

# Florida Department of Education



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

Proposed for 2012-2013

**2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

**PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS**

**School Information**

School Name: Heritage Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: MaryJo Stover	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Mallory Brandow	Date of School Board Approval:

**Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:**

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

[School Grades Trend Data](#) (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

**Administrators**

List your school’s administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	MaryJo Stover	BA Elementary Ed 1-6 MA Educational Leadership	6.5 years	6.5 years	2011-2012 Heritage Elementary, A, 68% Reading Learning Gains, 71% Math Learning Gains. 2010-2011 Heritage Elementary, B, 74%AYP 2009-2010 Heritage Elementary, A, 97% 2008-2009 Heritage Elementary, A, 95%

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Assistant Principal	Christopher Alvarez	BS Elementary ED K-6 MA Educational Leadership	1.5 years	1.5 years	2011-2012 Heritage Elementary, A, 68% Reading Learning Gains, 71% Math Learning Gains. 2010-2011 Heritage Elementary, B, 74% AYP 2009-2010 Apollo Beach Elementary, B, 100% AYP 2008-2009 Apollo Beach Elementary, A, 97% AYP
------------------------	---------------------	--	-----------	-----------	---

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

### Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Mary Boswell	BA Elementary Education	6	6	Heritage Elementary 2011-12, grade A, Scored 3 and above 58%, Learning Gains 68%, Bottom quartile 74%
					Heritage Elementary, 10/11: B, 74% AYP 76% scored 3, 57% making gains, 40% bottom quartile, Made AYP: white Did not meet AYP: Black, Hispanic, Economic Disadvantage, ELL

### Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Teacher Interview Day	General Directors	June
2. Monthly meetings	Assistant Principal	monthly
3. School Mentors	Principal	ongoing
4. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	ongoing
5. District Peer Program	District Peers	ongoing

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

### *Non-Highly Effective Instructors*

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

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0 % (0)	N/A

### *Staff Demographics*

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
55	4%(2)	30%(16)	44%(24)	24%(13)	25%(14)	100% (55)	7%(4)	11%(6)	82%(45)

### *Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan*

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Kathryn Bateham	Christina Jameson Biella	Mrs. Bateham is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Kathryn Bateham (District EET Mentor)	Bethany McNew	Mrs. Bateham is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Mary Boswell (School based mentor)	Alexandra Cleworth	Mrs. Boswell has over 20 years of teaching experience. She is the Reading Coach for our school.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Cynthia Terzado (School based mentor)	Autumn Banks	Mrs. Terzado has many years of teaching experience. She is the ESOL Resource Teacher for our school.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

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

### Additional Requirements

#### **Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only**

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

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



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

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

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

#### School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

MaryJo Stover, Principal, Christopher Alvarez, Assistant Principal, Christine Goff, Guidance Counselor, Carol Shapiro, School Psychologist, Alexa Sklar K, Nancy Tate 1<sup>st</sup>, Kelly Mineart 2<sup>nd</sup>, Tara Adams 3<sup>rd</sup>, Alex Cleworth 4<sup>th</sup>, Laurie Schroeder 5<sup>th</sup>, Cynthia Terzado ELL Resource, Gail Hutton ESE Specialist, Shari Fabri Soc. Worker, Mallory Brandow SAC Chair, Mary Boswell Reading Coach

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?

Oversee the multi-layered model of *instructional* delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)

- **Create, manage and update the school resource map**
- *Ensure the master schedule incorporates allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels.*
- **Determine scheduling needs, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers 2/3**
- **Facilitate the implementation of specific programs (e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school) that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/charts conducted by the PLCs.**
- **Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals**
- **Organize and support systematic data collection (e.g., district and state assessments; during-the-grading period school assessments/checks for understanding; in-school surveys)**
- *Assist and monitor teacher use of SMART goals per unit of instruction. (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)*
- **Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:**
- **Implementation and support of PLCs**
- *Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)*
- *Use of Common Core Assessments by teachers teaching the same grade/subject area/course (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)*
- **Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions. (as outlined in our SIP)**
- **Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data Specialty PSLT.**
- **Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) on core curriculum material.**
- **Coordinate/collaborate/integrate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).**

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

### **Elementary**

The Chair of SAC is a member of the *Leadership Team/PSLT*.

- ***The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.***
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work ***of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams***. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- ***Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the Leadership Team/PLST monitors the effectiveness of instruction and intervention by reviewing student data as well as data related to implementation fidelity (teacher walk-through data).***
- ***The Leadership Team/PSLT communicates with and supports the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by distributing Leadership Team members across the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, the Leadership Team members who are part of the PLCs regularly report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger Leadership Team/PSLT.***
- The ***Leadership Team/PSLT*** and PLCs both use the problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
  - ***Use the problem-solving model when analyzing data:***
    1. ***What is the problem? (Problem Identification)***
    2. ***Why is it occurring? (Problem Analysis and Barrier Identification)***
    3. ***What are we going to do about it? (Action Plan Design and Implementation)***
    4. ***Is it working? (Monitor Progress and Evaluate Action Plan Effectiveness)***
  - ***Identify the problem (based on an analysis of the data disaggregated via data sorts) in multiple areas – curriculum content, behavior, and attendance***
  - Develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers).
  - Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.
  - ***Identify*** appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at ***regular*** intervals matched to the intensity of ***the level of instructional/intervention support provided***.
  - ***Develop grading period or units of instruction//intervention goals that are ambitious, time-bound, and measureable (e.g., SMART goals).***
  - Review ***progress monitoring data at regular intervals*** to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify intervention and/or enrichment ***support***).
  - ***Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring.***
  - Assess the implementation of the strategies on the SIP using the following questions:
    1. ***Does the data show implementation of strategies are resulting in positive student growth?***
    2. ***To what extent are we making progress toward the school's SIP goals?***
    3. ***If we are making progress, what can we do to sustain what is working?***
    4. ***What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?***
    5. ***What should we do next? What should be our plan of action?***

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

### 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.

FCAT released tests	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach/Math Coach/AP
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability Reading, Math and Science form A, B, and C.	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
District monthly demand writing prompt	District Generated Excel Database	Writing committee, individual teachers and AP
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach, AP, <b>Reading Committee, PSLT</b>
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL Resource Teacher
DRA-2	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

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

As the District's **RtI Committee/RtI Facilitators** develop(s) resources and staff development trainings on PS/RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions, **as identified by teacher needs assessment and/or EET evaluation data**, will occur during faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. **The Leadership Team will send school team representatives to ongoing PS/RtI trainings/support sessions that are offered district-wide.** Our school will invite our area RtI Facilitator to visit quarterly (**or as needed**) to review our progress in implementation of PS/RtI and provide on-site coaching and support to our Leadership Teams/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI as they become available.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

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

- Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).
- Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.

Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement

### **Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)**

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Reading Curriculum Team

The **Reading Curriculum** Team (RCT) serves as the school's literacy Professional Learning Community. The team is comprised of:

- Principal
- Assistant Principal for Curriculum
- Reading Coach
- Reading Teachers
- Media Specialist
- Teachers across content areas (Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies and Electives) who have demonstrated effective reading instruction as reflected through positive student reading gains
- Language Arts Subject Area Leaders

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

The RCT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading *goals and strategies identified* on the SIP.

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

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

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

- Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading goals/strategies across the content areas
- Professional Development
- Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas
- Data analysis (on-going)
- Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan

### ***Public School Choice***

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

*Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.*

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

***\*Grades 6-12 Only*** Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

***\*High Schools Only***

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(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?

***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](#).

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

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Reading Goals**

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

<b>Reading Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>	1A.1. There is a minimal amount of higher order questioning in our daily instruction of shared reading. -Reading Coach is split between two schools.	1A.1. Our teachers are going to plan text based responses using FCAT 2.0 questions stems and text dependent questions. The reading coach will provide samples of text dependent questions.	1A.1. During monthly PLC's, grade level teachers will participate with data chats. Minutes will be logged and turned in to Administration for review. Administration will provide written feedback monthly based on the Administrator's Reading Walkthrough Checklist before PLC's so teachers can reflect on comments given.	1A.1. Teachers reflect on evidence of learning and understanding and used this knowledge to drive teacher instruction.	1A.1. DRA beginning and middle of year. -written responses during each grading period. -Fair 3x a year		

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

<u>Reading Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 69% to 74%.							
	<b>69 (199)</b>	<b>74 (214)</b>					
		1.2. There is a minimal use of building academic vocabulary in Tier 2 and Tier 3. -Reading Coach is split between two schools.	1.2. Teachers will participate and apply academic vocabulary building strategies learned through the book studies, Words Their Way and Building Academic Vocabulary.	1.2. The Reading Coach will monitor through participation of monthly book studies.  Administration will provide written feedback monthly based on the Administrator's Reading Walkthrough Checklist before PLC's so teachers can reflect on comments given.	1.2. Teachers reflect on evidence of learning and understanding and use this knowledge to drive teacher instruction.	1.2. Written responses through performance tasks through out the grading period.	
		1.3. The amount of teacher talk while building background knowledge limits our students to develop reading strategies. -Reading Coach is split between two schools.	1.3. Teachers will scaffold the instruction using processes that support and encourage students to stop and frequently think about the meaning of what they are reading.	1.3. Administration will do weekly walk-throughs to listen for evidence of accountable student talk and provide written feedback based on the shifts in reading instruction through CCSS for kindergarten and first grade teachers and NGSS for grades 2-5.	1.3. Teachers reflect on evidence of learning and understanding and used this knowledge to drive teacher instruction.	1.3. Students will be monitored during independent reading conferences bi-monthly.	



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

<p><b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b></p>	<p>1B.1. None of our students who scored a 4,5,6 on FAA Reading in 2012 are currently at Heritage                  -All of our current students are in the supported or participatory range                  -3 of our FAA students have severe visual impairments or physical impairments that make it difficult for them to accurately demonstrate their knowledge even with modifications and accommodations                  -Need to provide an organizational structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEP to determine student' progress throughout the school year, ESE Specialist will put a system in place for this school</p>	<p>1B.1. Student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of student's IEP goals, strategies, modifications and accommodation s.                  -Throughout the school year teachers of Access Points classes will review student's IEP's to ensure that IEPs are being implemented consistently and with fidelity.                  -Teachers (both individually and in PLC's) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP strategies and modifications into lessons.</p>	<p>1B.1. Principal                  Assistant Principal                  ESE Specialist</p>	<p>1B.1. Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction                  Using individual teacher data, PLC's will reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction</p>	<p>1B.1. IEP Progress Reports Quarterly                  Report card review with AP and ESE Specialist quarterly                  ESE Team developed checklist for effective evaluation of Access Points goals reviewed quarterly</p>		
--	---	--	---	---	---	--	--

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

	year.					
<b>Reading Goal #1B:</b>	<b>2012 Current</b>	<b>2013 Expected</b>				
	<u>Level of</u>	<u>Level of</u>				
	<u>Performance:*</u>	<u>Performance:*</u>				
The percentage of students scoring a Level 4,5 and 6 on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by1 %						
	<b>45%()</b>	<b>46 %()</b>				
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.</b></p>	<p>2.1. There is a minimal amount of higher order questioning in our daily instruction of shared reading. Reading Coach is split between two schools.</p>	<p>2.1. Our teachers are going to plan text based responses using FCAT 2.0 questions stems and text dependent questions. The reading coach will provide text dependent questions.</p>	<p>2.1 During monthly PLC's, grade level teachers will participate with data chats.  Minutes will be logged and turned in to Administration for review.  Administration will provide written feedback monthly based on the Administrator's Reading Walkthrough Checklist before PLC's so teachers can reflect on comments given.</p>	<p>2.1 Teachers reflect on evidence of learning and understanding and used this knowledge to drive teacher instruction..</p>	<p>2.1. DRA and written responses each grading period. -Fair 3x a year</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #2A:</u>  In grades 3-5, the percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 35% to 43%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	<b>35% (101)</b>	<b>43% (124)</b>					
		2.2. There is a minimal use of building academic vocabulary in Tier 2 and Tier 3. Reading Coach is split between two schools.	2.2 Teachers will participate and apply academic vocabulary building strategies learned through the book studies, Words Their Way and Building Academic Vocabulary..	2.2. The Reading Coach will monitor through participation of monthly book studies.	2.2. Teachers reflect on evidence of learning and understanding and used this knowledge to drive teacher instruction.	2.2. Written responses through performance tasks through out the grading period.	
		2.3 The amount of teacher talk while building background knowledge limits our students to develop reading strategies. Reading Coach is split between two schools.	2.3 Teachers will scaffold the instruction using processes that support and encourage students to stop and frequently think about the meaning of what they are reading.	2.3 Administration will do weekly walk-throughs to listen for evidence of accountable student talk and provide written feedback based on the shifts in reading instruction through CCSS for kindergarten and first grade teachers and NGSS for grades 2-5.	2.3 Teachers reflect on evidence of learning and understanding and used this knowledge to drive teacher instruction.	2.3 Students will be monitored during independent reading conferences bimonthly.	
	45						
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: The calculated points of students making learning gains in reading.</b>	3.1. There is a minimal amount of higher order questioning in our daily instruction of shared reading. Reading Coach is split between two schools.	3.1. Our teachers are going to plan text based responses using FCAT 2.0 questions stems and text dependent questions. The reading coach will provide text dependent questions.	3.1. During monthly PLC's, grade level teachers will participate with data chats. Minutes will be logged and turned in to Administration for review. Administration will provide written feedback monthly based on the Administrator's Reading Walkthrough Checklist before PLC's so teachers can reflect on comments given.	3.1. Teachers reflect on evidence of learning and understanding and used this knowledge to drive teacher instruction..	3.1. DRA and written responses each grading period.		
<b>Reading Goal #3A:</b> In grades 3-5, the percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 68% to 74%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>68% (197)</b>	<b>74%(214)</b>					

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

		<p>3.2. There is a minimal use of building academic vocabulary in Tier 2 and Tier 3. Reading Coach is split between two schools.</p>	<p>3.2. Teachers will participate and apply academic vocabulary building strategies learned through the book studies, Words Their Way and Building Academic Vocabulary..</p>	<p>3.2. The Reading Coach will monitor through participation of monthly book studies.</p>	<p>3.2. Teachers reflect on evidence of learning and understanding and used this knowledge to drive teacher instruction.</p>	<p>3.2. Written responses through performance tasks.</p>	
		<p>3.3. The amount of teacher talk while building background knowledge limits our students to develop reading strategies.  Reading Coach is split between two schools.</p>	<p>3.3. Teachers will scaffold the instruction using processes that support and encourage students to stop and frequently think about the meaning of what they are reading.</p>	<p>3.3. Administration will do weekly walk-throughs to listen for evidence of accountable student talk. and provide written feedback based on the shifts in reading instruction through CCSS for kindergarten and first grade teachers and NGSS for grades 2-5.</p>	<p>3.3. Teachers reflect on evidence of learning and understanding and used this knowledge to drive teacher instruction.</p>	<p>3.3. Students will be monitored during independent reading conferences bimonthly.</p>	

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

<p><b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>2B.1.</p>	<p>2B.1.                  Student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of student's IEP goals, strategies, modifications and accommodations.                   -Throughout the school year teachers of Access Points classes will review student's IEP's to ensure that IEPs are being implemented consistently and with fidelity.                   -Teachers (both individually and in PLC's) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP strategies and modifications into</p>	<p>1B.1.                  Principal                  Assistant Principal                  ESE Specialist</p>	<p>1B.1.                  Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction                   Using individual teacher data, PLC's will reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction</p>	<p>1B.1.                  IEP Progress Reports Quarterly                   Report card review with AP and ESE Specialist quarterly                   ESE Team developed checklist for effective evaluation of Access Points goals reviewed quarterly</p>		
--	--------------	---	--	---	--	--	--



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

Reading Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 7 on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%							
	N/A not enough students	N/A not enough students					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>4. FCAT 2.0 The calculated points of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>	4.1. There is a minimal amount of higher order questioning in our daily instruction of shared reading.  Reading Coach is split between two schools.	4.1. Our teachers are going to plan text based responses using FCAT 2.0 questions stems and text dependent questions. The reading coach will provide text dependent questions.	4.1. During monthly PLC's, grade level teachers will participate with data chats.  Minutes will be logged and turned in to Administration for review.  Administration will provide written feedback monthly based on the Administrator's Reading Walkthrough Checklist before PLC's so teachers can reflect on comments given.	4.1 Teachers reflect on evidence of learning and understanding and used this knowledge to drive teacher instruction...	4.1 DRA and written responses each grading period.		
<b>Reading Goal #4:</b>  In grades 3-5, the percentage of students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 74% to 75%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>74% (214)</b>	<b>75%(217)</b>					

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

		<p>4.2. There is a minimal use of building academic vocabulary in Tier 2 and Tier 3.  Reading Coach is split between two schools.</p>	<p>4.2 Teachers will participate and apply academic vocabulary building strategies learned through the book studies, Words Their Way and Building Academic Vocabulary...</p>	<p>4.2. The Reading Coach will monitor through participation of monthly book studies.</p>	<p>4.2. Teachers reflect on evidence of learning and understanding and used this knowledge to drive teacher instruction.</p>	<p>4.2. Written responses through performance tasks.</p>	
		<p>4.3 The amount of teacher talk while building background knowledge limits our students to develop reading strategies. Reading Coach is split between two schools.</p>	<p>4.3. Teachers will scaffold the instruction using processes that support and encourage students to stop and frequently think about the meaning of what they are reading.</p>	<p>4.3. Administration will do weekly walk-throughs to listen for evidence of accountable student talk and provide written feedback based on the shifts in reading instruction through CCSS for kindergarten and first grade teachers and NGSS for grades 2-5.</p>	<p>4.3. Teachers reflect on evidence of learning and understanding and used this knowledge to drive teacher instruction.</p>	<p>4.3. Students will be monitored during independent reading conferences bimonthly.</p>	

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
<b>Reading Goal #5D:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Target goal met</i>							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	



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

		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #5E:</u> <i>Target Goal Met</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

**Reading Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b> Please note that each							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Words Their Way	K-5	Reading Coach	Various K-5 teachers	1 day per month	Monthly sharing of activities at book studies	Reading Coach and Administration
Building Academic Vocabulary	K-5	Reading Coach	Various K-5 teachers	1 day per month	Monthly sharing of activities at book studies	Reading Coach and Administration
CCSS	K and 1	Administration	Kindergarten and 1 <sup>st</sup> grade teachers	By November 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2012	EET and Administration	Administration

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

**Reading Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

*End of Reading Goals*

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

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

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

<b>CELLA Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition</b>					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>	1.1. ELLs are at varying levels of English language acquisition stage.	1.1. 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.	1.1. -Principal -Assistant Principal -District Resource Teacher -ESOL Resource Teacher	1.1. -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from: The CALLA Handbook, p. 101, Table 5.4 "Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction.	1.1. -FAIR -CELLA  During the Grading Period: -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance.	
<b>CELLA Goal #1:</b>  The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 56% to 59%.	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</b>					
	56% (34)					

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

		1.2. Teacher's implementation of A+ Rise is not consistent.	1.2. ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards increases in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through the use of the district's on-line program A+Rise located on IDEAS under Programs for ELL.	1.2. Principal -Assistant Principal -ESOL Resource Teacher	1.2. -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the CRISS walkthrough form	1.2. FAIR -CELLA  During the Grading Period: -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance
		1.3. Allocation of Bilingual Aide dependent on number of ELLs	1.3. ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards improves through participation in the following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across Reading, LA, Math, Science, and Social Studies: 1. Extended time (lesson and assessments) 2. Small group testing 3. Para support (lesson and assessments) 4. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)	1.3. -Principal -Assistant Principal -ESOL Resource Teacher	1.3. -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist or ESOL Strategies Checklist.	1.3. During the Grading Period: -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>	2.1. ELLs are at varying levels of English language acquisition stage.	2.1. 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.	2.1. -Principal -Assistant Principal -District Resource Teacher -ESOL Resource Teacher	2.1. -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from: The CALLA Handbook, p. 101, Table 5.4 "Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction.	2.1. -FAIR -CELLA  During the Grading Period: -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance.	

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

<p><u>CELLA Goal #2:</u> The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 39% to 42%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u></p>					
	<p>39% (18)</p>					
		<p>2.2. Teacher's implementation of A+ Rise is not consistent.</p>	<p>2.2. ELLs (LYA, LYB &amp; LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards increases in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through the use of the district's on-line program A+Rise located on IDEAS under Programs for ELL.</p>	<p>2.2. -Principal -Assistant Principal -ESOL Resource Teacher</p>	<p>2.2. -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the CRISS walkthrough form</p>	<p>2.2. -FAIR -CELLA  During the Grading Period: -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance</p>
		<p>2.3. Allocation of Bilingual Aide dependent on number of ELLs.</p>	<p>2.3. ELLs (LYA, LYB &amp; LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards improves through participation in the following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across Reading, LA, Math, Science, and Social Studies: 1. Extended time (lesson and assessments) 2. Small group testing 3. Para support (lesson and assessments) 4. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)</p>	<p>2.3. -Principal -Assistant Principal -ESOL Resource Teacher</p>	<p>2.3. -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist or ESOL Strategies Checklist.</p>	<p>2.3. During the Grading Period: -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests</p>



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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>	3.1. ELLs are at varying levels of English language acquisition stage.	3.1. 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.	3.1. -Principal -Assistant Principal -District Resource Teacher -ESOL Resource Teacher	3.1. -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from: The CALLA Handbook, p. 101, Table 5.4 "Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction.	3.1. -CELLA -Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios	
<b>CELLA Goal #3:</b>  The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 46% to 49%.	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					
	46% (28)					
		3.2. Teacher's implementation of A+ Rise is not consistent.	3.2. ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards increases in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through the use of the district's on-line program A+Rise located on IDEAS under Programs for ELL.	3.2. -Principal -Assistant Principal -ESOL Resource Teacher	3.2. -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the CRISS walkthrough form	3.2. -CELLA -Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios

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

		<p>3.3. Allocation of Bilingual Aide dependent on number of ELLs</p>	<p>3.3. ELLs (LYA, LYB &amp; LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards improves through participation in the following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across Reading, LA, Math, Science, and Social Studies: 1. Extended time (lesson and assessments) 2. Small group testing 3. Para support (lesson and assessments) 4. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)</p>	<p>3.3. -Principal -Assistant Principal -ESOL Resource Teacher</p>	<p>3.3. -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist or ESOL Strategies Checklist.</p>	<p>3.3. -CELLA -Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

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

**CELLA Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:\$300.00</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of CELLA Goals*

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

**Elementary School Mathematics Goals**

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

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

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

<p><b>1A. FCAT 2.0:</b>  <b>Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>1A.1. Time: Teachers might feel like they do not have the instructional time to pull small group to differentiate as well as cover the core instruction.          -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.          -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.          - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).          - Teachers have varying understand of the intent of CCSS.</p>	<p>1A.1. <u>Strategy:</u> Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, teachers use core curriculum and provide <b>Differentiated Instruction (DI)</b> as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills.  <u>Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson</u>          -PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction.          -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of</p>	<p>1A.1.          -Principal          -AP          -Math Subject Area Team          -Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>1A.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 grade book.          -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery</p>	<p>1A.1.          -Go Math! Chapter Test          -District Modified Chapter Test          -District Formative Test</p>		
---	--	---	---	---	---	--	--

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

	<p>instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?"</p> <p>-Differentiated Instruction using data from previous assessments to guide student groupings.</p> <p><b>Do/Check</b> <u>Teachers in the Classroom</u></p> <p>-PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating effective strategies and Differentiated Instruction activities discussed at their PLC meetings.</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p><b>(EET Rubric</b></p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

		3d) <b>-Math contact will provide updated information and trainings on CCSS.</b>					
<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u>  In grades 3-5 the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from to 58% to 64%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	58% (168)	64%(185)					



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

		<p>1A.2. -Teachers do not have common planning time to have grade level PLC meetings.</p> <p>-Time: teachers time in PLC meetings is divided between reading data and math data</p> <p>-Dismissal: Parents might pick their students up early which will cause their students to miss RtI group.</p> <p>-Management: Grade levels will have to alter their RtI management to incorporate math along side of reading.</p>	<p>1A.2. Strategy: Implement a school wide RtI plan for math.</p> <p>Action Plan Teachers will meet with grade level PLC to identify student needs. They will then use the 30 minute RtI time for math (alternately with reading).</p> <p>Teachers will meet with grade level PLC to monitor the progress of the groups, and change placement as needed.</p>	<p>1A.2. -Principal -AP -Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>1A.2. Teachers will use classroom data (chapter tests, form tests, prerequisite tests) to determine student placement.</p> <p>-Teachers will use the RtI processes taught at the training to assess the effectiveness of the groups. (COILE and RIOT)</p>	<p>1A.2. Chapter Tests -District Form Test</p>	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

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

<p><b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>1B.1. None of our math students who scored a 7 on FAA Math in 2012 are currently at Heritage. -All of our current students are in the supported or participatory range -3 of our FAA students have severe visual impairments or physical impairments that make it difficult for them to accurately demonstrate their knowledge even with modifications and accommodations -Need to provide an organizational structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEP to determine student's progress throughout the school year, ESE Specialist will put a system in place for this school</p>	<p>1B.1. Student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of student's IEP goals, strategies, modifications and accommodations -Throughout the school year teachers of Access Points classes will review student's IEP's to ensure that IEPs are being implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLC's) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP strategies and modifications into lessons.</p>	<p>1B.1. -Principal -Assistant Principal -ESE Specialist</p>	<p>1B.1. Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction  Using individual teacher data, PLC's will reflect on lesson outcomes and data used, to drive future instruction</p>	<p>1B.1. IEP Progress Reports Quarterly  Report card review with AP and ESE Specialist Quarterly  ESE Team developed checklist for effective evaluation of Access Points goals reviewed quarterly</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

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

	year						
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u>					
	<u>Level of</u>	<u>Level of</u>					
	<u>Performance:*</u>	<u>Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 4-9 on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.							
	55% (6)	56% (6)					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

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

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

<p><b>2A. FCAT 2.0:</b>  <b>Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>2A.1. Teachers do not have enough planning time to find additional resources to use as enrichment curriculum.                  -Teachers may have difficulty managing differentiated math groups.</p>	<p>2A.1. <u>Strategy:</u>                  Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, teachers use core curriculum and provide enrichment through Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills.   <u>Planning/ PLCs Before the Lesson</u>                  -PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction.                   Differentiated Instruction</p>	<p>2A.1. Principal                  -AP                  -Math Subject Area Team                  -Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>2A.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 grade book.                  -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery</p>	<p>2A.1. Go Math! Chapter Test                  -District Modified Chapter Test                  -District Formative Test</p>		
---	--	--	---	---	---	--	--

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

		using data from previous assessments to guide student groupings. <i>Teachers in the Classroom</i> -PLC teachers instruct students using the enriched curriculum, incorporating effective strategies and Differentiated Instruction activities discussed at their PLC meetings.					
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u>  <b>In grades 3-5 the percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from to 35% to 39%.</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
	35% (101)	39% (113)					

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

		<p>2A.2. -Teachers do not have common planning time to have grade level PLC meetings. -Time: teachers time in PLC meetings is divided between reading data and math data -Dismissal: Parents might pick their students up early which will cause their students to miss Rtl group. -Management: Teachers will have to plan lessons that are addressing the same content, however are being taught differently than in the core classroom.</p>	<p>2A.2. Strategy: Implement a school wide Rtl plan for math. In the Rtl plan, teachers will include an enrichment group with purposeful enrichment activities.  Action Plan Teachers will meet with grade level PLC to identify student needs. They will then use the 30 minute Rtl time for math (alternately with reading). Teachers will meet with grade level PLC to monitor the progress of the groups, and change placement as needed.</p>	<p>2A.2. -Principal -AP -Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>2A.2. Teachers will use classroom data (chapter tests, form tests, prerequisite tests) to determine student placement. -Teachers will use the Rtl processes taught at the training to assess the effectiveness of the groups. (COILE and RIOT)</p>	<p>2A.2. District assessments</p>	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	

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

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



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

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

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

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

<p><b>3A. FCAT 2.0: The calculated points of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>3A.1. Teachers at varying levels of skill expertise in using checks for understanding techniques -Teachers have PLCs and need to spend time planning for checks for understanding within lessons.</p>	<p>3A.1. <u>Strategy</u> The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the math core curriculum. Through PLC's teachers will discuss strategies, implementation of instruction and review data to guide daily instruction. <u>Teacher Planning</u> -PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction -Teachers need to review the instructional calendar and review the test before instruction starts. - With PLCs, teachers plan ways to check for understanding throughout the</p>	<p>3A.1. -Principal -AP -Math Lead Teacher -Math PLC Team -Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p>	<p>3A.1. Anecdotal Record of Classroom Activity Math Journal Chapter Tests Form Test</p>	<p>3A.1. District Assessments GO Math! Chapter Tests</p>		
---	--	---	---	--	--	--	--

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

	<p>lesson.          -With PLCs teachers plan to incorporate into their lessons specific strategies to check for understanding during and at the close of the lesson.</p> <p>-PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction.</p> <p>--When students have difficulty with the lesson, the teacher probes them for additional information so that the lesson adjustment accurately addresses the problem or meets with them in small groups.</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Mathematics Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In grades 3-5 the percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from to 71% to 75%.							
	71% (205)	75% (217)					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	

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

<p><b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>3B.1. None of our students who scored a 4,5,6 or 7 on FAA Math in 2012 are currently at Heritage                  -All of our current students are in the supported or participatory range                  -3 of our FAA students have severe visual impairments or physical impairments that make it difficult for them to accurately demonstrate their knowledge even with modifications and accommodations                  -Need to provide an organizational structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEP to determine student' progress throughout the school year, ESE Specialist will put a system in place for this school</p>	<p>3B.1. Student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of student's IEP goals, strategies, modifications and accommodations.                  -Throughout the school year teachers of Access Points classes will review student's IEP's to ensure that IEPs are being implemented consistently and with fidelity.                  -Teachers (both individually and in PLC's) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP strategies and modifications into</p>	<p>3B.1. Principal                  Assistant Principal                  ESE Specialist</p>	<p>3B.1. Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction                  Using individual teacher data, PLC's will reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction</p>	<p>3B.1. IEP Progress Reports Quarterly                  Report card review with AP and ESE Specialist quarterly                  ESE Team developed checklist for effective evaluation of Access Points goals reviewed quarterly</p>		
--	---	--	---	---	---	--	--

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

	year.						
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2012 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.							
	No data available at this time						
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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



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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>4. FCAT 2.0: The calculated points of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>4A.1. -Teachers do not have common planning time to have grade level PLC meetings. -Time: teachers time in PLC meetings is divided between reading data and math data -Dismissal: Parents might pick their students up early which will cause their students to miss Rtl group. -Management: Grade levels will have to alter their Rtl management to incorporate math alongside of reading.</p>	<p>4A.1. Strategy: Implement a school wide Rtl plan for math. Action Plan Teachers will meet with grade level PLC to identify student needs. They will then use the 30 minute Rtl time for math (alternately with reading). Teachers will meet with grade level PLC to monitor the progress of the groups, and change placement as needed.</p>	<p>4A.1. -Principal -AP -Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>4A.1. -Teachers will use classroom data (chapter tests, form tests, prerequisite tests) to determine student placement. -Teachers will use the Rtl processes taught at the training to assess the effectiveness of the groups. (COILE and RIOT)</p>	<p>4A.1. District Assessments GO Math! Chapter Test</p>		

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

Mathematics Goal #4:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In grades 3-5 the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from to 66% to 70%.							
	66% (191)	70% (202)					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<b>5. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>						
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity</b> (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) <b>not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>1A.1. Time: Teachers might feel like they do not have the instructional time to pull small group to differentiate as well as cover the core instruction.          -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.          -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.          - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).          - Teachers have varying understand of the intent of CCSS.</p>	<p>5B.1. The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the math core curriculum. Through PLC's teachers will discuss strategies, implementation of instruction and review data to guide daily instruction.  <u>Teacher Planning</u>          -PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction          -Teachers need to review the instructional calendar and review the test before instruction starts.          - With PLCs, teachers plan ways to check for understanding throughout the lesson.          -With PLCs teachers plan to incorporate into their lessons specific strategies to check for understanding during and at the close of the lesson.          -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction.          --When students have difficulty with the lesson, the teacher probes them for additional information so that the lesson adjustment accurately addresses the problem or meets with them in small groups.</p>	<p>5B.1. Assistant Principal Principal Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>5B.1. Teachers will use classroom data (chapter tests, form tests, prerequisite tests) to determine student placement.          -Teachers will use the RtI processes taught at the training to assess the effectiveness of the groups. (COILE and RIOT)</p>	<p>4A.1. District Assessments GO Math! Chapter Test</p>		
---	--	---	---	--	---	--	--

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of Asian students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from <u>88</u> % to <u>89</u> %.							
	88%	89%					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>							
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<b>Target goal was met</b>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		



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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
<i>Target goal was met.</i>							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u> <i>Target goal was met.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

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

**Mathematics Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b> Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CCSS	K-5	Math Contact District Staff	School-wide	K-1 November 2012 2-5 June 2013	Report back to grade level at team meetings In service records	Administration
Go Math Professional Development	K-5	District Staff Math Contact	School-wide	On-going	PLC's Coaching Model	Administration

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

**Mathematics Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Math Professional Development	Substitute allocation for classroom teachers to participate in district training.	SAC funds	\$600.00
<b>Subtotal:\$600.00</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Mathematics Goals*

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

**Elementary and Middle School Science Goals**

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

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

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

<p><b>1A. FCAT 2.0:</b>  <b>Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b></p>	<p>1A.1.                  Not all teachers of the same course give the same common assessment at the end of the instructional cycle.                  -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.                  -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.                  - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.                  - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).</p>	<p>1A.1.  <u>Teacher will implement higher order strategies into their instruction.</u>                  -Teachers will attend school-based professional development activities on higher order questioning strategies and apply those strategies in the classroom.  <u>Planning/ PLCs Before the Lesson</u>                  -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction.                  -Within PLCs, teachers discuss how to scaffold questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students for upcoming lessons.                  -Teachers</p>	<p>1A.1.                  Principal                  -AP                  -Peer and Mentor Evaluators                  -Science contacts                  -Science teachers    <u>How</u>                  PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.                  -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-through.                  -EET formal evaluations/informal observations                  -Classroom walk-through conducted by administration.</p>	<p>1A.1.  <u>Teacher Level</u>                  -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.                  -Science PLC's will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.    <u>PLC/Department Level</u>                  -Teachers will meet during PLC's to discuss strategies and plan for instruction.</p>	<p>1A.1.  <u>3x Per Year</u>                  -District baseline assessments                  -Mid/End of year common assessments.    <u>During Grading Period</u>                  - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>		
---	---	---	--	---	---	--	--

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

		design higher order questions to increase rigor in lesson plans and promote student accountable talk. -Within PLCs, teachers plan and write for higher order questions in upcoming lessons.					
<b>Science Goal #1A:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<b>In grade 5, the percentage of students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT science will increase from 46% to 51%.</b>							
	46% (43)	51% (47)					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	



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

<p><b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b></p>	<p>1B.1. -Need to provide an organizational structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEP to determine student' progress throughout the school year, ESE Specialist will put a system in place for this school year.</p>	<p>1B.1. Student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of student's IEP goals, strategies, modifications and accommodations.</p> <p>-Throughout the school year teachers of Access Points classes will review student's IEP's to ensure that IEPs are being implemented consistently and with fidelity.</p> <p>-Teachers (both individually and in PLC's) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP strategies and modifications into lessons.</p>	<p>1B.1. Principal Assistant Principal ESE Specialist</p>	<p>1B.1. Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction</p> <p>Using individual teacher data, PLC's will reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction</p>	<p>1B.1. IEP Progress Reports Quarterly</p> <p>Report card review with AP and ESE Specialist quarterly</p> <p>ESE Team developed checklist for effective evaluation of Access Points goals reviewed quarterly</p>		
--	---	---	---	---	---	--	--

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

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

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

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

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

<p><b>2A. FCAT 2.0:</b>  <b>Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b></p>	<p>2A.1. - Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques.          - PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.          -Lack of common planning time.</p>	<p><b>2A.1. Plan</b>  <u>Teachers will implement higher order strategies into their daily instruction.</u>          -Teachers attend school-based professional development activities on higher order questioning strategies and apply those strategies in the classroom.          -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction          -Within PLCs, teachers discuss how to scaffold questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students for upcoming lessons.          -Teachers design higher order questions to increase rigor</p>	<p>2A.1. <u>Who</u>          -Principal          -AP          -Peer and Mentor Evaluators  <u>How</u>          -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.          -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.          -EET formal evaluations/informal observations          -School-based informal walk-through conducted by administration.</p>	<p>2A.1. <u>Teacher Level</u>          -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.          -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery.</p>	<p>2A.1.          District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing          Semester Exams  <u>During the Grading Period</u>          - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)          Science Notebooks          Science Investigation Rubric</p>		
---	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

		in lesson plans and promote student accountable talk. -Within PLCs, teachers plan and write for higher order questions in upcoming lessons.					
<b>Science Goal #2A</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<b>In grade 5, the percentage of students scoring a level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 15 % to 20 %.</b>							
	15% (14)	20% (19)					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

*End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals*

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

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
HOT Training	All grade levels	Grade level team leaders/ Science contacts with attend district level trainings and report back to faculty	All grade levels	On going	Administrative walk-throughs or PLC meetings	Principal
Differentiated Instruction	All grade levels	Science contact/ team leaders will attend trainings and lead a PLC on differentiated instruction	All instructional staff	On going	Classroom visits	Principal Science Contacts

**Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

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

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

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

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science Professional Development	Purchase Picture Perfect Teacher resource and picture books to go with the lessons	SAC funds	\$300.00
<b>Subtotal:\$300.00</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Science Goals*



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

**Writing Goals**

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

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

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

<p><b>1A. FCAT:</b>  <b>Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b></p>	<p>1A.1. Teachers were not initially provided with FCAT Writing Assessment and scoring rubric prior to the beginning of the school year.          -Teachers do not have confidence using holistic scoring methods.          -Teachers lack common planning time to meet in PLCs to discuss common deficiencies in writing.</p>	<p>1A.1. <b>Tier 1</b> – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students’ writing skills will improve through participation of best practices for teaching writing. Best practices include PLC instructional calendars, Differentiated Instruction and effective holistic scoring methods, district modeling.</p> <p><u>Action Steps:-</u>          -As a Professional Development activity, teachers participate in assessment and rubric courses.          -As a Professional Development activity PLC</p>	<p>1A.1. <u>Who</u>          Principal          Assistant Principal          Writing teachers</p> <p><u>How</u>          PLC logs turned into administration.          -classroom walk-through observing these strategy.          -Evidence of strategy in teacher’s lesson plan seen during administration walk-through.          -EET formal/informal observations</p>	<p>1A.1. PLC/Subject Area Level will identify trends (deficiencies and growth) in student writing performance.</p>	<p>1A.1. Student monthly demand writes, student daily drafts, conferencing notes and smile/star interview.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

		discussions draw teachers to a consensus regarding student trends, needs, and scores based on connecting student writing with state anchors. -Have district resource come out and have an onsite writing training to provide additional support.					
<u>Writing Goal #1A:</u> In grade 4, the percentage of students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing will increase from 84% to 86%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	84% (89)	<b>86% (94)</b>					

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

		<p>1A.2. Teachers and students will collaborate to maintain on-going progress monitoring in writing skills.</p>	<p>1A.2. The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' writing skills will improve through teachers using the Continuous Improvement Model with core curriculum. School will implement Embedded Assessments and writing workshops in the core curriculum and monthly/ongoing formative writing assessments to monitor student progress/improvement. <u>Action Steps:</u> -As a Professional Development activity PLCs participate in discussions that share PLC data, trends, and best-practice instructional strategies. These discussions are held in both horizontal (across course) and vertical (across grade levels) groups. -Teachers and students will maintain writing portfolios to demonstrate student engagement in all stages of the writing process. -Teachers and students will engage in metacognitive reflection of embedded assessments to celebrate attainment of writing skills and goals and to identify continuing needs and adjust instruction. -As a Professional Development activity, PLCs meet and discuss data in order to implement effective teaching strategies and lesson plans targeted to meet the needs of</p>	<p>1A.2. <u>Who</u> Principal Assistant Principal Writing teachers  <u>How</u> PLC logs turned into administration. -classroom walk-through observing these strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teacher's lesson plan seen during administration walk-through. -EET formal/informal observations</p>	<p>1A.2. PLC/Subject Area Level will identify trends (deficiencies and growth) in student writing performance.</p>	<p>1A.2. Student monthly demand writes, student daily drafts and star/smiley interview.</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

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

			students. -PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.				
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

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

<p><b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b></p>	<p>1B.1 -None of our students who scored a 4 or higher on FAA Writing in 2012 are currently at Heritage -All of our current students are in the supported or participatory range -3 of our FAA students have severe visual impairments or physical impairments that make it difficult for them to accurately demonstrate their knowledge even with modifications and accommodations -Need to provide an organizational structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEP to determine student' progress throughout the school year, ESE Specialist will put a system in place for this school</p>	<p>1B.1. Student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of student's IEP goals, strategies, modifications and accommodations. -Throughout the school year teachers of Access Points classes will review student's IEP's to ensure that IEPs are being implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLC's) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP strategies and modifications into lessons.</p>	<p>1B.1. Principal Assistant Principal ESE Specialist</p>	<p>1B.1. Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction  Using individual teacher data, PLC's will reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction</p>	<p>1B.1. IEP Progress Reports Quarterly Report card review with AP and ESE Specialist quarterly  ESE Team developed checklist for effective evaluation of Access Points goals reviewed quarterly</p>		
---	--	---	---	---	--	--	--

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

	year.							
<b>Writing Goal #1B:</b> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	<u>2012 Current</u> Level of Performance: *	<u>2013 Expected</u> Level of Performance: *						
	5 students	6 students						
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

**Writing Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Rubric training	3-5	District level Employee	3-5	Year long	Follow up with administration on completing/passing of rubric assessment	Administration
Faculty Meetings	k-5	Writing contact	School wide	Monthly	Teachers will implement information given each month into their daily lesson plans.	Administration
Writing strategies	k-5	PLC leader	School wide	Monthly	Discuss/share successful strategies/ lessons used in classrooms.	Administration

**Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

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

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



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

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Writing Goals*

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

**Attendance Goal(s)**

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

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

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

<p><b>1. Attendance</b></p>	<p>1.1 Students may have unexpected illnesses.  Lack of familiarity of school attendance laws.</p>	<p>1.1. Tier 1: The school will establish an attendance committee to review the school's attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. The committee will also maintain a database of students with significant attendance problems and implement and monitor interventions to be documented on the Attendance Intervention Form SB 90710.</p>	<p>1.1. Attendance committee Social Worker</p>	<p>1.1. Attendance committee will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students.</p>	<p>1.1. Instructional Planning Tool Attendance /Tardy data</p>		
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

<p><u>Attendance Goal #1:</u></p> <p>1)The attendance rate will increase from 95.57% in 2011-12 to 96% in 2012-13.</p> <p>2) The number of student who have 10 or more absences throughout the year will decrease by 10%.</p> <p>3) The number of students who have 10 or more tardies to school throughout the year will decrease by 10%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>95.57%</b></p>	<p><b>96%</b></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>					
	<p><b>197 (ex. &amp; un.)</b></p>	<p><b>178</b></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p>					
	<p><b>142</b></p>	<p><b>128</b></p>					

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

		1.2. No meaningful consequences to parents & students. Cultural based attitudes towards school/education.	1.2. Tier 1: All teachers contact parents after the third unexcused absence. Teachers record documentation of contact.	1.2. Social Worker and Attendance committee	1.2. Attendance committee will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students.	1.2. Instructional Planning Tool Attendance /Tardy data	
		1.3. No meaningful consequences for dealing with tardies. Cultural based attitudes towards school/education.	1.3. Tier 2: Social worker and counselor will meet with students in groups to monitor/decrease tardies and send letter to parents.	1.3. Social Worker Counselor Attendance committee	1.3. PSLT will disaggregate attendance data for the "Tier 2" group and maintain communication about these children.	1.3. Instructional Planning Tool Attendance /Tardy data	

**Attendance Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring
Leadership Team Meeting	Subject area contact	Social Worker Guidance	School-wide	On going	Leadership team meets quarterly to review data Incentives	Leadership team Administration

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

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

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

**Attendance Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Attendance goal	FCAT incentives for students who are present every day for FCAT.	SAC funds	\$300.00
<b>Subtotal:\$300.00</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Attendance Goals*

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

**Suspension Goal(s)**

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

<b>Suspension Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension</b>						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Suspension</b>	1.1. There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	1. Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will continue to be implemented expectations and rules, set these through staff survey, discipline data, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations.	1.1. Principal, AP, Guidance Counselor, School Psychologist, and Social Worker.	1.1. PSLT “Behavior Committee” will review data on Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs), ATOSS, and out of school suspensions weekly and monthly.	1.1. UNTIE” ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data.  PSLT reviews observation data from school wide PBS or implementation checklist to Target areas of need.		

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

<p><u>Suspension Goal #1:</u> The total number of <u>in-school suspensions</u> will decrease by 10%</p> <p><u>Suspension Goal #2:</u> The total number of students receiving <u>in-school suspensions</u> will decrease by 10%</p> <p><u>Suspension Goal #3:</u> The total number of <u>Out-of-school suspensions</u> will decrease by 10%</p> <p><u>Suspension Goal #4:</u> The total number of Students receiving <u>Out-of-school suspension</u> will decrease by 10%</p>	<p><u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>					
	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u></p>					
	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u></p>					
	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u></p>					
	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>					



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

		1.2. Teachers being absent and not having someone to fill on for them on their assigned bus.	1.2. New bus monitoring procedures have been created to ensure seating assignments and adult presence to address any student concerns.	1.2. Principal, AP, and Guidance Counselor	1.2. Students and Bus drivers will be surveyed bi-weekly for any concerns that have not been openly expressed.	1.2. Survey of Bus riders and or Parents.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Leadership Team Meeting	Subject area contact	Social Worker Guidance	School-wide	On going	Leadership team meets quarterly to review data Incentives	Leadership team Administration

**Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

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

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Suspension Goals*

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

<b>STEM Goal #1:</b> Implement /expand project/problem-based learning in math, science, and STEM	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.	1.1. PLC or grade level lead teachers	1.1. Administrative walk-throughs	1.1. -Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and STEM elective per nine weeks. -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

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> <small>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</small>						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Project-based learning	K-5	Team Leaders	Science, math teachers	On-going	Administrator walk-through	Administration

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

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

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

**STEM Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

**Additional Goal(s)**

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

<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>1. Continuous Improvement Goal</b></p>	<p>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 on how to pull data from different resources. -Still some resistance to teachers taking the time to disaggregate the data.</p>	<p>The leadership team will become trained on Building Effective Teams. Also all staff members will be trained on what PLCs should look and sound like by district personnel. Math contact person will give a training on how to pull data from IPT and how to interpret the data to plan for quality instruction. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Leadership Team.</p>	<p>Principal Assistant Principal Leadership Team</p>	<p>“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.</p>	<p>PLC Survey materials PLC logs.</p>		
--	---	--	--	---	---	--	--



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

Additional Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that “the teachers that I work with consistently communicate assessment results to students.” (under Teaching and Learning)” will increase from 34.6% in 2012 to 37% in 2013.							
	34.6%	37%					

**Additional Goals Professional Development**

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

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

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

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

**Additional Goal(s) Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>							
<b>Total:</b>							
<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Health and Fitness goal</b>	1.1. Not all teachers will take their students out for the required amount of time.	1. Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5.	1.1..Heart Team which is comprised of the principal, assistant principal, the PE teachers, and the school nurse.	1.1. Heart Team which is comprised of the principal, assistant principal, the PE teachers, and the school nurse	1.1. Spring Pacer Test.  1.1. Teacher Schedules and Master schedule. Documentation of Teacher directed PE in teachers schedules.		

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

<p><u>Additional Goal #1:</u> During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the “Healthy Fitness Zone” (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 58% on the Pretest to 68% on the Posttest.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level :*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level :*</u></p>					
	<p><b>58%.</b></p>	<p><b>68%</b></p>					
		<p>2. Transportation of students after school.</p>	<p>1.2.The PE Teachers will organize an after school running club from November through February of the 2012-2013 school year.</p>	<p>1.2. Heart Team-see team listed above in 1.1</p>	<p>1.2. Heart team will review attendance and participation of students in the after school running program.</p>	<p>1.2. Data collection of miles and how the miles were logged.</p>	
		<p>1.3.Weather and changes in teachers daily schedule.</p>	<p>1.3.Health and Physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the school’s HEART Team</p>	<p>1.3. Heart Team-see team listed above in 1.1</p>	<p>1.3. Heart team will informally observe teacher directed PE.</p>	<p>1.3. Anecdotal records of physical activity.</p>	

**Additional Goals Professional Development**

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

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

<b>Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC's	PE Coach	District staff	PE Coach	On going	Provide information at Faculty meetings	PE supervisor Administration

*Career and Technical*

<b>CTE Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>					
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy		Strategy Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check	Evaluation Tool
<u>CTE Goal #1:</u> Increase student interest in career opportunities and program selection prior to middle school. The school will increase the frequency of career exposure activities/events from <u>2</u> in 2011-2012 to <u>3</u> in 2012-2013.		1. Provide field trips to local businesses or CTE student competitions.				Record field trips to view Career and technical jobs.
		2 Implement special speakers to visit and share with students about CTE careers throughout the year and during the Great American Teach-In.				Log of volunteers and presentations CTSOs visits.
		3.				

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

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

**Elementary CTE Professional Development**

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

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

<b>Grand Total:</b>



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

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

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

**Differentiated Accountability**

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

Please choose the school’s DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under “Default value” header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an “x” in the box.)

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

Are you reward school? Yes No

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

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

**School Advisory Council (SAC)**

*SAC Membership Compliance*

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

Yes  No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

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

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

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

Two Reading Book studies (Words Their Way) and (Building Vocabulary)	\$500.00