resource maps and collaborate in formation of Best Practices within the individual learning communities; leadership members will train and advise to proper practices (fidelity and documentation) of teachers within their department. Additional recommendations will be considered/referred to administration on an ‘as needed’ basis. Our School will invite the RtI Facilitator to visit quarterly (or as needed) to review our implementation plan and provide immediate training/feedback to support our team.</p> <p>*Training will be provided at the district level for easyCBM application at secondary level</p>		
<p>Describe plan to support MTSS.</p> <p>MTSS team will seek involvement and ‘buy in’ from all stakeholders and school personnel. This will involve expanding the leadership team, as appropriate, to include any personnel that may address a critical need or area of support. As staff members change, training and advisement will take place (primarily through the leadership team) to allow for continuity amongst services. Data will continue to be analyzed to allow for modifications in intervention strategies. Training and resources in the RtI process, including using proper forms and documentation, will be disseminated to the staff. Additional feedback and opportunities to contribute will be encouraged by staff members.</p>		

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

### Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

#### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team serves as the school's literacy Professional Learning Community. The team is comprised of:

- Principal
- Assistant Principal for Curriculum
- Reading Coach
- Reading Teachers
- 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
- Language Arts Subject Area Leaders

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 reading coach is a member of the team and provides extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions. The reading coach and principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instruction support is provided to all teachers.

The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the Problem Solving Leadership team's support plan. Additionally the principal ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students.

**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
- Implementation of close reading lessons.

### *NCLB Public School Choice*

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

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

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

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

N/A

### **\*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.

Lennard will provide professional development during preplanning and quarterly throughout the school year. Topics will include text complexity, text dependent questioning, close reading, and AVID critical reading strategies. Reading coaches will work closely with content area teachers to ensure implementation of the above professional development and will model close readings in the classrooms. Reading coaches will facilitate two content PLCs and facilitate coaching cycles with individual teachers on an ongoing basis throughout the school year. Project CRISS follow-up training is offered annually by the reading coach. Mandatory follow-up is provided at the school site by the reading coach. Complementing the Project CRISS initiative is the inclusion of close reading lessons in the ELA, reading, and content area classrooms.

### **\*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?

Students currently have a multitude of course offerings to choose from such as Child Development, Food Preparation, Practical Arts, Forensic Science, and Nursing. Many of these courses focus on job skills and teach skills necessary for a successful future. The College Board Springboard program used in the mathematics courses are using integrates applies the mathematics concepts from the curriculum to real world application problems. Students participate in at least one of these activities per quarter depending upon the course in which they are enrolled. The activities last from 3 to 5 days and over the course of the activity student's work in collaborative situations to solve problems.

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?

Students meet with counselors on an annual basis to discuss (and when needed upon student request) and fill out their Course Selection sheets. During this meeting the student and the counselor discuss future plans and then decide on a course of action which will best fulfill that plan. Future meetings between student and counselor focus on the advancement of the plan and the next steps to be taken. Where needed, a phone conference or one-one-conference is conducting with the student and the parents to discuss course placement and future plans. We currently have an elective fair that exposes students to the curriculum of elective courses in all core content as well as in business, practical arts and nursing electives. Additionally, counselors go class to class to

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

review curriculum selections. On an annual basis, Lennard High School will review new course offerings at the state and district level to continue to offer rigorous and relevant coursework and to meet the State Standards.

### 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](#).

Currently, we are taking on many initiatives to improve student readiness for public postsecondary education. Our guidance counselors are equipped with programs of study to help guide students to their educational pathway. The program of study for high school students maps out the courses and timeline for students to be program completers and successfully transition to post secondary institutions. Focus Calendars for Math and English 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade classes' focus on SAT/ACT skills and readiness. We also offer SAT/ACT tutoring once a week, held by Math and English teachers. Counselors meet with all students to encourage students to participate in the free SAT/ACT tutoring and take the tests. Using of ELP funds, "College Night" is also offered to students on a monthly basis to begin the process of transitioning into postsecondary education. Juniors who are identified also take the PERT.

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Reading Goals**

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

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

<p><b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).</b></p>	<p>1.1. -Not all teachers of the same course give the same common assessment at the end of the instructional cycle. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. -Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with low performing and high performing students).</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specifically, teachers use C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) with core curriculum and provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills. <u>Action Steps</u> Reading teachers to report FCIM data monthly to reading coaches and share at PLCs to drive future instruction. Target grade 9 and 10 Level 2 students in reading and content classrooms. Reading and content teachers (grade 9 and 10) to work with reading coaches to implement the 3 step process of evaluating text, generating text</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Subject Area Leaders/ Department Heads -Peer and Mentor Evaluators <u>How</u> -PLC Logs turned into administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET Formal Evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer /Mentor) -EET Informal Observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School Based Informal walk-through forms which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart course progress using class averages towards the SMART goal. <u>PLC Level</u> -Reading Coaches and reading teacher will facilitate student-centered PLC's to gather and analyze additional data (student work) to drive instruction and monitor student progress (monthly). Reading coaches will attend content PLC's to assist implementation of reading strategies school-wide (monthly). PLCs will ask the following questions: <i>1. How are we using data to inform our instruction?</i> <i>2. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?</i> <i>3. To what degree are we making progress towards our SMART goal?</i> <i>4. Are there skills that need to be re-taught as mini-lessons to the entire class?</i> <i>5. Are there skills that need to be re-taught as mini-lessons to the entire class?</i> <i>6. Are there skills that need to be re-taught to targeted students?</i></p>	<p>1.1. <u>Weekly-</u> Formative <u>Semester-</u> Summative Reading FCIM Instruction Daily Reading FCIM Mini-Assessments Weekly</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

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

		based questions, and modeling/teaching close reading.		<p><i>7. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?</i></p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u>          -PLC facilitator/Subject Area Leader/Department Heads shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.          -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.          -Content Area teachers implement one CIS model per semester.</p>			
<p><u>Reading Goal #1:</u>          In grades 9&amp;10, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 37% to 39%</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<b>37%</b>	<b>39%</b>					

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

		1.2.	1.2. Strategy  Reading Coaches will assist in the implementation of differentiated instruction in grade 10 classrooms (across content) by instructing small groups (FCAT Level 2 students) based on data/needs. (January 2013- Spring testing).	1.2. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Instructional Coaches -Subject Area Leaders/ Department Heads -Peer and Mentor Evaluators  <u>How</u> -PLC Logs turned into administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Administration walk-throughs where students are asked to explain what they are learning. -EET Formal Evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET Informal Observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School Based Informal walk-through forms which includes the school's SIP strategies.	1.2. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart course progress using class averages towards the SMART goal.  <u>PLC Level</u> -PLCs calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students across the PLC per class/course. -PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to identify effective communication with student strategies for future lessons.  <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -Leadership Team determines what specific data will be reported to the Leadership Team. -Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress. -PLC facilitator/Subject Area Leader/Department Heads share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -PSLT uses data to evaluate effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for	1.2. <u>3x per year</u> -FAIR	
--	--	------	--	---	---	-------------------------------------	--



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

					targeted students and future professional development for teachers.		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

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

		<p>1.3. -Not all teachers plan for higher order questions prior to teaching the lesson. -Not all teachers know how to ask higher order/open-ended questions during instruction. -Not all teachers are able to attend HOTS training. -Not all teachers involve students in leading discussions.</p>	<p>1.3. <u>Strategy</u> Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increase through participation in <b>Costa's higher order questioning skills</b> to promote critical thinking and problem-solving skills. This strategy will be implemented across all content areas. For this strategy, teachers implement a variety or series of questions/ prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote meta-cognition. <b>(EET Rubric 1e, 3b)</b></p>	<p>1.3 <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Instructional Coaches -Subject Area Leaders/ Department Heads -Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p><u>How</u> -PLC Logs turned into administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET Formal Evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET Informal Observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School Based Informal walk-through forms which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p>1.3. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart course progress using class averages towards the SMART goal.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u> -PLCs calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students across the PLC per class/course. -PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to identify effective communication with student strategies for future lessons.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> -Leadership Team determines what specific data will be reported to the Leadership Team. -Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress. -PLC facilitator/Subject Area Leader/Department Heads share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -PSLT uses data to evaluate effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for</p>	<p>1.3. <u>3x per year</u> -FAIR</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--

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

					targeted students and future professional development for teachers.		
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> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		
<b>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.</b>	2.1.	2.1. See Goals 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #2:</u> In grades 9 and 10, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 16% to 18 %.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>16%</b>	<b>18%</b>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		

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

<p><b>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>3.1.</p>	<p>3.1. See Goals 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3</p>	<p>3.1.</p>	<p>3.1.</p>	<p>3.1.</p>		
<p><b>Reading Goal #3:</b>  In grades 9 and 10, the points earned from ALL Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 61 to 62.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>61 points</b></p>	<p><b>62 points</b></p>					
		<p>3.2.</p>	<p>3.2.</p>	<p>3.2.</p>	<p>3.2.</p>	<p>3.2.</p>	
		<p>3.3.</p>	<p>3.3.</p>	<p>3.3.</p>	<p>3.3.</p>	<p>3.3.</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p><b>Anticipated Barrier</b></p>	<p><b>Strategy</b></p>	<p><b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p><b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p><b>Student Evaluation Tool</b></p>		

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

<p><b>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>4.1.</p>	<p>4.1. See Goals 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3  Reading Coaches will assist in the implementation of differentiated instruction in grade 9 and 10 classrooms (across content) by instructing small groups (FCAT Level 1 students) based on data/needs. (January 2013- Spring Testing).</p>	<p>4.1.</p>	<p>4.1.</p>	<p>4.1.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #4:</u>  In grades 9 and 10, the points earned from ALL Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 71 to 72.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>71 points</b></p>	<p><b>72 points</b></p>					
		<p>4.2.</p>	<p>4.2.</p>	<p>4.2.</p>	<p>4.2.</p>	<p>4.2.</p>	
		<p>4.3</p>	<p>4.3.</p>	<p>4.3.</p>	<p>4.3.</p>	<p>4.3.</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p>	<p><b>Anticipated Barrier</b></p>	<p><b>Strategy</b></p>	<p><b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p><b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p><b>Student Evaluation Tool</b></p>		

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

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<b>5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>							
<u>Reading Goal #5:</u>							
<b>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5A.1.	5A.1. See Goals 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> The percentage of white students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 59% to 61%.  The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 26% to 36%.  The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 30% to 38%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	White:59% Black:26% Hispanic: 30% Asian:N/A American Indian:N/A	White:61% Black:36% Hispanic: 38% Asian:N/A American Indian:N/A					
		5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		
<b>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5B.1.	5B.1. See Goals 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 34% to 36%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>34%</b>	<b>36%</b>					

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

		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> 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. See Goals 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
<b>Reading Goal #5C:</b>  The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 6% to 15%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>6%</b>	<b>15%</b>					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	



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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		
---	----------------------------	-----------------	--	---	--------------------------------	--	--

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

<p><b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>1.1. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. -Teachers at varying levels of implementation of curriculum.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specifically, teachers provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills. <u>Action Steps</u> Action Steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC Action plans.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -ESE Specialist -ESE Teachers -Peer and Mentor Evaluators <u>How</u> -PLC Logs turned into administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET Formal Evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer /Mentor) -EET Informal Observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School Based Informal walk-through forms which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart course progress using student averages towards the SMART goal. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses for FAA students. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART goal. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions: <i>1. How are we using data to inform our instruction?</i> <i>2. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?</i> <i>3. To what degree are we making progress towards our SMART goal?</i> <i>4. Are there skills that need to be re-taught to targeted students?</i> <i>5. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?</i> <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/Subject Area Leader/Department Heads shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>3x per year</u> - FAIR <u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)</p>		
---	---	--	---	--	---	--	--

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

				-Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.			
<b>Reading Goal #5D:</b> The percentage of SWD students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 25% to 27%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>25%</b>	<b>27%</b>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

**Reading Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
DI/CIS Model	Grades 9-12	-Reading Coach -Subject Area Leaders and/or course-specific Facilitators	-All teachers school-wide -PLCs	- Early Release: October - December 2010 -PLCs: Ongoing	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation	PLC Facilitator APC Department Head

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

<p>CRISS Follow Ups (HOTS)</p>	<p>Grades 9-12</p>	<p>-Demonstration Classrooms (by AVID, Reading Coach and other targeted teachers)                      -AVID Library                      AVIDonline.org                      SDHC AVID World                      -Subject Area Leaders and/or course-specific Facilitators</p>	<p>-All teachers school-wide                      -PLCs</p>	<p>-PLCs: Ongoing</p>	<p>Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor Common Core implementation (CIS Model or close reading model)</p>	<p>PLC Facilitator                      APC                      Department Head</p>
<p>AVID Critical Reading</p>	<p>Grades 9-12</p>	<p>-Reading Coach                      -Subject Area Leaders and/or course-specific Facilitators</p>	<p>-All teachers school-wide                      -PLCs</p>	<p>- Early Release: October - December 2010                      -PLCs: Ongoing</p>	<p>Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation</p>	<p>PLC Facilitator                      APC                      Department Head</p>

*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)).

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

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

<p><b>Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).</b></p>	<p>I.1. -Teachers at varying levels with the FCIM Model. -Teachers' implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across math classes. -Lack of common planning time to develop/identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring. -Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. -Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide.</p>	<p>I.1. Tier 1- The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the FCIM strategy on identified tested benchmarks.</p>	<p>I.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Teachers -Math Resource/DH <u>How</u> -PLC Logs turned into administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk through to observe this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -A fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timelines/logs of targeted skills reviewed by the administration and/or Math Coaches.</p>	<p>I.1. -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in a course specific PLC data base (excel spreadsheet). -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on each mini-assessment. -PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitator will share data with the coaches.</p>	<p>I.1. <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid Year Testing -Form A -Form B -Form C <u>Semester Exams</u> <u>During the Nine Weeks</u> -Benchmark mini assessments -Unit and/or chapter assessments</p>		
--	--	---	---	---	---	--	--

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

<p><u>Algebra Goal #1:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 Algebra EOC will increase from 22% to 28%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>22%</b></p>	<p><b>28%</b></p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2. Tier 1- The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through participation in Costas Level Questioning (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>1.2. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Teachers -Math Resource/DH <u>How</u> -Use the forms to compute percentage of higher level vs. lower level and monitor improvement /growth. -HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET Tool)</p>	<p>1.2. PLCs examine student data from the Costas questioning experiences.  With teachers, administration reviews College Board Rigor walk-through form.</p>	<p>1.2. <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid Year Testing -Form A -Form B -Form C <u>Semester Exams</u>  <u>During the Nine Weeks</u> EET Pop In forms</p>	

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

		1.3.	1.3. Tier 1- The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through the use of technology and hands-on activities to implement the Common Core State Standards.	1.3. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Teachers -Math Resource/DH <u>How</u> -PLC Logs turned into administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk through to observe this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET Formal Evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET Informal Observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School Based Informal walk-through forms which includes the school's SIP strategies.	1.3. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.  PLC facilitator will share data with the PSLT. The PSLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per grading period.	1.3. <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid Year Testing -Form A -Form B -Form C  <u>Semester Exams</u>  <u>During the Nine Weeks</u> -Benchmark mini assessments -Chapter Tests	
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> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		
<b>Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.</b>	2.1.	2.1. See Goals 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		



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

<u>Algebra Goal #2:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 Algebra EOC will increase from 2% to 8%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>2%</b>	<b>8%</b>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

**High School AMO Mathematics Goals**

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<b>A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>						
<u>HS Mathematics Goal A:</u>							

**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 subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1. See Goals 1 & 2	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<p><u>HS Mathematics Goal B:</u></p> <p>The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 EOCs/FAA will increase from 52% to 53%.</p> <p>The percentage of Black students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 EOCs/FAA will increase from 31% to 43%.</p> <p>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 EOCs/FAA will increase from 32% to 43%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p> <p>White:52% Black:31% Hispanic:32% Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p> <p>White:53% Black:43% Hispanic:43% Asian: American Indian:</p>					

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

		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
<u>HS Mathematics Goal C:</u> The percentage of ELL students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 EOCs/FAA will increase from 30% to 31%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	30%	31%					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
<u>HS Mathematics Goal D:</u> The percentage of SWD students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 EOCs/FAA will increase from 37% to 38%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	37%	38%					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<b>E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
<b>HS Mathematics Goal E:</b> The percentage of ED students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 EOCs/FAA will increase from 34% to 45%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	34%	45%					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

*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							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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
Analyzing first semester exams	Grades 9 & 10	Math SAL APC	Math Teachers - PLCs	After the administration of the test	PLC logs	APC

*End of Mathematics Goals*

**Writing/Language Arts Goals**

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

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

<p><b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.</b></p>	<p>I.1. -Teachers lack skill and understanding regarding the FCAT Writing Assessment and Scoring Rubric. -Teachers new to Language Arts may not have FCAT Writing training. -Teachers do not have confidence using holistic scoring methods. -Teachers lack sufficient time to score student papers. -Teachers lack PLC instructional common planning time in order to meet in PLCs to discuss common deficiencies in writing.</p>	<p>I.1. Tier 1- The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum students writing. Skills will improve through the teachers' use of daily FCIM lessons focused on writers craft as well as one-one-one conferencing to support differentiated instruction. Best practices include PLC instructional calendars, differentiated instruction, and effective holistic scoring methods.</p>	<p>I.1. <u>Who</u> Principal APC DH/LA PLCs Writing Coach  <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned in to administration. Admin provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing FCIM Mini Lessons. -Evidence of student writing portfolios seen during admin walk-throughs. -HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form -SpringBoard Walk-Through Observation Form.</p>	<p>I.1. PLCs will identify trends (deficiencies and growth) in student writing performance and collaborate to modify the instructional calendar to provide differentiated instruction as appropriate.  PLCs- Review writing workshop data to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric. PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching 4.0, or above, on each benchmark writing prompt and submit to DH.  PLCs will participate in rubric Norming sessions to identify teacher barriers impeding effective holistic scoring. DH will collect writing assignments and decide amongst grade-level PLCs to check teacher effectiveness at holistic scoring.</p>	<p>I.1. <u>2-3x per year</u> Student monthly demand writes, student daily drafts, conferencing notes.</p>		
<p><u>Writing/LA Goal #1:</u>  The percentage of students scoring a Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 82% to 88%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>82%</b></p>	<p><b>88%</b></p>					



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

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Writing/Language Arts Professional Development**

<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
Holistic Scoring Training	9-10	District Trainers LA SAL/PLC Facilitators	Language Arts Teachers LA PLCs	Through Spring 2013	PLC logs turned into administration.	Principal APC Writing Coach/DH PLC Facilitators

*End of Writing Goals*

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

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

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

<p><b>1. Attendance</b></p>	<p>1.1. -Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance. -Lack of time to focus on attendance -Lack of staff to focus on attendance</p>	<p>1.1. The Administration Team along with other appropriate staff will meet every 20 days to review the school's Attendance Plan to 1) ensure that all steps are being implemented with fidelity and 2) discuss targeted students. A data base will be maintained for students with excessive unexcused absences and tardies. This data base will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of attendance interventions and to identify students in need of support beyond school wide attendance initiatives.</p>	<p>1.1. AP will run Attendance/Tardy meetings every 20 days with appropriate reports  AP will maintain data base  Social Worker</p>	<p>1.1. Administration Team and subset of PSLT will examine data monthly</p>	<p>1.1. Attendance Report Tardy Report Attendance Plan</p>		
-----------------------------	--	---	---	--	--	--	--

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

<p><b>Attendance Goal #1:</b></p> <p>The attendance rate will increase from 91% in 2011-2012 to 93% in 2012-2013.</p> <p>The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.</p> <p>The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>91%</b></p>	<p><b>93%</b></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>					
	<p><b>864</b></p>	<p><b>778</b></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p>					
	<p><b>386</b></p>	<p><b>347</b></p>					

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

		1.2. There is not a system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance.	1.2. <b>Tier 2</b> - 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 attendance improves (no absences in a 20 day period) a positive letter is sent home to the parent regarding the increase in their child's attendance.	1.2. Social Worker Guidance Counselor PSLT	1.2. PSLT will disaggregate attendance data for the "Tier 2" group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children	1.2. Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data	
		1.3. Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance.	1.3. <b>Tier 3</b> – 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.	1.3. Social Worker Other PSLT members as needed School Security - SRO	1.3. Social Worker/PSLT review data monthly on Tier 3 students (provided by social worker)	1.3. Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data	

<p><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.</p>							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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
Attendance Plan	Administrators	AP	At Administrator staff meting	August/September	Review plan and student data every 20 days	AP
EdLine	9-12	AP	As needed	On-going	Random check of EdLine postings	AP

### *End of Attendance Goals*

#### Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool		
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?			
<b>1. Suspension</b>	1.1. -Lack of parental involvement -Repeat offenders -Students may have personal/family issues.	1.1. - Contact parents early through teachers, SSW, administration. -Create parent link phone calls, newsletters, PTSA. -Offer different forms of discipline to repeat offenders as well as positive reinforcement. -Offer guidance assistance for any problems students may face before a problem exists.	1.1. -Principal -Administration -Guidance -Department Heads -Teachers	1.1. PSLT will analyze data collected by all.	1.1 EASI data and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data		

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

<p><u>Suspension Goal #1:</u> The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>					
	<p><b>1638</b></p>	<p><b>1474</b></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u></p>					
	<p><b>603</b></p>	<p><b>543</b></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u></p>					
	<p><b>652</b></p>	<p><b>587</b></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u></p>					
	<p><b>345</b></p>	<p><b>310</b></p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	

**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
Discipline Review	Administrators	AP	Admin Staff Meeting	Weekly	Review discipline plan every 30 days	AP

*End of Suspension Goals*

**Dropout Prevention Goal(s)**

<b>Dropout Prevention Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention</b>						



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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Dropout Prevention</b> <u>Dropout Prevention</u> Goal #1:	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Dropout Prevention Professional Development**

<p><b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b></p> <p>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</p>							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

*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:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		

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

<b>1. Health and Fitness Goal</b>	1.1.	1.1. High School students will engage in a minimum of two semesters of physical education in grades 9-12.	1.1. Principal Guidance Counselors APC	1.1. Checking of students schedules- Master Schedule	1.1.		
<b>Health and Fitness Goal #1:</b>  During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 64% last year to 70% on the post test.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
	<b>64%</b>	<b>70%</b>					
		1.2.	1.2. Health and fitness activity initiatives developed and implemented by the schools H.E.A.R.T team.	1.2. HEART Team	1.2. HEART Team notes/ Agendas	1.2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	
		1.3.	1.3. Five physical education classes per week for a minimum of two semesters in grades 9-12 with a certified physical education teacher.	1.3. Physical Education Teacher	1.3. Classroom walk-throughs of PE classes by principal.	1.3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	

### Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with</b>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

<b>Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC	PE	Wilt	All PE Teachers	Every Monday	PLC Logs	APC

**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>						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		

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

<p><b>1. Continuous Improvement Goal</b></p>	<p>1.1. -Not all staff is trained in creating Costas level of question</p>	<p>1.1. PLCs will meet on all early release days for additional time.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u> Administration  <u>How</u> -Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback.</p>	<p>1.1. PSLT will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process.</p>	<p>1.1. PLC facilitators will provide feedback to PSLT team on progress of their PLC.</p>		
<p><u>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</u>  The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that “The teachers that I work with deliver lessons that consistently include higher order thinking skills.” Will increase from 57% to 67% in 2013.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level :*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level :*</u></p>					
	<p><b>57%</b> <b>(50)</b></p>	<p><b>67%</b> <b>(58)</b></p>					
		<p>1.2. -PLC facilitators are not all trained to lead PLCs. -Difficulty keeping the transition for keeping meetings curriculum and student focused.</p>	<p>1.2. Key staff will provide training on PLCs to the PSLT. PSLT Members will implement skills learned within the grade-level PLC.</p>	<p>1.2. <u>Who</u> Administration  <u>How</u> -Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback.</p>	<p>1.2. PSLT will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process.</p>	<p>1.2. PLC facilitators will provide feedback to PSLT team on progress of their PLC.</p>	

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

		1.3. -PLCs do not always have a clear focus. -PLCs not sure what they should be doing in meetings.	1.3. PLC logs will be created that include the SIPs goals. PLCs will use the Action Steps of the Goals as a guide for the PLC discussion and PLC work.	1.3. <u>Who</u> Administration  <u>How</u> -Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback.	1.3. PSLT will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process.	1.3. PLC facilitators will provide feedback to PSLT team on progress of their PLC.	
--	--	--	---	---	---	---	--

**Continuous Improvement 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
PLC	All		PLC	Every Monday	PLC Logs	APC

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

**NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals**

<p><b>A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).</b></p>	<p>1.1. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. -Teachers at varying levels of implementation of curriculum.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specifically, teachers provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills.  <u>Action Steps</u> Action Steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC Action plans.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -ESE Specialist -ESE Teachers -Peer and Mentor Evaluators  <u>How</u> -PLC Logs turned into administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET Formal Evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer /Mentor) -EET Informal Observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School Based Informal walk-through forms which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart course progress using student averages towards the SMART goal.  <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses for FAA students. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART goal. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions: <i>1. How are we using data to inform our instruction?</i> <i>2. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?</i> <i>3. To what degree are we making progress towards</i></p>	<p>1.1. Brigance, FAA Practice Materials</p>		
---	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

				<p><i>our SMART goal?</i>  <i>4. Are there skills that need to be re-taught to targeted students?</i>  <i>5. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?</i></p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u>                      -PLC facilitator/Subject Area Leader/Department Heads shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.                      -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.</p>			
<p><u>Reading Goal A:</u>                      The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<b>80%</b>	<b>81%</b>					
		A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	
		A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	



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

<p><b>B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>1.1. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. -Teachers at varying levels of implementation of curriculum.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specifically, teachers provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills.  <u>Action Steps</u> Action Steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC Action plans.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -ESE Specialist -ESE Teachers -Peer and Mentor Evaluators  <u>How</u> -PLC Logs turned into administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET Formal Evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer /Mentor) -EET Informal Observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School Based Informal walk-through forms which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart course progress using student averages towards the SMART goal.  <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses for FAA students. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART goal. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions: <i>1. How are we using data to inform our instruction?</i> <i>2. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?</i> <i>3. To what degree are we making progress towards our SMART goal?</i> <i>4. Are there skills that need to be re-taught to targeted students?</i> <i>5. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?</i></p>	<p>1.1. Brigance, FAA Practice Materials</p>	
---	---	---	--	--	--	--

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

				<u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/Subject Area Leader/Department Heads shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.			
<u>Reading Goal B:</u>  The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>4%</b>	<b>5%</b>					
		B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	
		B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	

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

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

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

<p><b>C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.</b></p>	<p>1.1. Teachers not implementing accommodations.</p>	<p>1.1. CALLA, Flexible settings, Bilingual dictionaries, Accommodations, Separate ELL versions of assessments, Vocabulary cards</p>	<p>1.1. - Principal -APC -Reading Coach -Department Heads -Teachers -ESOL Specialists -Paraprofessionals -Leadership Team</p>	<p>1.1. Examine learning gains on CELLA, Listening/Speaking; Reading, Writing, Fair Improvements</p>	<p>1.1. FAIR, FCAT, CELLA, EOC</p>	
<p><u>CELLA Goal #C:</u> The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 52%-53%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u></p>					
	<p><b>52%</b></p>					
		<p>1.2. Lack of appropriate materials for ELL students.</p>	<p>1.2 Word Walls</p>	<p>1.2. PLC-ESOL, Walk-throughs</p>	<p>1.2. Teachers reflect on lessons</p>	<p>1.2. Grades</p>
		<p>1.3. Lack of alternative assessments</p>	<p>1.3 Use of Notes for Class Assignments</p>	<p>1.3. ESOL Strategies Checklist</p>	<p>1.3. Analyze Grades</p>	<p>1.3. Progress Reports</p>
<p>Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</p>	<p><b>Anticipated Barrier</b></p>	<p><b>Strategy</b></p>	<p><b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p><b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p><b>Student Evaluation Tool</b></p>	

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

<b>D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.</b>	2.1. Teacher's lack of implementation of At Risk strategies is not consistent across core courses.	2.1. Understanding BICS-Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills. CALP- Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency.	2.1. -Principal -APC -Reading Coach -Department Heads -Teachers -ESOL Specialists -Paraprofessionals -Leadership Team	2.1. Compare CALLA lessons from within departments.  Review data at PLCs, Pre-planning, faculty meetings.	2.1. Weekly, Biweekly, Unit, Chapter assessments.	
<b>CELLA Goal #D:</b>  The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 13%-15%.	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u>					
	<b>13%</b>					
		2.2. Core Assessments at ELL Levels	2.2. Analyze CELLA Data	2.2. Use ESOL Strategies checklist on Walk throughs	2.2. Analyze Test Data	2.2. Notes/Journals
		2.3 Lack of reading across core courses.	2.3 Implement the use of ELL Supplemental materials from ELL Specialist	2.3 Copies of lessons with ESOL Strategies and accommodations	2.3 Teachers reflect on At Rise, CALLA, and ESOL Strategies checklist. What worked? What didn't? Why?	2.3 Vocabulary Cards
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>	

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

<b>E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.</b>	1.1. Teachers not implementing accommodations.	1.1. CALLA, Flexible settings, Bilingual dictionaries, Accommodations, Separate ELL versions of assessments, Vocabulary cards	1.1. - Principal -APC -Reading Coach -Department Heads -Teachers -ESOL Specialists -Paraprofessionals -Leadership Team	1.1. Examine learning gains on CELLA, Listening/Speaking; Reading, Writing, Fair Improvements	1.1. FAIR, FCAT, CELLA, EOC	
<b>CELLA Goal #E:</b>  The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 30%-32%.	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</b>					
	<b>30%</b>					
		2.2.	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 Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).</b></p>	<p>1.1. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. -Teachers at varying levels of implementation of curriculum.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specifically, teachers provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills. <u>Action Steps</u> Action Steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC Action plans.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -ESE Specialist -ESE Teachers -Peer and Mentor Evaluators <u>How</u> -PLC Logs turned into administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET Formal Evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer /Mentor) -EET Informal Observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School Based Informal walk-through forms which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart course progress using student averages towards the SMART goal. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses for FAA students. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART goal. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions: <i>1. How are we using data to inform our instruction?</i> <i>2. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?</i> <i>3. To what degree are we making progress towards our SMART goal?</i> <i>4. Are there skills that need to be re-taught to targeted students?</i> <i>5. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?</i> <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/Subject Area Leader/Department Heads shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.1. Brigance, FAA Practice Materials</p>	
---	---	--	---	--	--	--

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

Mathematics Goal F:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.							
	<b>80%</b>	<b>81%</b>					
		F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	
		F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	

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

<p><b>G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>1.1. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. -Teachers at varying levels of implementation of curriculum.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specifically, teachers provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills. <u>Action Steps</u> Action Steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC Action plans.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -ESE Specialist -ESE Teachers -Peer and Mentor Evaluators <u>How</u> -PLC Logs turned into administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET Formal Evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer /Mentor) -EET Informal Observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School Based Informal walk-through forms which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart course progress using student averages towards the SMART goal. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses for FAA students. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART goal. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions: <i>1. How are we using data to inform our instruction?</i> <i>2. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?</i> <i>3. To what degree are we making progress towards our SMART goal?</i> <i>4. Are there skills that need to be re-taught to targeted students?</i> <i>5. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?</i> <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/Subject Area Leader/Department Heads shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.1.</p>		
---	---	--	---	--	-------------	--	--



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

<b>Mathematics Goal</b> <b>G:</b> The percentage of students making learning gains on 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
	<b>6%</b>	<b>7%</b>					
		G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	
		G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	

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

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

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

<p><b>H. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry.</b></p>	<p>1.1. Teachers at varying levels with the FCIM Model. -Teachers' implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across math classes. -Lack of common planning time to develop/identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring. -Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. -Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide.</p>	<p>1.1. Tier 1- The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the FCIM strategy on identified tested benchmarks.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Teachers -Math Resource/DH <u>How</u> -PLC Logs turned into administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk through to observe this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -A fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timelines/logs of targeted skills reviewed by the administration and/or Math Coach.</p>	<p>1.1. -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in a course specific PLC data base (excel spreadsheet). -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on each mini-assessment. -PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitator will share data with the coaches. The coaches will review data that includes all skills covered during the nine week period.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>3x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid Year Testing -Form A -Form B -Form C <u>Semester Exams</u> <u>During the Nine Weeks</u> -Benchmark mini assessments -Unit and/or chapter assessments -</p>		
--	---	---	---	--	---	--	--

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

<p><b>Geometry Goal H:</b></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring in the middle or upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Geometry Exam will increase from 64% to 66%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>64%</b></p>	<p><b>66%</b></p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p><b>Anticipated Barrier</b></p>	<p><b>Strategy</b></p>	<p><b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p><b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p><b>Student Evaluation Tool</b></p>		
<p><b>I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.</b></p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1. See Goals 1 &amp; 2</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>		
<p><b>Geometry Goal I:</b></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring in the upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Geometry Exam will increase from 20% to 22%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	<b>20%</b>	<b>22%</b>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

**NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal**

<b>Elementary, Middle and High Science 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> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		

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

<p><b>J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).</b></p>	<p>1.1. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. -Teachers at varying levels of implementation of curriculum.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specifically, teachers provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills.  <u>Action Steps</u> Action Steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC Action plans.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -ESE Specialist -ESE Teachers -Peer and Mentor Evaluators  <u>How</u> -PLC Logs turned into administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET Formal Evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer /Mentor) -EET Informal Observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School Based Informal walk-through forms which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart course progress using student averages towards the SMART goal.  <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/ courses for FAA students. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART goal. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions: <i>1. How are we using data to inform our instruction?</i> <i>2. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?</i> <i>3. To what degree are we making progress towards our SMART goal?</i> <i>4. Are there skills that need to be re-taught to targeted students?</i> <i>5. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?</i>  <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/Subject Area Leader/Department Heads shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.1. FAA Practice</p>		
--	---	---	--	---	------------------------------	--	--

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

<b>Science Goal J:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.							
	<i>Not enough students</i>						
		J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	
		J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	

**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)).

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

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

<p><b>K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology.</b></p>	<p>1.1 Teachers are not properly informed of the Science skill deficiency of individual students.</p>	<p>1.1 Students' Science skills will improve through implementation of                      - the 5E lesson plan model                      -reading strategies to enhance literacy                      - student generated "Word-Walls"                       Teachers will give a common district mini-assessment per unit and analyze results through the PLC to identify strategies that were most effective in producing greatest achievement.</p>	<p>1.1 Who: APC, Science teachers                      -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans observed through walk-throughs.</p>	<p>1.1 Science PLC's will review unit assessments and analyze the number of students reaching 80% mastery on units of instruction or showing adequate progress.</p>	<p>1.1 District level Mini assessments per unit of instruction.</p>		
<p><b>Biology Goal K:</b>                       The percentage of students scoring in the middle and upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Biology Exam will increase from 49% to 51%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>49%</b></p>	<p><b>51%</b></p>					

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

		1.2 Science Teachers are not supported through the provision of a Science Coach to provide directed individualized remediation of Common Core Standards.	1.2 Students will be remediated through the use of the new District "Adaptive Curriculum" lessons in ELP and in class small group.	1.2 Who: APC, Science teachers -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans observed through walk- throughs.	1.2 Science PLC's will review unit assessments and analyze the number of students reaching 80% mastery on units of instruction.	District level Mini assessments per unit of instruction.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> 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.	2.1. See Science Goals 1 & 2	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<b>Biology Goal L:</b>  The percentage of students scoring in the upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Biology Exam will increase from 17% to 19%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					



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

	<b>17%</b>	<b>19%</b>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

**NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal**

<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:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		

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

<p><b>M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).</b></p>	<p>1.1. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. -Teachers at varying levels of implementation of curriculum.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specifically, teachers provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u> Action Steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC Action plans.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -ESE Specialist -ESE Teachers -Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p><u>How</u> -PLC Logs turned into administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET Formal Evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET Informal Observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School Based Informal walk-through forms which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart course progress using student averages towards the SMART goal.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/ courses for FAA students. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART goal. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions: <i>1. How are we using data to inform our instruction?</i> <i>2. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?</i> <i>3. To what degree are we making progress towards our SMART goal?</i> <i>4. Are there skills that need to be re-taught to targeted students?</i> <i>5. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?</i></p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/Subject Area Leader/Department Heads shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.1. FAA Practice Materials</p>	
---	---	--	---	---	--	--

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

<u>Writing Goal M:</u>  The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>Not enough students</b>						
		M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	
		M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	

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

<b>STEM Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>

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

<p><u>STEM Goal #1:</u> Students will focus on problem solving through the integration of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics in units of instruction.</p>	<p>Teachers are not provided adequate technological equipment. Teachers have varying skill levels with the use of technology. Teachers are not provided lateral movement within the constraints of the county required curriculum to pursue STEM projects.</p>	<p>Teachers will attend district level training in technology. Teachers will encourage students to participate in STEM related projects within the district.</p>	<p>APC Science teachers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of PDS training in the use of technology.</li> <li>Implementation of STEM projects within the curriculum.</li> </ul>	<p>Science PLC's will review assessment data for positive trends of successful STEM activities in their curriculum.</p>	<p>District level mid-year test Semester exams</p>
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**STEM Professional Development**

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

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

PD content /Topic PLC Focus:	Grade level	PD Facilitator/ PLC Leader	Participants	Target dates/ Schedules	Strategy for follow up	Person Monitoring
Common Core Literacy training	9-12	Dan McFarland/ In-service training	All science teachers.	August – December	Implement Common Core Literacy strategies	APC Department Chair
Kagan Training	9-12	PDS	All Science teachers	August - May	Implement Kagan Strategies	APC Department Chair

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

<b>CTE Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>

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

<p><b>CTE Goal #1:</b></p> <p>To continue to support the Career and Technology Education District Mission and provide Dr. Earl Lennard High School (Career and Technology Education) students with readiness skills to further expand their opportunities for success in their pursuit of college and careers. The students will be afforded opportunities to improve in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Industry Certification</li> <li>○ College/Job Readiness Skills</li> <li>○ Florida Ready to Work</li> <li>○ Scholarship Opportunities</li> <li>○ CTSO's (CTE Student Organization)</li> <li>○ Florida Bright Futures</li> <li>○ Florida Gold Seal</li> <li>○ Program Curriculum</li> </ul>	<p>1.1. Barriers that may prevent goals from being met are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Attendance</li> <li>-Remediation/Testing during Elective class</li> <li>-Schedule Changes</li> <li>-ESOL/ELL</li> </ul>	<p>1.1. All CTE Programs will work toward goal success by teacher participation in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Professional Development</li> <li>-Program Knowledge</li> <li>-Curriculum Updates</li> <li>-State/District Changes and Initiatives</li> <li>-Rigor and Relevance</li> </ul>	<p>1.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Program Supervisors</li> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Peers/Mentors</li> <li>● Teacher Head</li> <li>● Department</li> <li>● Students</li> <li>● Parents</li> </ul>	<p>1.1. To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, teachers will need to use various assessments. This may be done through the use of the Student Evaluation Tools listed.</p>	<p>1.1. The various evaluation tools listed below will assist in recognizing the success of the strategy/goal(s).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pre-Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Exams</li> <li>○ Classroom Test</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Industry Certifications</li> <li>○ State/District Readiness</li> </ul>
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

### CTE Professional Development

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

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

Provide the CTE Education students with readiness skills for success in their college and careers	9-12	Michelle. Grinstead	Career and Technical Education Teachers	3 <sup>rd</sup> Monday of the month Early Release Days	Implementation will be monitored by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Walkthroughs</li> <li>● Pop-ins</li> <li>● EET Evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● School Administrators</li> <li>● Program Supervisor</li> <li>● Department Head</li> <li>● EET Evaluators</li> </ul>

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

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

### Differentiated Accountability

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

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

<b>School Differentiated Accountability Status</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input 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.
Flyers home to parents in newsletters and first day packets, Open House recruitment, Phone calls by SAC chair, Parent Links, Emails from SAC chair, and website.

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
AP Student Achievement- History	Texts for AP History Students to improve achievement	349.50	349.50
Higher EOC Math Scores	Supplies for higher EOC math Scores	135.96	135.96
Raising FCAT reading scores	Reading; Texts for raise FCAT reading scores	259.75	259.75
SAT Achievement	Gift Cards for SAT achievement incentive/Reading score increase incentive	300.00/200.00	500.00
Staff Development	Texts for Staff Training	288.30	288.30



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

Final Amount Spent	1533.51		
--------------------	---------	--	--