

Florida Department of Education



**DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1**

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Cimino Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Cindy Dowdy	Superintendent: Mary Ellan Elia
SAC Chair: Mary Pat Swindell	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

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](#)

Administrators

List your school’s 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)
----------	------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

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

Principal	Cindy Dowdy	BS Music Education, BA Music, Early Childhood Education, MS Educational Leadership	10	5	11/12: A; 74% Reading Proficiency; 64 pt. learning gains; 48 pt. lowest 25%; 73% Math Proficiency; 71 pts. learning gains; 60 pt. lowest 25% 10/11: A; Reading 91% Math 91% Read (low 25%) 72% AYP Math (low 25%) 81% AYP 09/10: A 08/09: A
Assistant Principal	Amber Norris	Elementary Education, Masters, Educational Leadership	8	0	NA

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

Instructional Coaches

List your school's 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 ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (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 Coach	Patricia Eckles	BA Primary Education, K-3	2	4	11/12: A; 74% Reading Proficiency; 64 pt. learning gains; 48 pt. lowest 25%; 73% Math Proficiency; 71 pts. learning gains; 60 pt. lowest 25% 10/11: A; Reading 91% Math 91% Read (low 25%) 72% AYP Math (low 25%) 81% AYP

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Teacher Interview Day	District Staff	June
2. School based teacher recognition system	Principal	Ongoing
3. Opportunities for teacher leadership	Principal	Ongoing
4. District Mentor program	District Mentors	Ongoing

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
6 out of field	<p><u>Administrators</u> Meet with the teacher four times a year to discuss progress on: Preparing and taking the certification exam Completing classes for certification Assistance provided in observing other teachers when necessary.</p> <p><u>PLC Leader</u> The teacher will attend PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and a PLC member can improve learning for all.</p>

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of Highly Qualified Teachers	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
74	3(4%)	11(15%)	38(51%)	22(29%)	25(33%)	73 (99%)	1(1%)	7(9%)	45(60%)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan 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
Mrs. Yordan ESE Specialist – School Based Mentor	Mrs. Felker	Mrs. Yordan has over 15 years of experience and is the ESE Specialist and PLC facilitator for ESE.	Observations and Coaching Cycles (both at school and another site); Planning Meetings, Meetings with Administrative Team, and weekly PLC's
Tammie Craddick	Mr. Thompson	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Tammie Craddock	Ms. Schwabe	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

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

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The Leadership Team includes;

Principal

Assistant Principal

Guidance Counselor

ESE Specialist

School Psychologist

Reading Coach

Representatives from each grade level K-5

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 MTSS/RtI Team meets weekly in order to discuss Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The MTSS/RtI Team supports the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.

Review ongoing progress monitoring data to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goals in curriculum, behavior and attendance.

Assist teachers in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers 2/3.

The RtI Team uses the Problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation) to:

- Identify the problem, based on data from multiple areas – curriculum, behavior, attendance.
- Identify why problem is occurring.
- Develop and target interventions to assist in correcting problem.
- Identify appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at regular intervals matched to the intensity of the level of instruction/intervention support provided.
- Review progress monitoring data on at regular intervals to determine when students need more or less support.

MTSS Implementation

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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.

- Monthly writing prompts
- Common Math Assessments
- Common Reading Assessments
- Reading, Math, and Science Formative Tests
- DRA's
- Easy CBM
- I Station Reports
- FBA's
- ABC Behavior Reports

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

- Area V Trainer, Betsy Lazega trained PSLT/RTI Team in the spring of 2012 on new forms
- Angell Callahan, school psychologist, trained RTI Team in August, 2012
- Area V Trainer, Betsy Lazega will train faculty in October, 2012
- Ongoing trainings at Faculty Leadership Meetings

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Response to Intervention (RtI) has also been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions. In order to support MTSS in our schools, we will:

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

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

The Leadership Team includes:

Principal: Cindy Dowdy

Assistant Principal: Amber Norris

Guidance Counselor: Deborah Minichbauer

Reading Coach: Patricia Eckles

Reading Contact: Sherri Platt

SAC Chair: Mary Pat Swindell

PLC Leaders: Sherill Farrell, Sheryl Yordan, Elizabeth Sanchez, Michelle Bird, Gwen Porter, Denice Devine-Martin

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

The LLT team meets monthly. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the all academic strategies on the SIP.

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

The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the MTSS/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 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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</p>	<p>1A.1. Teachers knowledge base of Common Core benchmarks is an area of need for professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in the 2012-2013 year for teachers of grades 2 – 5. More training is being offered for teachers of grades K -1. Parental knowledge base of Common Core benchmarks is an area of need.</p>	<p>1A.1. Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas Reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in grappling with complex text. Teachers need to understand how to select/identify complex text, shift the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and share complex texts with all students. Action Steps Grade Level PLC’s will write and focus on SMART goals. Hold Family</p>	<p>1.1. Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Reading Contact -PLC facilitators SI coordinator How -Reading PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after meetings -Administration rotates through PLCs looking for complex text discussion. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>1.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students’ progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitators and Team Leaders share SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1A.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

		Nights to educate the parents on the Common Core State Standards and the techniques to use to help improve the students reading and comprehension levels..					
Reading Goal #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 74 % to 75%							
	74%	75%					

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

		<p>1A.2.</p> <p>Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas</p> <p>Common Core Questions of all types and levels are necessary to scaffold students' understanding of complex text. Teachers need to understand and use higher-order, text-dependent questions (Webb's & Blooms). Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Scaffolding of students' grappling with complex text through well-crafted text-dependent question assists students in discovering and achieving deeper understanding of the author's meaning. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.</p> <p>Action Steps</p> <p>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>	<p>1A.2.</p> <p>Who</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Reading Contact -PLC facilitators SI coordinator <p>How</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares trends with staff via email or at staff meetings -PLC logs 	<p>1A.2.</p> <p>Teacher Level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. <p>PLC Level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. <p>Leadership Team Level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLC facilitators and Team Leaders share SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. 	<p>1A.2, <u>3X per year</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FAIR <p>During the Grading Period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

		1A.3.	<p>1A.3. 1.3. <u>Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas</u> Teachers will design and deliver close reading lessons as part of the Shared Reading Lesson. K – 1 teachers have been trained on this process and teachers in grades 2 – 5 will be trained during the school year. Specific close reading strategies include: 1) multiple readings of a passage 2) asking higher-order, text-dependent questions, 3) writing in response to reading and 4) engaging in text-based class discussion, and 5) pairing fiction and non-fiction passages. .</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>All teachers will be trained this year and begin implementing this strategy a minimum of 3x per quarter.</p>	<p>1A.3. <u>Who</u> - Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Reading Contact -PLC facilitators SI coordinator</p> <p><u>How</u> -Reading PLC Logs -Reading Coach modeled lessons, observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares trends with staff via email or at staff meetings</p>	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
<p><u>Reading Goal #1B:</u> N/A</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

	N/A	N/A					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1.	2A.1. See Goal # 1	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Reading Goal #2A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will maintain at 50%	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	50%	50%					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Reading Goal #2B: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	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

<p>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</p>	<p>3A.1. PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their learning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are using the Plan-Do-Check-Act “Instructional Unit” log.</p>	<p>3A.1. Strategy Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't 	<p>3A.1. Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Reading Contact -PLC facilitators -ESE Specialist SI coordinator How -PLCS turn their logs after meetings -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis. -Quarterly data chats -Review of pre- and post-tests from “Wordly Wise”</p>	<p>3A.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, and/or leadership team.</p>	<p>3A.1. 3x per year FAIR Reading Formatives During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>		
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

	<p>learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it?</p> <p>Actions/Details -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check-Act “Unit of Instruction” log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans. -4th and 5th grade teachers will implement “Wordly Wise” vocabulary program – a weekly</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

		program with vocabulary words, pre- and post-tests, and literature integration designed to increase vocabulary and improve reading comprehension.					
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u> Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 64 points to 66 points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>64 points</i>	<i>66 points</i>					

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

		<p>3A.2. Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies.</p>	<p>3A.2. Strategy/Task Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction.</p> <p>Actions/Details Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. In the classroom -During the lessons, students are involved in flexible grouping techniques PLCs After Instruction -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Teachers use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation.</p>	<p>3A.2. Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Reading Contact -PLC facilitators -ESE Specialist -SI coordinator How -Walkthrough, and formal/ informal observations by administration -Walkthroughs and observations by ESE specialist and reading coach -PLC logs</p>	<p>3A.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes 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 development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/ courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p>	<p>3A.2.. 3x per year FAIR Reading Formatives</p> <p>During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>	
<p>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</p>	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

Reading Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
NA							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	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

<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p>	<p>4A.1 . The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis. -Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP. -Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.</p>	<p>4A.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students' reading comprehension improves through receiving <u>ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills</u> that are not at the mastery level. <u>Action Steps</u> -Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered. -ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level. -Students attend ELP sessions. -Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on</p>	<p>4A.1 -Principal -Assistant Principal -ESE Specialist</p>	<p>4A.1. -Progress monitoring by classroom teachers as well as ELP teacher</p>	<p>4A.1.</p>		
---	---	---	--	---	--------------	--	--

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

		a biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher.					
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u> Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 48 points to 52 points	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>48 points</i>	<i>52 points</i>					
		4A.2.				4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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

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

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	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						
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		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1. See Reading Goals # 1, 3, and 4	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

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

Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<p>The percentage of white students scoring at a proficient level will increase from 76% in 2012 to 78% in 2013.</p> <p>The percentage of black students scoring at a proficient level will increase from 62% in 2012 to 66% in 2013.</p> <p>The percentage of hispanic students scoring at a proficient level will increase from 69% in 2012 to 72% in 2013.</p>							
	White:76% Black:62% Hispanic:69% Asian:NA American Indian:NA	White:78% Black:66% Hispanic:72% Asian:NA American Indian:NA					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C See Reading Goals # 1, 3, and 4	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u> The percentage of English Language Learners (ELL) scoring at a proficient level will increase from 32% in 2012 to 39% in 2013.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	32%	39%					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5D.1. See Reading Goals # 1, 3, and 4</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5D:</u> The percentage of Students with Disabilities (SWD) scoring at a proficient level will increase from 38% in 2012 to 44% in 2013.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>38%</p>	<p>44%</p>					
		<p>5D.2.</p>	<p>5D.2.</p>	<p>5D.2.</p>	<p>5D.2.</p>	<p>5D.2.</p>	
		<p>5D.3.</p>	<p>5D.3.</p>	<p>5D.3.</p>	<p>5D.3.</p>	<p>5D.3.</p>	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. See Reading Goals # 1, 3, and 4	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #5E:</u> The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring at a proficient level will increase from 54% in 2012 to 59% in 2013.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	54%	59%					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Daily 5 Reading Instruction for Grades K – 3	Reading	Patricia Eckles	Reading Teachers, Grades K – 3	September 24, 2012	Walkthroughs, Coaching Cycles	Reading Coach, Administrators
Easy CBM	Reading, Gr. K-5	Patricia Eckles Angell Callahan	All Teachers, Gr. K – 5	October 2, 2012	RTI, Data Chats	Reading Coach, Psychologist, Administrators
Independent Reading and Conferencing, K – 5	Reading	Patricia Eckles	Reading Teachers, K – 5	October 15, 2012	Walkthroughs, Coaching Cycles	Reading Coach, Administrators

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. See Reading Goals # 1, 3, and 4	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
CELLA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of CELLA will increase by 1%	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	43%					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1. See Reading Goals # 1, 3, and 4	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
CELLA Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase by 1%.	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u>					
	43%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1. See Writing Goal #1A	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
CELLA Goal #3: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase by 1%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	48%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</p>	<p>1.1 -Lack of infrastructure to support technology -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS</p>	<p>1.1 Strategy Students' math achievement improves through the use of <u>technology and hands-on activities</u> to implement the Common Core State Standards. In addition, student take on-line assessments (such as the district math formatives) in order to prepare students for on-line state testing. Action Steps -PLCs use their core curriculum information to learn more about hands-on and technology activities. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area</p>	<p>1A.1. 1.1 Who -Principal -AP -Technology Specialist SI coordinator How Monitored -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Administrators aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementations.</p>	<p>1 A.1. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.</p>	<p>1A.1. <u>2x per year</u> District Formative Testing During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.)</p>		
---	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

		PLC action plans.					
<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 73% to 74%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	73%	74%					

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

		<p>1.2. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. -Finding time to conduct Webb's Depth of Knowledge walk-throughs is sometimes challenging.</p>	<p>1.2 Strategy/Task Students math achievement improves through frequent participation in higher order questions/discussion activities to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality questions/prompts and discussion techniques promotes thinking by students, assisting them to arrive at new understandings of complex material. Actions/Details Within PLCs -Teachers work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively use higher order questions/activities. -Teachers plan higher order questions/activities for upcoming lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement. -Teachers plan for scaffolding questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students. -After the lessons, teachers examine student work samples and classroom questions using Webb's Depth of Knowledge to evaluate the sophistication/ complexity of students' thinking. -Use student data to identify successful higher order questioning techniques for future implementation.</p>	<p>1A.2. Who - Principal -AP How Monitored -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Administrator and coach aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation</p>	<p>1A.2. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.</p>	<p>1A.2. <u>2x per year</u> District Formative Testing <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.)</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--	--	--

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

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

		<p><i>In the classroom</i> <u>During the lessons, teachers:</u> -Ask questions and/or provides activities that require students to engage in frequent higher order thinking as defined by Webb’s Depth of Knowledge. -Wait for full attention from the class before asking questions. -Provide students with wait time. -Use probing questions to encourage students to elaborate and support assertions and claims drawn from the text/ content. -Allow students to “unpack their thinking” by describing how they arrive at an answer. -Encourage discussion by using open-ended questions. -Ask questions with multiple correct answers or multiple approaches. -Scaffold questions to help students with incorrect answers. -Engage all students in the discussion and ensure that all voices are heard.</p> <p><u>During the lessons, students:</u> -Have opportunities to formulate many of the high-level questions based on the text/content. -Have time to reflect on classroom discussion to increase their understanding (and without teacher mediation).</p>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

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

			<p><u>School Leadership</u> -The /PLC member/ administrator collects higher order questioning walk-through data using Webb’s Depth of Knowledge wheel. -Monthly, school leaders conduct one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This teacher data/chats guides the leadership’s team professional development plan (both individually and whole faculty).</p>				
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

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

		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1.	2A.1. See Goal # 1	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase to 46%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	45%	46%					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	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

<p>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	<p>3A.1. PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their learning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.</p>	<p>3A.1. Strategy Students' math achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond 	<p>3A.1. Who -Principal -AP -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses SI coordinator How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrative Leadership Team attends targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>3A.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.</p>	<p>3A.1. 2x per year District Formative Tests During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>		
--	---	---	--	---	---	--	--

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

		<p>if they don't learn?</p> <p>4. How will we respond if they already know it?</p> <p><u>Actions/Details</u></p> <p>-</p> <p>-Grade level/like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log.</p> <p>-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase to 72 points.							
	71 points	72 points					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	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

<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	<p>4A.1. Scheduling time for the principal/AP to meet with teachers concerning instructional practices and academic progress of struggling students.</p>	<p>4A.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students' math achievement improves through receiving <u>ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills</u> that are not at the mastery level. <u>Action Steps</u> -Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered. -ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level. - Students attend ELP sessions. - Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or</p>	<p>4A.1. Administration How - Administrative walk-throughs working with teachers (either in classrooms, PLCs or planning sessions)</p>	<p>4A.1. -Data Chats -Administrative walkthroughs during interventions and ELP -PLC Logs</p>	<p>4A.1. 2x per year District Formative Tests During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>		
---	--	--	---	---	--	--	--

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

		biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher. -When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.					
<u>Mathematics Goal #4:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 60 points to 62 points.							
	60 points	62 points					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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

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

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	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						
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		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. See Math Goal #3A	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

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

Mathematics Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<p>The percentage of white students scoring at a proficient level will increase from 76% in 2012 to 78% in 2013.</p> <p>The percentage of black students scoring at a proficient level will increase from 62% in 2012 to 66% in 2013.</p> <p>The percentage of hispanic students scoring at a proficient level will increase from 69% in 2012 to 72% in 2013.</p>							
	White:78% Black:49% Hispanic:55% Asian:NA American NA Indian: NA	White:80% Black:54% Hispanic:69% Asian: NA American NA Indian: NA					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. See Math Goal #3A	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> The percentage of English Language Learners (ELL) scoring at a proficient level will increase from 47% in 2012 to 52% in 2013.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	47%	52%					
		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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D See Math Goal #3A.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u> The percentage of Students with Disabilities scoring at a proficient level will increase from 43% in 2012 to 49% in 2013.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	43%	49%					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. See Math Goal #3A	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u> The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring at a proficient level will increase from 60% in 2012 to 64% in 2013.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	60%	64%					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional						
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Higher Order Questioning Strategies	K – 5	Principal and Math Contact	All math teachers(K – 5)	Early Release Dates	Walkthroughs and PLC Logs	Principal and AP

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</p>	<p>1A.1. Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model.</p>	<p>1A.1. Strategy Students' science skills will improve through participation in the 5E instructional model. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans to drive future instruction.</p>	<p>1A.1. Who Principal AP Science Contact SI coordinator How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.</p>	<p>1A.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1A.1. 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc.)</p>		
<p>Science Goal #1A: <i>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 60% to 62%.</i></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

	60%	62%					
		IA.2.	<p>IA.2. <u>Strategy</u> Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning using the 5E Instructional Model. Specifically, they use the <u>Plan-Do-Check-Act model</u> to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? <p>PLC, share action plan successes and challenges of the grade levels courses. -PLCs will adjust action plans based on teacher/coach walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data.</p>	<p>IA.2. Who Principal AP Science Contact SI coordinator How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.</p>	<p>IA.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/ courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>IA.2. 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc.)</p>	
		IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.		

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

<u>Science Goal #1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

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

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

<p>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</p>	<p>2A.1. Not all teachers have received the CCLS for Science overview. -Not all teachers understand how to integrate close reading with the 5E instructional model. -Not all PLCs routinely look at curriculum materials beyond those posted on the curriculum guide</p>	<p>2A.1. Strategy Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text (textbooks and other supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the close reading model (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least 3 times per nine weeks.</p> <p>Action Steps</p> <p>Professional Development</p> <p>-The Reading Coach attends grade level and vertical PLC's in order to help teachers plan close ELA</p>	<p>2A.1. Principal AP Science Contact Reading Coach Reading Leadership Team SI coordinator</p> <p>How Monitored Administration, Coach, walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration. -Administration provides feedback.</p>	<p>2A.1. Science PLC Resource meetings Reading Leadership Team</p> <p>PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing baseline achievement level to 80% mastery .</p>	<p>2A.1. 3x-per year District Formative Tests</p> <p>During the Grading Period -mini-assessments -unit assessments</p>		
---	---	--	---	--	--	--	--

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

	<p>Lessons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers will attend professional development provided by the district/school on text complexity and close reading models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model. <p>In PLCs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks. -PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile. -PLCs assign appropriate NGSSS benchmark to Close Reading passage -To increase stamina, teachers select high-Lexile, complex and rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the 					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

		<p>year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons. 					
<p>Science Goal #2A:</p> <p><i>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 29% to 30%.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	29%	30%					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	

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

2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Science Goal #2B: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Science Professional Development

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

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</p>	<p>1A.1. Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing. -Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction. -All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.</p>	<p>1A.1 Strategy Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/ daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing. Action Steps -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.) Plan: -Professional Development for updated rubric courses -Professional Development</p>	<p>1A.1. Principal AP SI coordinator District (Writing Team, Supervisors, Writing Resources, Academic Coaches, and DRTs) How Monitored -PLC logs -Classroom walk-throughs Observation Form -Conferencing while writing walk-through tool (for coaches)</p>	<p>1A.1 See "Check" & "Act" action steps in the strategies column</p>	<p>1A.1. Student monthly demand writes/ formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios</p>		
--	---	--	---	--	--	--	--

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

	<p>for instructional delivery of mode-specific writing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Training to facilitate data-driven PLCs -Using data to identify trends and drive instruction -Lesson planning based on the needs of students <p><u>Do:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points -Daily/ongoing conferencing <p><u>Check:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes -PLC discussions and analysis of student 					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

	<p>writing to determine trends and needs</p> <p><u>Act:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Receive additional professional development in areas of need -Seek additional professional knowledge through book studies/ research -Spread the use of effective practices across the school based on evidence shown in the best practice of others -Use what is learned to begin the cycle again, revise as needed, increase scale if possible, etc. -Plan ongoing monitoring of the solution(s) 					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

<p>Writing Goal #1A: <i>The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 89% to 91%,</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	89%	91%					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</p>	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
<p>Writing Goal #1B: N/A</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><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring
Book Study on "Mechanically Inclined"	K - 5	Elizabeth Sanchez	K – 5	Early Release Dates in October – December	PLC's, Monthly Writing Prompts, Walkthroughs	Principal and AP

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Writing Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>1. Attendance</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</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 tardies2. 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. DP will run Attendance/Tardy meetings every 20 days with appropriate reports</p> <p>Social Worker</p> <p>Guidance Counselors</p>	<p>1.1. DP will run Attendance/Tardy meetings every 20 days with appropriate reports</p> <p>Social Worker</p> <p>Guidance Counselors</p>	<p>1.1. Attendance Report Tardy Report Attendance Plan</p>		
-----------------------------	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

<p><u>Attendance Goal #1:</u> The attendance rate will maintain the district's goal of 96%, The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences will decrease from 24 students to 23 students.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p>					
	<p>96%</p>	<p>96%</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>24</p>	<p>23</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>0</p>	<p>0</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

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1. Increased enrollment of students in the 2012-2013 school year.	1. Teachers participated in a climate building training during pre-planning. 2. Guidance lessons focus upon character education. 3. Teachers developed and utilize classroom behavior plans. 4. At risk students are identified and proactive measures are taken to help them understand expectations and connect with an adult at school.	1.1. Administrative Team Guidance Counselor Social Worker Psychologist FBA Team	1. Monitoring of Suspensions	1.1. EASI Discipline Reporting System		
The number of students suspended from school will be less than 15.	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					

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

	2	<i>Less than 15</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	2	<i>Less than 15</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	1	<i>Less than 15</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring
Climate Building Training	K – 5	Deborah Minichbauer	All Teachers	Pre-Planning	Guidance Lessons, Data Chats	Principal, AP, Guidance Counselor

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.

Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

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

<p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.</i></p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.</i></p>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

<p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</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 (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>

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: Increase the number of students participating in math bowl	1. Preparation takes place after school hours	1. Math Contact will meet with interested teachers and form clubs beginning in late October/early November	1. -Math Contact -Principal -AP	1. Review of attendance in math clubs.	1.1. Science Formatives and Grade Level Tests. Participation in Math Bowls.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity 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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: Increase the number of diversity of speakers at the Great American Teach In	1. We are limited to the number of parents who are available to speak.	1. Begin earlier and advertise in a broader fashion for speakers.	1.1. Guidance Counselor	1.1. Review the data from Speaker Forms.	1.1. Sign in from Teach In and interviews with teachers.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE 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)).

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
1. Health and Fitness Goal	1.1.	1.1. Implementation of an afterschool running club by the P.E. coach and other teachers Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5.	1.1. Coach Principal AP	1.1. Master Schedule Teacher Schedules Walkthroughs	1.1. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.		
Health and Fitness Goal #1: 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 41% (60) on the Pretest to 51% (73) on the Post Test.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					

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

	41% (60)	51%					
		1.2.	1.2. Healthy and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by P.E. Coach.	1.2. P.E. Coach	1.2. Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone.	1.2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	
		1.3.	1.3. Use of the playground: walk/jog/run/activities in designated areas and exercising to the outdoor activities such as the ones provided in the 150 minutes of Elementary Physical Education Folder on IDEAS.	1.3. P.E. Coach	1.3. Lesson plans of P.E. Coach	1.3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check 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?	Evaluation Tool		
1. Continuous Improvement Goal	1.1. -There is still confusion on how to conduct PLC's that are focused on deepening the knowledge base of teachers and improving student performance by the implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model.	1.1. The Leadership Team and the faculty will be trained on the use of the PLC "Unit of Instruction" log that follows the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. PLC leaders will guide their PLC's through the Plan-Do-Check-Act model for units of instruction. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Leadership Team.	1.1. <u>Who</u> Principal Leadership Team PLC Facilitators <u>How</u> An administrator or member of Leadership Team is assigned to attend each PLC meeting.	1.1. Review of PLC logs. Feedback from Leadership Team.	1.1. Results from Climate Survey		

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

<u>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
The percentage who strongly agree with the indicator “ teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students’ learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/assessments that improve student performance (under Commitment to Continuance Improvement) ” will increase from 62% in 2012 to 75% in 2013.							
	62%	75%					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

<p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</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 Additional 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.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

Are you reward school? Yes No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
To help plan and facilitate Family Night events. To monitor our goals and strategies across content areas.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
--	--------

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

Wordly Wise, a Vocabulary program that helps students understand vocabulary with multiple meaning words and increases higher vocabulary use.. This program will be purchased for fourth and fifth grade students to increase vocabulary	1,300.00
School Improvement Coordinator position	800.00