Florida Department of Education

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Steinbrenner High School	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Brenda Grasso	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Brenda Leach	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Highly Qualified Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Brenda Grasso	M.Ed.	4	15	2011-12- 2010-2011 A/87% AYP 2009-2010 B/85% AYP 2008-2009 B/79% AYP

Assistant Principal	Holly Clemmons	B.S. Music Education/ Certified k-12 M.Ed. Educational Leadership/Certified all levels M.Ed.	2	9	2011-12 2010-2011 B/87% AYP 2009-2010 B/85% AYP 2011-2012
	Benjamin Gerhardt	M.Ed.	2	10	2010-2011 A/90% 2009-2010 A/95% 2008-2009 A/92% 2011-2012-
	Edward Henderson	M.Ed.	4	7	2010-2011 A/87% AYP 2009-2010 B/85% AYP 2008-2009 B/87% AYP 2011-2012-
	Kelly King		4	8	2010-2011 A/87% 2009-2010 B/85% 2008-2009 C/72%

	Mark Watson	M.Ed.	4	4	2011-2012- 2010-2011 A/87% 2009-2010 B/85% 2008-2009 B/87%

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)

Reading	Anna Maria Wannos	Bachelor of Arts English 5-9 Reading Endorsement	3	5	2011-2012- 2010-2011 A/87% 2009-2010 B/85%

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Targeted staff development provided by Reading Coach, Tech Resource, and Qualified Teachers	Reading Coach, Tech Resource, Steinbrenner Administration	June 2013	
2. Administration and Peer Support within the school	Steinbrenner Administration	June 2013	
3. Mentoring within departments	Department Heads	June 2013	
4. PLC sharing of effective lessons and strategies	PLC members, PLC leaders, Department Heads	June 2013	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly qualified.	**Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective**

14	PLC, lesson planning, idea sharing, observations through county TIP program

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
129	5%	19%	43%	33%	40%	89%	12%	5%	19%

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Leisha Collins	Laura Stegenga Bethany Forde Josh Roach Virginia Scherch Kyle Wolf Tyler Orr Allison Ennis Kristen Crosby	First or second year teachers are paired with a district mentor to provide support.	TIP reviews Support with EET Lesson Plan development Classroom Management support

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. Principal (Grasso), Administrative team (King, Henderson, Watson, Clemmons, Gerhart) Guidance (Powell, Cappello, Ferguson, Blevins, Tschopp), School Psychologist (Wiles), and School Social Worker (Hutchinson)

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 Administrative Team meets every Friday morning in order to discuss school data and other topics which require attention. The Assistant Principals, Guidance and Psychologist meet once a month to discuss individual students, as well as academically low performing students. There is also an Attendance Committee comprised of APs and the school social worker which addresses students with attendance issues.

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

Oversee the multi-layered model of service delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive). The team reviews the data from periodic assessments to determine if the child is making appropriate growth. If student is not meeting benchmarks as set by the team, the tier is increased. If the benchmarks are met, the tier is decreased. The team meets to determine the needs of the student, collecting data from the student's academic performance on district and state assessments, and input from the teachers to diagnose areas of needs. The team then allocates resources such as ELP, one-on-one mentoring, incentives, social services, and referral to enrichment programs.

- Based on student data, recommend, coordinate and implement supplemental services (Tiers 2 and 3) that match students' non-mastery of skills through:
    - Extended Learning Programs during and after school
    - Intensive Reading and Math Classes
- Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Determine scheduling needs, curriculum materials and intervention resources based on identified needs derived from data analysis
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Review and interpret student data (academic, behavior and attendance) at the school and grade levels
- Organize and support systematic data collection as needed
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
    - Implementation and support of PLCs
    - Use of school-based *Reinforcement Instructional Calendars, Mini-Lessons* and *Mini-Assessments*

- Use of Mini Assessments (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)
- Implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions (e.g., Differentiated Instruction)

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Academic data is pulled from a number of sources including mini assessments, formative assessments, quarter grade reports, FAIR, and semester exams scores. Discipline and attendance data is pulled from EdConnect and monitored weekly.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The RtI coordinator meets with the MTSS Leadership team at least two times a year and is currently assisting with methods to identify 9th grade students whose academic performance falls in the lower quartile.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

Monthly meetings held by the RTI committee and area specialist to review data and progress monitor strategies being used to support students.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Grasso, King, Wannos, Jarrett, Schwartz, Hartung, Hardy
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The team meets monthly to review literacy data such as FAIR and proposes school wide activities, events, incentives, and strategies to promote literacy.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? Focus on professional development trainings for the faculty aimed to assist students with reading and understanding complex texts. Support Reading Counts program to encourage and reward 9th grade students. Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas

NCLB Public School Choice

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

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

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

Project CRISS, Level 1 training, which is a 12 hour initial training, is offered annually through district-provided training. Mandatory follow-up is provided at the school site by the reading coach. Complementing the Project CRISS initiative is the inclusion of close reading lessons in the ELA, reading, and content area classrooms.

The reading coach is required as a part of his/her job description to provide on-site support of the implementation of the Project CRISS Strategic Lesson Plan model and the design and delivery of close reading lessons through professional development opportunities, as well as, coaching opportunities. A yearly action plan is created by the reading coach that outlines what Project CRISS and close reading model lesson professional development will be offered. A monthly written update allows the reading supervisor to monitor the progress of each coach's action plan.

Content-specific (mathematics, social studies, science and language arts) Project CRISS close reading model lesson follow-up trainings are offered on request at school sites and as district-offered trainings throughout the school year.

Demonstration classroom opportunities focusing on the implementation of content-based literacy strategies are mandated by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan at each site. The reading coach is responsible for scheduling and facilitating pre-observation, during observation, and post-observation activities and discussion.

A Reading Leadership Team is mandated by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan at each site. The principal is the chairperson of the committee and the reading coach is an integral member, guiding the data review, creation of an action plan, progress monitoring of the plan and evaluation of the plan each school year. The RLT should have representation from each content area and is responsible for reporting back to the school their findings and instructional decisions.

Each PLC is responsible for reviewing their students' literacy data and creating lessons that are responsive to identified student needs. PLCs are responsible for the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model (Plan-Do-Check-Act) with their core curriculum and acting on the data by providing additional instruction where needed. Common assessments on chapter tests are used to identify effective reading strategies and guide instruction for re-teach or enrichment.

Reading coaches are responsible for assisting content teachers with the integration of differentiated instruction strategies into their content area classrooms.

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

Senior Night- All seniors are encouraged to attend senior night, where they receive their senior handbook and the counselors share valuable information about their senior year. This includes postsecondary information, a timeline of what seniors should be doing during the course of the year, SAT/ACT test dates, etc.

College Visits- Various college representatives visit Steinbrenner to share information about their specific colleges or universities with students.

ASVAB- Students interested in possibly enlisting in the military are given an opportunity to take this aptitude test.

Students have the opportunity to visit our Career Center and work with the College and Career Counselor or other staff members on a variety of resources to help them learn more about their own interests and their potential in certain areas.

Guidance counselors work with students toward future goals to include post-secondary education and career planning.

AVID- The curriculum is based on rigorous standards driven by W.I.C.O.R. Method (writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization) and it supports higher order thinking. AVID elective teachers also work with guidance to guide students through the college application process.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).	1.1. -The percentage of students scoring at this level is currently high and may be difficult to increase even further. -Teachers are still learning about Common Core State Standards and how it relates to developing college and career ready students	1.1. -Students' comprehension of grade level text will increase through reading complex text and the use of the Comprehension Instructional Sequence (CIS) Model as a strategy for understanding higher levels of text. Teachers in all content areas and electives, on a monthly basis, at least, will require students to read content related complex text and employ the CIS Model to learn how to read complex text independently and proficiently.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, and Department Heads will monitor the fidelity of implementing the CIS Model in classroom walk-throughs, PLC logs and action plans.	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 -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. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

Reading Goal #1: The percentage of standard curriculum students scoring level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test will increase from 66% to 68%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	66	**68**					

		1.2. -A review of EET rubric summary data indicates that some teachers are still developing effective use of questioning strategies, so training will be necessary.	1.2. **Use of higher-order thinking and questioning** Students will generate and respond to higher-order questions (as determined by Costa's levels) in writing (dialectical journals, bellwork/exit slips and short analysis essays) and through formal discussion structures (Lit Circles, Socratic Seminar, Fishbowl, or Inner/Outer Circle).	1.2. Principal, Assistant principals, and Peers will monitor the use of effective questioning strategies while doing classroom observations.	1.2. 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. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.2. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.	2.1.	2.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Reading Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 43% to 45%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	43%	**45%**					

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

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

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.	3.1. Teachers have recently received training and are in the implementation phase.	3.1. **Use of complex text:** Students will read a complex text, generate a claim regarding the content of the text, and create a response (analytical essay, alternative book report, oral presentation) supported by relevant and significant textual evidence.	3.1. Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Department Heads How -Reading PLC Logs -English PLC Logs -Social Studies PLC Logs -Elective PLC Logs -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.	3.1. 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 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/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive	3.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

				teacher support and student supplemental instruction.			
Reading Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 70 points to 72 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	70	**72**					

		3.2. Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc	3.2. **Strategy/Task** Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction. **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	3.2. Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -PLC logs turned into department heads. -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	3.2. 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/ Department Heads shares	3.2. 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)	

			their DI lessons. -Teachers use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Teachers, using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/ interventions and how that instruction will be provided.		SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.		
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**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**		

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4.1. 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	4.1. Strategy Students' reading comprehension improves through receiving ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills that are not at the mastery level. **Action Steps** -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 classroom teacher	4.1. Who ELP coordinator How Monitored ELP coordinator will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.	4.1. Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.	4.1. 3x per year FAIR		

Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 71 points to 73 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	71	**73**					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							

Reading Goal #5:							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. See Goals 1, 3, and 4	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.		

Reading Goal #5A: . The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from ___% to ____%. The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from ___% to ____%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	

		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	

		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority. -With such a small number of ELL students spread across a large student population, the developmental language arts teacher is the primary contact for ELL students -Teachers implementation of CALLA is not consistent across core courses. -ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core	5C.1. ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/standard improves through participation in the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) strategy across Reading, Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science. **Action Steps** -ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons. -ERT models lessons using CALLA. -ERT observes content area teachers using CALLA and	5C.1. Who -School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from:	5C.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 ELL SMART Goal.	5C.1. -FAIR -CELLA During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance		

	courses. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of CALLA/ in order to effectively conduct a CALLA fidelity check walk-through.	provides feedback, coaching and support. -District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of CALLA. -Core content teachers set SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming core curriculum assessments. -Core content teachers administer and analyze ELLs performance on assessments. -Teachers aggregate data to determine the performance of ELLs compared to the whole group. -Based on data core content teachers will differentiate instruction to remediate/enhance instruction.					

Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from ___% to ____%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher.	5D.1. SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/ SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	5D.1. Who Principal, Assistant Principals, ESE Specialist How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by ESE Specialist and APC	5D.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.	5D.1. FAIR During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance		

Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from ___% to ____%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

Reading Professional Development

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

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CIS Reading Model	9th-12th	Wannos, Barton	English, Reading, Social Studies, Science Teachers	Ongoing	Classroom Walkthroughs Formal Observations	Administrators Reading Coach Department Heads
Designing and Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning	9th-12th	Wannos District Staff	English and Reading Teachers	Ongoing	Classroom Walkthroughs Formal Observations	Administrators Reading Coach Department Heads
The 3 S's of Complex Text: Selecting / Identifying Complex Text, Shifting to Increased Use of Informational Text, and Sharing of Complex Text with All Students	9th – 12th	Wannos-Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administrators Reading Coach Department Heads

Close Reading Workshop	9-12/ Building Close Reading/ CIS lessons across all disciplines to address the Common Core State Standards	Wannos- Reading Coach	Reading, English, Math and Science teachers- interdisciplinary	April 2,16, and 30	Classroom walkthroughs/visits	Administrators Reading Coach Department Heads	

End of Reading Goals

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

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

Algebra EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						

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

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

Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).	1.1. Rigor of the standards	1.1. Students' math comprehension will improve through teachers across content areas better understand the compelling why and structure of the **Math Common Core State Standards**. Student learning will increase through the use of scaffolded lessons and cognitively complex tasks as demanded by the CCSS. **Action Steps** -As a Professional Development activity, math teachers will participate in the district's CCSS training during pre-planning. -PLCs come to consensus on and use common assessments that reflect the level of rigor based on the use of complex	1.1. Who Administration Department Chair PLC Leaders How PLC logs turned into administration Administration provides feedback. Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. EET formal evaluations EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) EET formal observations (Admin and	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 -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. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1. District made Algebra formative assessments will be given 3 times a year.		

		test. End of the unit/segment assessments include writing response. -Teachers implement the scaffolded lessons. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. PLCs study students' responses to the scaffolded lessons. -Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps in cognitive complexity strategy implementation. -PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. Learning will increase through the use of AVID tutorials (collaborative groups use process of inquiry to find solutions to real world problems.	Peer/Mentor) EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies				

Algebra Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. The percentage of all curriculum students scoring proficient on the 2013 End-of-Course Algebra exam will increase from 55% to 58%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	55% **267**	**58%** **200**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.	2.1. Rigor of the standards	2.1. Students' math comprehension will improve through teachers across content areas better understand the compelling why and structure of the **M**ath Common Core State Standards. Student learning will increase through the use of scaffolded lessons and cognitively complex tasks as demanded by the CCSS**.** **Action Steps** -As a Professional Development activity, math teachers will participate in the district's CCSS training during pre-planning. -PLCs come to consensus on and use common assessments that reflect the level of rigor based on the use of complex	2.1. Who Administration Department Chair PLC Leaders How PLC logs turned into administration Administration provides feedback. Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. EET formal evaluations EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) EET formal observations (Admin and	2.1. 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. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	2.1. District made Algebra formative assessments will be given 3 times a year.		

		test. End of the unit/segment assessments include writing response. -Teachers implement the scaffolded lessons. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. PLCs study students' responses to the scaffolded lessons. -Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps in cognitive complexity strategy implementation. -PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.	Peer/Mentor) EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies				

Algebra Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. The percentage of all curriculum students scoring achievement level on the 2013 End-of-Course Algebra exam will increase from 10% to 12%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	10% **267**	**12%** **200**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core State Standards	9-12/algebra	District trainer	All math teachers	8/15/12	Individual follow-up as required/needed	Department Head
Analyzing first semester exams	9-12	-Math DH	Math Department and course-specific PLCs	After the administration of the test	PLC logs	APC

End of Mathematics Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

Writing/ Language Arts Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.	1.1. Teachers are at varying levels of experience with teaching students appropriate strategies for transitions, support, and conventions	1.1. Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, teachers use on-going progress monitoring data (FCAT, district formative assessments, baseline, mid-year, nine week assessments, semester exams, curriculum assessments and daily class work) to plan and deliver mini-lessons and mini-assessments (F-CIM). **Action Steps** **Plan** *Planning/ PLCs Before the Lesson* - PLCs identify	1.1. Who Administration Department Chair PLC Leaders How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.	1.1 Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/ using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students per class/course. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery. PLC/Department Level See "Check" & "Act" action steps in the strategies column Leadership Team Level See "Check" & "Act" action steps in the strategies column	1.1. Student monthly demand writes/ formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios		

		essential tested skills/standards/ benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. -Teachers discuss how to correlate mini lessons with core curriculum. - Based on the data, PLCs develop a one-two week projected timeline/calendar for teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. **(EET Rubric 1b, 1e, and 4d)** -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify (using District resources and curriculum resources) and/ or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs will use a combination of District and	*1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check*				

		school-generated mini lessons and mini assessments. **(EET Rubric 1e, 1d, 1f, 4d)** -Teachers discuss strategies for teaching the mini lessons. **Do/Check** *Teachers in the Classroom* -Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments to the whole group or targeted students. **Check/Act** *Teachers/PLCs after the Mini-Assessments* -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. **(EET Rubric 4d)** -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching.					

		(EET Rubric 4a) -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the mini-lesson timeline/ calendar. -If needed Differentiated Instruction mini-lessons/ assessments are given to targeted students as Tier 1 interventions. -Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule. **(EET Rubric 1b, 3c, 3e, 4d)** -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. **(EET Rubric 3d)**					

Writing/LA Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students scoring **Level 3.0** or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 91% to 93%.							
Students will read a complex text for compelling evidence and elements of writer's craft (voice, diction, tone, etc) and create a text-based response incorporating those elements supported by relevant and significant textual evidence, resulting in a thoughtful, analytical piece of writing.							
Students will generate Costa's level 2 and 3 questions using primary or complex texts as the basis for the questioning and respond to them in thoughtful, reflective pieces of writing.							

	91	**93**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

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

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
Authentic Grammar	10	C Dillon	PLC	3rd Tuesday of each month	FCIM Review	C Dillon

			PLC	3rd Tuesday of each month	Baseline Writing Comparison	C Dillon
Changes to Rubric	10	C Dillon				

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
1. Attendance	1.1. Identifying students with excessive absences	1.1. Weekly reports will be run and reviewed by PSLT and forwarded to guidance counselors and the attendance committee to identify students and move through the RTI process. Monitor progress of students with excessive absences on a rolling monthly basis for the 2012-13 school year.	1.1. PSLT, guidance counselors, attendance committee	1.1. Compare the data of students with excessive absences from 2011-12 to their current attendance.	1.1. E-Reports, Edconnect Attendance data, SDHC mainframe reports		

Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box. 1. The attendance rate will increase from 95.08% in 2011-2012 to 95.10% in 2012-2013. 2. The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will **decrease from by 20% (177 in 2011 to 142 in 2012)** The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** tardies to school throughout the school year will **decrease by 20%. (66 in 2012 to 53 in 2013)**							

	95.08	**95.15**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	698	**675**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	66	**53**					
	1.2. Decreasing the number of students who sign in to school late. 1.3. Raising school-wide attendance rate	1.2. Immediately identify students at the SAO counter during sign in who have an excessive number of tardies to school.	1.2. SAO staff	1.2. Compare data of those students identified as excessive tardies from 2011-2012 school year and continuing through 2012-13.	1.2. EdConnect sign-in/out reports	1.2. EdConnect sign-in/out reports	

		1.3. Provide attendance incentives through promotions to student body by grade level and targeted cohorts of students.	1.3. Attendance committee and administration	1.3. Review and comparison of monthly and annual cumulative attendance averages. Comparison with include previous year's attendance data as well as data from other schools' and areas' averages from throughout the district.	1.3. Attendance average data provided from SDHC through attendance supervisor's office.	1.3. Attendance average data provided from SDHC through attendance supervisor's office.	

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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving						

	Process to Decrease Suspension						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
1. Suspension	1.1. Data indicates that there is wide variation in the number of ODRs generated across the classrooms.	1.1. PSLT "behavior" sub-group will review data and make recommend ations to the PSLT for additional assistance in classroom management for teachers in need	1.1. PSLT "behavior" subgroup	1.1. PSLT "behavior" subgroup will review data on ODRs and suspensions in targeted classrooms.	1.1. ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data.		

Suspension Goal	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 5%. (756 in 2012 to 719 in 2013)							
2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 5%. (420 in 2012 to 399 in 2013)							
3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease							

by 5%. (271 in 2012 to 258 in 2013) 4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 5%. (194 in 2012 to 1185 in 2013)							
	756	**719**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	420	**399**					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					

	271	**258**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	194	**185**					
		1.2. There should be common school wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior	1.2.. PSLT "behavior" sub-group will address faculty concerning school-wide expectations and rules, as well as methods for teaching and reinforcing those rules.	1.2. PSLT "behavior" subgroup	1.2. PSLT "behavior" subgroup will review data on ODRs and suspensions on a monthly basis.	1.2. ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data	

		1.3. Incoming freshmen are often unaware of the rules and expectations at the high school level leading to an increased number of ODRs.	1.3. PSLT "behavior" sub-group will present discipline information at the new student orientation as well as during grade level assemblies. Teachers will also cover important sections of the student handbook during home rooms.	1.3. PSLT "behavior" subgroup and teachers.	1.3. PSLT "behavior" subgroup will review data, according to grade level, on ODRs and suspensions on a monthly basis.	1.3. ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data	

Suspension Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Analyzing School Discipline Data	9-12	Student Affairs APs	School Wide	Once at beginning of year and at following faculty meetings as needed.	Weekly data review and walk throughs of targeted classrooms.	Assistant Principals

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention**						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

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

1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	1.1. Students not being successful on FCAT Reading and Math	1.1. Remediated in Intensive Reading/ Math classes Remediated through ELP	1.1 APC/Counselors monitor placement/scheduling Recommendations made by teacher(s), Students participation in ELP, ELP rosters	1.1. Review of FAIR data to predict success on FCAT Improved performance on FAIR/ FCAT	1.1. FAIR/FCAT results Practice Test Exercises in ELP		
Reduce the dropout rate by 1%	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	TBA	**TBA**					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	92%	**93%**					

	1.2. High absenteeism 1.3. Failing required classes for graduation	1.2. Monitor excessive absence reports Attendance Incentives	1.2. Reviewed weekly by administrative staff Attendance Committee	1.2. Comparison of monthly attendance rate	1.2. Student Attendance Rate	1.2.	
		1.3. At-risk list provided to counselors and teachers to monitor student performance	1.3. Counselors monitor at risk students grades and meet with them to review progress quarterly	1.3 Analysis of quarter grades	1.3. Progress Reports Quarter Grades	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention 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
Guidance PLC	ALL	Powell	Guidance PLC	Weekly	Reviewed by PLC	Powell, Guidance DH
Admin PLC	ALL	King	Admin PLC	Weekly	Reviewed by PLC	King, APC
RTI	ALL	Wiles	RTI	Monthly/As needed	Reviewed by PLC	Wiles, Sch Psych/APSAs

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Title I Schools – Please see the Parent Information Notebook (PIN) to view a copy of the Title I PIP.

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**	**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. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1:	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
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**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

2. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #2:	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

Parent Involvement 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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Health and Fitness Goal	1.1. Injury/illnesses Online courses	1.1. HS Students will engage in a minimum of 2 semesters of physical education with certified PE teachers	1.1 Guidance Counselors APC.	1.1. Reviewing Student Schedules	1.1. Master Schedule Student Schedules PACER Test		
Health and Fitness Goal #1: The number of students scoring in the Healthy Fit Zone (HFZ) on the Pacer will increase from 41% on the pretest to 52% on the Postest	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	41%	**52%**					

		1.2. Dressing Out and Student Participation	1.2. Health and PE initiatives developed and implemented by PE teachers to encourage active participation	1.2. PE Teachers	1.2 Classroom Walkthroughs Data from HFZ.	1.2. PACER test	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic 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
Cardiovascular Efficiency	9-12	PE DH	All PE Teachers	Early Release-PLC	Classroom Walkthroughs	DH, Administrators
HOPE Class Uniformity	9-12	PE DH	All PE Teachers	Early Release-PLC	Classroom Walkthroughs	DH, Administrators

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Continuous Improvement Goal	1.1 -There is still confusion on how to conduct PLCs that are focused on deepening the knowledge base of teachers and improving student performance by the implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. -Still confusion on how the Plan-Do-Check-Act model works. -Still some resistance to staff members attending PLCs and/or arriving on time to meetings. -Teachers asking for more PLC collaboration time. Possibility of waiver will be explored.	1.1 The leadership team will become trained on the use of the PLC "Unit of Instruction" log that follows the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. Subject Area Leader and/or PLC facilitators will guide their PLCs 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 Who Principal Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC facilitators	1.1 "Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training.	1.1 PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach		

Continuous Improvement Goal #1: The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "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 Teaching and Learning)" will increase from 50% in 2012 to 55% in 2013.	2012 Current Level :* **50%**	2013 Expected Level :* **55%**					
		1.2 -Not enough time to meet in PLCs.	1.2 Leadership team will use teacher survey information every nine weeks to determine next steps for PLC professional development.	1.2 Who Leadership team How Leadership team aggregates the data	1.2 "Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training.	1.2 PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach (Anne Jolly)	

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) 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
PLCs Plan-Do-Check-Act Model	Leadership Team All teachers	Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC Facilitators	School-wide	PLCs meet every three weeks for Plan-Do-Check-Act PLCs.	Administrator and leadership team walk-throughs Administrator and leadership attendance at PLC meetings PLC Survey data	Leadership Team

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).	A.1.	A.1	A.1. **See Reading Goal 5d**	A.1.	A.1.		
Reading Goal A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A						
		A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	
		A.3.	A.3.	A.3.)	A.3.	A.3.	

B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1. **See Reading Goal 5d**	B.1.	B.1.		
Reading Goal B: The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1.	1.1. **See Reading Goal 5d**	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 83% to 85%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	83%					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** 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**	
D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1.	2.1. **See Reading Goal 5d**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 39% to 41%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :					
	39%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** 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**	

E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1.	2.1 **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 61% to 63%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					

	61%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).	F.1. INCREASING STUDENT EMEORY AND RECALL FOR BASIC MATH DACTS	F.1.USE OF MATH GIZMOS AND TECHNOLOGY	F.1.FAA MATH TEACHERS WILL KEEP PLC MEETING LOGS	F.1.GIZMO QUIZES	F.1. BERGANCE MATH TESTING		

Mathematics Goal F:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.							
	N/A						

	F.2. TEACHERS WILL IDENTIFY STUDENT LEVELS F.3. TEACHERS WILL USE ONLINE FLASH CARDS, GIZMOS, AND COMPUTER TECHNO LOGY TO INCREASE MATH LEVELS BY 10%	F.2.FAA MATH TEACHERS	F.2.PLC FAA TEACHERS WILL TURN IN LOG TO DEPT CHAIR	F.2. TEACHERS REFLECT ON TEST STRATERGIES, AND TECHNIQUES	F.2.FAA TEST	F.1. BERGANCE MATH TESTING	
		F.3.FAA MATH TEACHERS	F.3.DEPT CHAIR WILL TURN INTO ADMINISTRATION	F.3.TEACHERS CHART STUDENT PROGRESS	F.3.FAA TEST		

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

Mathematics Goal G: The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A						
		G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	
		G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	

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

Geometry EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** 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**		

H. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry.	1.1. Rigor of the standards	1.1. Students' math comprehension will improve through teachers across content areas better understand the compelling why and structure of the **Math Common Core State Standards**. Student learning will increase through the use of scaffolded lessons and cognitively complex tasks as demanded by the CCSS**.** **Action Steps** -As a Professional Development activity, math teachers will participate in the district's CCSS training during pre-planning. -PLCs come to consensus on and use common assessments that reflect the level of rigor based on the use of complex	1.1. Who Administration Department Chair PLC Leaders How PLC logs turned into administration Administration provides feedback. Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. EET formal evaluations EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) EET formal observations (Admin and	1.1. 1.1. 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/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem	1.1. District made Geometry formative assessments will be given 3 times a year.		

		test. End of the unit/segment assessments include writing response. -Teachers implement the scaffolded lessons. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. PLCs study students' responses to the scaffolded lessons. -Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps in cognitive complexity strategy implementation. -PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.	Peer/Mentor) EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies	Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.			

Geometry Goal H: The percentage of all curriculum students scoring in the middle and upper thirds on the 2013 End of Course Geometry exam will increase from 84% to 87%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **84%** **563**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **87%** **563**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.	2.1. Rigor of the standards	2.1. Students' math comprehension will improve through teachers across content areas better understand the compelling why and structure of the **Math Common Core State Standards**. Student learning will increase through the use of scaffolded lessons and cognitively complex tasks as demanded by the CCSS**.** **Action Steps** -As a Professional Development activity, math teachers will participate in the district's CCSS training during pre-planning. -PLCs come to consensus on and use common assessments that reflect the level of rigor based on the use of complex	2.1. Who Administration Department Chair PLC Leaders How PLC logs turned into administration Administration provides feedback. Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. EET formal evaluations EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) EET formal observations (Admin and	2.1. 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/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem	2.1. District made Geometry formative assessments will be given 3 times a year.		

		test. End of the unit/segment assessments include writing response. -Teachers implement the scaffolded lessons. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. PLCs study students' responses to the scaffolded lessons. -Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps in cognitive complexity strategy implementation. -PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.	Peer/Mentor) EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies	Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.			

Geometry Goal I: The percentage of all curriculum students scoring in the upper third on the 2013 End of Course Geometry exam will increase from 53% to 56%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **53%** **563**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **56%** **563**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

	Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).	M.1. INSTRUCTIONAL TIME	M.1.TEACHERS WILL USE PRETEST TO IDENTIFY STUDENT DEFICIENCIES	M.1. THROUGH MONTHLY PLC MEETINS AND QUARTERLY ASSESSMENTS	M.1.BY MEASURING INCREASES OF KNOWLEDGE BAISED ON STUDENT LEVELS	J.1.		

Science Goal J: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	*N/A*					
	M.2. USE OF COMPUTERS, GIZMOS, AND ONLINE FLASH CARDS TI INCREASE STUDENT SCIENCE VOCABULARY M.3.	M.2.TEACHERS WILL USE PLC MEETINGS TO DISCUSS STRATERGIES AND TECHONOLGY IMPLEMENTATION	M.2.PLC LEAD TEACHER	M.2.PLC LEAD TEACHWER	J.2.	J.2.	
		M.3.	M.3.DEPARTMENT CHAIR AND ESE SPECIALIST	M.3. DEPARTMENT CHAIR AND ESE SPECIALIST.	J.3.	J.3.	

NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Biology EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student**						

	Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** 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**		

K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology.	1.1. The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the science core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through participation in lessons designed around the **5E lesson plan model.**	1.1. Action Steps -Teachers will attend District Science training and share 5 E Lesson Plan Model information with their PLCs. -PLCs write SMART goals based on each Grading Period of material. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively building 5E Lesson Plans. -PLC teachers instruct students using the 5E Lesson	1.1. Who Administration Department Chair PLC Leaders How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies. Administrative Level Use on-line integrated	1.1. Teacher Level -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans. -Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of 5E Lesson planning. - PLCs record their work in the PLC logs -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students per class/course. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery. PLC/Department Level	1.1. Unit Mini Assessments At the end of each unit, on the same day, teachers give a common assessment (Unit Mini Assessment) provided by the district as identified from the core curriculum materials.		

		Plans. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.	student database program to monitor skill by course/ instructor/unit/student *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	Leadership Team Level *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*			
Biology Goal K: The percentage of students achieving a score in the middle or upper third (levels 3, 4, & 5) for the Biology EOC exam will increase from 87% (523 students) in 2012 to 89% (504 students) in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	87% **(523)**	**89%** **(504)**					

		1.2. The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content improves by engaging in accountable talk within differentiated, collaborative structures/ cooperative learning groups. Students benefit from collaborative structures by being engaged in the activity, explaining what they are learning, developing collaborative group study skills, refining inquiry skills that help solve problems and analyze issues in each subject area, developing oral language for personal and academic use,	1.2. Action steps In PLCs, teachers plan ways to incorporate accountable talk and specific collaborative structures throughout the lesson (not just at the end of the lesson). Teachers repertoire of strategies include: --Think-Pair-Share --Heads-in-together --Jigsaw --Philosophical Chairs --Socratic Seminar --Fish Bowl --Round table Teachers determine student grouping based on data, skill level, interest, etc. to ensure equal engaged. Teachers decide when a collaborative structure is appropriate and which one best suits the learning	1.2. Who Administration Department Chair PLC Leaders How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. EET formal evaluations EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/ Mentor)	1.2. Teacher Level Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. Teachers distribute rubrics in advance, describe expectations, assign grades based on the rubric, and enter grade in the on-line grading system. Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery of. PLC/Department Level Leadership Team Level *1st Grading Period Check*	1.2. Teacher-Generated Rubric & Assessment At the end of activity, teachers give compare rubric scores and student performance on assessment.	

		and developing listening skills that support interaction with others.	objective. PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?" Demonstration classrooms will be offered to assist teachers in implementing the strategies in their classrooms. Teachers will be identified through walk-throughs and PLC discussions PLCs will document use of the strategies and discussion of their effectiveness with presenting core curriculum	School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	*2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*		

		1.3. The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' understanding of the nature of science and scientific inquiry will improve through the use of appropriate hands-on instructional, scientific and laboratory technology (Gizmos, *Vernier Probeware,* digital microscopy)	1.3. Action steps All lesson plans include science technology (such as Gizmos, Probeware, etc.) as a tool of inquiry in the science classroom. Teachers who have not yet been trained in Gizmos will attend the district-offered training have their accounts set up with *ExploreLearning*. Teachers who have not yet been trained on the use of *Vernier Probeware* will receive training from the district. Teachers use technology such as Gizmos and *Vernier Probeware* in their classrooms on a regular basis.	1.3. Who Administration Department Chair PLC Leaders How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. EET formal evaluations EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/	1.3. Teacher Level Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. Teachers distribute rubrics in advance, describe expectations, assign grades based on the rubric, and enter grade in the on-line grading system. Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery of. PLC/Department Level Leadership Team Level *1st Grading Period Check*	1.3. Gizmo Quiz Each student will complete the 5-question quiz at the end of the Gizmo lesson.	

				Mentor) School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	*2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*		
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology.	2.1. The purpose of this strategy is to offer students an intensified instructional experience or an enrichment experience based on their performance band data. Teachers will collaborate and **ability group students in a carousel teaching model**.	2.1. Action Steps Teachers within the PLC will identify anchor lessons for each benchmark that can be developed for intensive instruction and a companion lesson that can be taught as an enrichment activity. Teachers divide their students into two ability groups. One teacher will develop and present the benchmark lesson as an intensive instruction to the less proficient students while the other teacher develops and presents the enrichment lesson to the more proficient students Teachers must rotate the responsibility for	2.1. Who Administration Department Chair PLC Leaders How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. EET formal evaluations EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/ Mentor)	2.1. Teacher Level Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. Teachers distribute rubrics in advance, describe expectations, assign grades based on the rubric, and enter grade in the on-line grading system. Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery of. PLC/Department Level Leadership Team Level *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	2.1. Unit Mini Assessments At the end of each unit, on the same day, teachers give a common assessment (Unit Mini Assessment) provided by the district as identified from the core curriculum materials.		

		the enrichment and intensive lesson	School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*				
Biology Goal L: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. The percentage of students achieving a score in the upper third (levels 4 & 5) for the Biology EOC exam will increase from 59% (355 students) in 2012 to 61% (346 students) in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **59%** **(355)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **61%** **(346)**					

		2.2. This strategy is designed to increase the level of student engagement by **using project based** activities to teach the benchmarks.	2.2. Action Steps Teachers will conduct research on the nature of problem based learning. http://www.coloradoadulted.org/SS%20Lessons%20for%20Adult%20Learners/Curriculum%20Topics/lessontemplate.pdf PLCs will use the template for writing a project based lesson to teach a particular cluster of challenging benchmarks PLC teachers instruct students using project based learning activities.	2.2. Who Administration Department Chair PLC Leaders How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. EET formal evaluations EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/ Mentor) EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/ Mentor) School-based informal walk-	2.2. Teacher Level Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. Teachers distribute rubrics in advance, describe expectations, assign grades based on the rubric, and enter grade in the on-line grading system. Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery of. PLC/Department Level Leadership Team Level *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check*	2.2. Unit Mini Assessments At the end of each unit, on the same day, teachers give a common assessment (Unit Mini Assessment) provided by the district as identified from the core curriculum materials.	

				through form which includes the school's SIP strategies. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	*3rd Grading Period Check*		

		2.3 This strategy is designed to increase the level of student engagement by **using problem based** activities to teach the benchmarks.	2.3 Action Steps Teachers will conduct research on the nature of problem based learning. http://pbln.imsa.edu/ PLCs will develop a template for writing problem based lessons. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers will rewrite best practices lesson plans into problem based activities. PLC teachers instruct students using problem based learning activities.	2.3 Who Administration Department Chair PLC Leaders How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. EET formal evaluations EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/ Mentor) EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/ Mentor) School-based informal walk-	2.3 Teacher Level Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. Teachers distribute rubrics in advance, describe expectations, assign grades based on the rubric, and enter grade in the on-line grading system. Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery of. PLC/Department Level Leadership Team Level *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check*	2.3 Unit Mini Assessments At the end of each unit, on the same day, teachers give a common assessment (Unit Mini Assessment) provided by the district as identified from the core curriculum materials.	

				through form which includes the school's SIP strategies. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	*3rd Grading Period Check*		

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

Writing Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).	M.1 -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	M.1. **Strategy** SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/ SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	M.1. Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC	M.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.	On-going writing prompts and assessments		

Writing Goal M: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A						
		M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	
		M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM electives.	1.1 Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers	1.1 -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established. -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs. -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.	1.1 PLC , Department Heads	1.1 Administrative/walk-throughs	1.1 Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM elective per nine week. Share data with teachers.
	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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

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

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

CTE Goal #1: Increase the student membership in CTO chapters from _____ in 2011-2012 to _____in 2012-2013.	1.1. Participation in other clubs/ organizations	1.1. Increase student participation in CTSO competitions/ events.	1.1. CTE Teachers	1.1. Aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop next steps	1.1. Log of number of CTSO events Log of number of students who attend CTSO events
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Establishing or growing a CTSO.	9-12	District	CTE Teachers	October, 2012	Log of events and attendance	CTE Contact Teacher

End of CTE Goal(s)

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
Priority	Focus	Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

X Yes No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the use of SAC funds.			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
Professional Development and Reading1.1,2.1, 3.1, 4.1	History Lesson books	277.76	

Geometry Goal 1, strategy 1.1	Geometry End of Course Books	540.00	
Reading 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 and 4.1	Class set of Reading Novels from Teen Reads list	325.00	
Reading Goal 4, strategy 4.1	Timed Readings Plus Books	1509.06	1487.16
Reading strategy 1.1, Writing 1.1, and Science 2.1	Science Kits/Programs to emulate real life cases	801.26	
Post secondary transition	Academic Acheivement Awards	341.00	
Reading Goal for SWD 5D.1.	16 Work Task Systems for students with disabilities to improve FAA reading scores	330.00	
Professional Development	Close Reading Workshop addressing the Common Core State Standards	1800.00	
Final Amount Spent 5924.08			