Florida Department of Education

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Stowers Elementary School	District Name: Hillsborough County
Principal: Catherine Lennard	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Dustin Robinson	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data:

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

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Highly Qualified Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Catherine Lennard	M.Ed. Leadership	4	11	06-07-A 07-08-B 08-09-A 09-10-A 10-11-A 11-12-A
Assistant Principal					

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Megan Goode	Elem Ed K-6 ESOL	2	2	11/12: A 10/11: A

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Creating strong administrative support to increase collaboration and alleviate conflict between teachers' needs and administrator's expectations	Catherine Lennard	On-going	
2. Attend Teacher Interview Day to publicize and recruit teachers	Catherine Lennard	June 2013	
3. Eliminating self-contained special education classes and integrating special education students in all other classes, then using special education teachers as Resource Teachers to support content area certified teachers	Catherine Lennard	On-going	

4. Departmentalizing instruction: For example, using one teacher for math and science and another teacher for Lang. Arts and social studies, with each teacher endorsed in at least one of the two subject areas	Catherine Lennard	On-going	
5. Partner new teachers with veteran staff	Catherine Lennard	On-going	
6. Regular Time for Teacher Collaboration	Catherine Lennard	On-going	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly qualified.	**Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective**
1	Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented. **Administrators** Meet with the teachers at least four times per year to discuss progress on: ● Preparing and taking the certification exam ● Completing classes need for certification ● Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers ● Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s) **Reading Coach** The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis

Staff Demographics

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

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
61	3% (2)	26% (16)	52% (32)	18% (11)	34% (21)	98% (60)	3% (2)	10% (6)	52% (32)

Teacher Mentoring Program

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring

			Activities
Tamala Geiger	Dustin Robinson Jennifer Page John Michels Kathryn Scarmato Lauren Williamson	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem solving.

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D

Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

• Principal

• Assistant Principal

• Guidance Counselor

• School Psychologist

• Social Worker

• Reading Coach

• ESE teacher

• SAC Chair

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

The school RTI Team focuses on developing and maintaining a problem-solving system to ensure optimal student achievement for all students.

The team meets biweekly. Examples of activities during biweekly meetings include reviewing student data (screening, progress monitoring). The review of data will facilitate identification of students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, or who are at moderate or high risk for not achieving benchmarks. Based on evaluation of data and identification of student needs the team will identify professional development and resources needed.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?
All members of the RtI Team met with our School Advisory Council committee to help develop this School Improvement Plan. The Team provided the SAC with data from the 2011-2012 school year. Once the data was explained, the Team helped facilitate a discussion on how to write measurable student-friendly objectives, how to increase academic rigor, how to increase student engagement, and how to differentiate instruction for struggling students.

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.
Baseline data are obtained through the FAIR assessment and previous test information. The data is made available through the use of the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network. Progress Monitoring is obtained through the administration of FAIR, Curriculum Based Measurements, Writes Upon Request, and other FCAT simulation assessments. Midyear data is obtained through FAIR assessments, Writes Upon Request, and other FCAT simulation assessments. End of year data is obtained through FAIR, FCAT, and SAT.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
Describe plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

NCLB Public School Choice

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

*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 (b) F.S

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

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.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).	1.1. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	1.1. Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas Reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in grappling with complex text. Teachers need to understand how to select/identify complex text, shift the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and share complex texts with all students. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation. <u>Action Steps</u> Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <u>How</u> -Reading PLC Logs -Language Arts PLC Logs -Social Studies PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/ or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		
<u>Reading Goal #1:</u> In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 73% to 76%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

	73%	**76%**					
		1.2. -Teachers' knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	1.2. Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas Common Core Questions of all types and levels are necessary to scaffold students' understanding of complex text. Teachers need to understand and use higher-order, text-dependent questions at the word/ phrase, sentence, and paragraph/passage levels (Webb's, Bloom, Costas). Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Scaffolding of students' grappling with complex text through well-crafted text-dependent question assists students in discovering and achieving deeper understanding of the author's meaning. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation. <u>Action Steps</u> Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.2. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach <u>How</u> -Reading PLC Logs -Language Arts PLC Logs -Social Studies PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.	1.2. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC Level</u> -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.2. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)	

		1.3. Teachers' knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	1.3. Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas Teachers need to understand how to design and deliver a close reading lesson. Student reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in close reading instruction using complex text. Specific close reading strategies include: 1) multiple readings of a passage 2) asking higher-order, text-dependent questions, 3) writing in response to reading and 4) engaging in text-based class discussion. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation. <u>Action Steps</u> Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.3. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <u>How</u> -Reading Logs -Language Arts Logs -Social Studies Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.	1.3. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.3. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.	2.1.	2.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Reading Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 45% to 48%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	45%	**48%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

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

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

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.	3.1. PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log	3.1. Strategy Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1.What is it we expect them to learn? 2.How will we if they have learned it? 3.How will we respond if they don't learn? 4.How will we respond if they already know it? Actions/Details -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log.	3.1. Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/ or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	3.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, and/or leadership team.	3.1. 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)		

		-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.					
Reading Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 74 points to 77 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	74%	**77%**					

		3.2. -Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.	3.2. <u>Strategy/Task</u> Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction. <u>Actions/Details</u> Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/ work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. In the classroom -During the lessons, students are involved in flexible grouping techniques <u>PLCs After Instruction</u> -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Teachers use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation.	3.2. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	3.2. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	3.2. 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)	

		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4.1. -Scheduling time for the principal to meet with the reading coach on a regular basis. -Teachers' willingness to accept support from the coach.	4.1. Strategy Across all Content Areas Strategy/Task Student achievement improves through teachers' collaboration with the reading coach in all content areas. Actions/Details Reading Coach -The reading coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the teacher's student past and/or present data. -The reading coach rotates through all subjects' PLCs to: --Facilitate lesson planning that embeds rigorous tasks --Facilitate development, writing, selection of higher-order, text-dependent questions/activities, with an emphasis on Webb's Depth of Knowledge question	4.1. Who Administration How -Review of coach's log -Review of coach's log of support to targeted teachers. -Administrative walk-throughs of coaches working with teachers (either in classrooms, PLCs or planning sessions)	4.1. -Tracking of coach's participation in PLCs. -Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, de-debriefing, professional development, and walk throughs) -Administrator-Instructional Coach meetings to review log and discuss action plan for coach for the upcoming two weeks	4.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)		

		hierarchy --Facilitate the identification, selection, development of rigorous core curriculum common assessments --Facilitate core curriculum assessment data analysis --Facilitate the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students. -Using walk-through data, the academic coach and administration identify teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing. -The academic coach trains each subject area PLC on how to facilitate their own PLC using structured protocols. -Throughout the school year, the academic coach/ administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This data is used for					

		future professional development, both individually and as a department. Leadership Team and Coach -The reading coach meets with the principal to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year. -Every two weeks, the reading coach meets with the principal to: --Review log and work accomplished and --Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks.					
Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 71 points to 74 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	71%	**74%**					

		4.2. -The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis. -Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP. -Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.	4.2. Strategy Students' reading comprehension improves through receiving ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills that are not at the mastery level. Action Steps -Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered. -ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level. -Students attend ELP sessions. -Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher. -When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program	4.2. Who Administrators How Monitored Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.	4.2. Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.	4.2. Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) (From District RtI/ Problem Solving Facilitators.)	
		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
Reading Goal #5: **In grades 3-5, 76% of all students will be proficient on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.**							

5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5A.1. White**:** **N** Black: **N** Hispanic: **N** Asian: **Y** American Indian: N/A	5A.1. **White:** The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 74% to 77% **Black:** The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 55% to 60% **Hispanic:** The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 75% to 78% **Asian:** The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 82% to 84%	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.		

Reading Goal #5A: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. **See 1.1**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: 74 Black: 55 Hispanic: 75 Asian: 82 American Indian: N/A	White: 77 Black: 60 Hispanic: 78 Asian: 84 American Indian: N/A					
		5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
Reading Goal #5B: In grades 3-5, 60% of economically disadvantaged all curriculum students will score a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 4%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	55%	**60%**					

		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. -ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses.	5C.1. Strategy ELLs (LYs/LFs) reading comprehension will improve through core content teachers (Reading, Language Arts, Science, Social Studies) implementing ELL strategies Action Steps Across all content areas, PLCs write ELL SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the	5C.1. Who School based Administrators ESOL Resource Teachers How Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walkthroughs. Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. PSLT will create a walkthrough fidelity	5C.1. ERTs are on the problem solving leadership teams in order to update the team on ELLs (inclusive of LFs) performance data. -ERTs meet with Language Arts PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. -ERTs meet with core content teachers during PLC meetings to review ELL (inclusive of LF's) performance data. -ERTs meet with PSLT to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) PLC facilitator will share ELL data with the Problem	5C.1. 2-3x Per Year -FAIR -CELLA During Nine Weeks Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests		

		ELL students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing and modeling ELL strategies PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating ELL strategies from their PLC discussions. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from	monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walkthrough form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.	Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks			

		the core curriculum material. Teachers bring ELL assessment data back to the PLCs. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective for ELL students. Based on the data, teachers decide what skills need to be re-taught to targeted students using DI techniques. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).					

		PLCs record their work in logs.					
Reading Goal #5C: In grades 3-5, 51% of economically disadvantaged all curriculum students will score a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 4%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	46%	**51%**					
	_	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		

Reading Goal #5D: In grades 3-5, 57% of Students with Disabilities will score a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 4%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	52%	**57%**					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional

Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Analyzing student FAIR data	K-5	Reading Coach PLC Facilitators	All teachers school wide -PLCs	Data Analysis with grade level - October, January, April	Administrator will review reading logs to monitor the analysis of student data to inform instructional decisions.	Principal and Administrative Team
Data Collection and Analysis	K-5	Reading Coach PLC Facilitators Principal Assistant Principal	All teachers school wide	PLCs, faculty meetings - Oct, Jan, and April Data Analysis by Grade Level – October, January and April	PSLT review of data	PSLT

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).	1.1. - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices	1.1. Strategy **Tier 1** - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the **Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM)** with core curriculum and providing **Differentiated Instruction (DI)** as a result of the problem-solving model. Action Steps As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based DI best-practice strategies. In	1.1. Who -Principal -APC How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be	1.1. PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data wall PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	1.1. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Nine Weeks Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments		

	before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction	addition, math teachers visit math demonstration classrooms where DI is emphasized. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to minilessons	used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.				

	(both with the low performing and high performing students).	or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 9. PLCs record their work in logs.					

Mathematics Goal #1: In grades 3-5, the percentage of all curriculum students scoring a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 68% to 71%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	68%	**71%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.	2.1. Not all teachers know how to identify student's needs from assessments. Not all teachers know how to ask higher order/ open ended questions during instruction. Not all teachers are able to attend mathematics trainings on dates available by the district.	2.1. Classroom training 2. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 3.Take strategies learned from training and discuss in PLC 4. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss HOT strategies and how they can be implemented in the upcoming lessons. 5. Teachers implement the targeted higher order questioning strategies in their lessons. 6. Teachers implement the common	2.1. Who Teacher Principal AP How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty.	2.1. PLCs – Periodic (weekly or biweekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	2.1. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing -BOY test -MYT tests -EOY test During Nine Weeks Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments		

		assessments. 7. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 8. PLCs study specifically students' responses to the higher order questions to assess students' higher order thinking processes. 9. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher order strategy implementation. 10. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.	Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. -Elementary Mathematics Walkthrough Form -Mathematics PLC Recording Document				

Mathematics Goal #2: In grades 3-5, the percentage of all curriculum students scoring a level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 38% to 41%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	38%	**41%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.	3.1. Lack of infrastructure to support technology -Lack of technology hardware -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the NGSSS Teachers lack of understanding of the new county implemented textbook curriculum.	3.1. Strategy The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through the use of **technology and hands-on activities** to implement the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. Action Steps 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers	3.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will	3.1. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	3.1. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Nine Weeks Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments		

		spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling technology and hands-on strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating strategies from their PLC discussions. 5. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 7. As a Professional Development activity, teachers use data to discuss strategies that were effective. 8. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning	be reviewed every nine weeks. -HCPS Informal Observation Pop- In Form (EET tool).				

		technology and hands-on strategies. 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.					
Mathematics Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 72 points to 75 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	72	**75**					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.	

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4.1. Teachers at varying skill levels with the FCIM model. - Teachers' implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across math classes. - Lack of common planning time to develop/ identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring.	4.1. Strategy The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the **FCIM** strategy on identified tested benchmarks *(middle school uses this as bell work).* Action Steps 1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/ or remediation. 3. As a Professional Development	4.1. Who Teacher Principal Assistant Principal How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walkthrough form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine	4.1. -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in a course specific PLC data wall. -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on each mini-assessment. PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team reviews data that includes all skills covered during the nine week period.	4.1. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Nine Weeks Benchmark mini assessments		

	- Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. - Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide.	activity in their PLCs, teachers identify and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons/ assessments. 4. Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/ calendar. Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule. 7. As a PLC,	weeks. -Another fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/ logs of targeted skills reviewed by the Administration. - PSLT will review the calendars/logs and make progress statements at the end of each nine weeks				

		teachers develop a school-based assessment that covers all mini lesson skills taught within the nine week period. 8. PLCs record their work in logs.					
Mathematics Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 67 points to 70 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	67	**70**					
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	

		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
Math Goal #5: **In grades 3-5, 71% of all students will be proficient on the 2013 FCAT Math Test.**							

5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics**	5A.1. Students not receiving academic support outside of math classroom instruction. - Lack pre-requisite skills	5A.1. Strategy The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through participation in **Differentiated Instruction** (DI) lessons. These DI lesson will provide both reteaching and enrichment where needed. Students will be regrouped for DI lessons based on classroom performance. Action Steps PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material 3. Based on classroom	5A.1. Who Teacher Principal AP How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walkthroughs Observing lessons designed with Differentiated Instruction. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walkthroughs. -PSLT will create a walkthrough	5A.1. PLCs – Periodic (weekly or bi-weekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores, teacher observations, and response through modification of lesson plans based on data are reviewed to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	5A.1. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid- Year Testing -BOY test -MYT tests -EOY test During Nine Weeks Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments		

		performance and the use of the Evaluation Tools listed in the last column, teachers provide DI lessons and regroup students for both reteaching and remediation. 4. Teachers assess the skills taught in the DI lessons to ensure mastery. 5. As a Professional Development activity, in PLCs teachers discuss the outcomes of their DI lessons and share the effectiveness of their lessons. 6. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of DI lesson planning.	fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walkthrough form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. -Elementary Mathematics Walk-through Form -Mathematics PLC Recording Document				

		7. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.					
Mathematics Goal #5A: In grades 3-5, 71% of the following all curriculum student subgroups will score a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 4%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White:69 Black:55 Hispanic:67 Asian:82 American Indian: N/A	White:72 Black:60 Hispanic:70 Asian:84 American Indian: N/A					

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

Mathematics Goal #5B: In grades 3-5, 59% Economically disadvantaged all curriculum students will score a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math or the percentage of nonproficient **students will decrease by 4%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	54%	**59%**					
		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses.	5C.1. Strategy ELLs (LYs/LFs) reading comprehension will improve through core content teachers (Reading, Language Arts, Science, Social Studies) implementing ELL strategies Action Steps Across all content areas, PLCs write ELL SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the **ELL** students will score an 80% or above on each unit	5C.1. Who School based Administrators ESOL Resource Teachers How Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walkthroughs. Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. PSLT will create a walkthrough fidelity monitoring tool that	5C.1. ERTs are on the problem solving leadership teams in order to update the team on ELLs (inclusive of LFs) performance data. -ERTs meet with Language Arts PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. -ERTs meet with core content teachers during PLC meetings to review ELL (inclusive of LF's) performance data. -ERTs meet with PSLT to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) PLC facilitator will share ELL data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving	5C.1. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid- Year Testing During Nine Weeks -Benchmark mini assessments -Unit assessments		

		of instruction.) As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing and modeling ELL strategies PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating ELL strategies from their PLC discussions. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. Teachers bring ELL assessment data back to the PLCs.	includes all of the SIP strategies. This walkthrough form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks				

		Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective for ELL students. Based on the data, teachers decide what skills need to be re-taught to targeted students using DI techniques. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). PLCs record their work in logs.					
Mathematics Goal #5C: **See 1.1**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	54%	**59%**					

		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. **See 1.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1**		

Mathematics Goal #5D: **See 1.1**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	44%	**50%**					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Algebra Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

Algebra Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a

professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Hands-On Activities	K-5	PLC facilitators	All math teachers	Course specific PLC meetings-ongoing throughout the year	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation	Principal/Administration Team
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	PLC facilitators	All math teachers	Course specific PLC meetings-ongoing throughout the year	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation	Principal/Administration Team

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.	1.1. - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum) , as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.	1.1. Strategy: **Tier 1** - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science comprehension will improve through teachers using the **Core Continuous Improvement Model** **(C-CIM)** with core curriculum and providing **Differentiated Instruction (DI)** as a result of the problem-solving Action Steps: 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the	1.1. Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Team Leaders -Classroom Teachers How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Classroom Teachers will provide monthly to their team leaders, a random set of HOT questions used in classroom content lessons. -Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C - CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans	1.1. Teacher Level PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. Leadership Team Level	1.1. 2-3x Per Year End of Unit Tests District Level baseline & mid- year tests. During Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments		

	- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). -Lack of common "Higher Order Thinking" strategies training.	students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. Teachers and staff will continue to use "Higher Order Thinking" skills learned in last year's workshop. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 4. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI and HOT strategies from their PLC discussions.	seen during administration walk-throughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.	Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.			

		5. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs and discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 8. PLCs record their work in PLC notes.					

Science Goal #1: In grade 5, the percentage of all curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 69% to 72%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	69%	**72%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.	2.1. Teachers are at varying skill levels of long-term investigations. -Not all teachers integrate long term investigations into science instruction to provide students with opportunities to collect data over time.	2.1. Strategy **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science skills will improve through increased participation in **laboratory experiences**. The goal will be to complete one lab per week. Action Steps. Teachers utilize curriculum maps, science calendars and curriculum resources to implement the lab experience in the classroom.	2.1. Who Classroom teacher Assistant principal How Curriculum maps and lesson plans turned into the AP.	2.1. Science investigations will be evaluated using a rubric.	2.1. Science investigations 2-3x Per Year During Nine Weeks Unit Assessments		

Science Goal #2: In grade 5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2011 FCAT Science will increase from 21% to 24%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	21%	**24%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning

Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	Science Contact	All Science Teachers	PLC Meetings	Administrators conduct targeted walkthroughs to monitor DI implementation	Administration Team
	K-5	Science Contact	All Science Teachers	PLC Meetings	Administrators conduct targeted walkthroughs to monitor DI implementation	Administration Team

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.	1.1. Teachers and students lack ongoing monitoring of progress in writing (skills)	1.1. Strategy The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' writing skills will improve through teachers using the **Core Continuous** **Improvement Model** (C-CIM) with core curriculum. School will implement embedded writing assessments in the core curriculum and **monthly/ongoing** **formative writing assessments** to monitor student progress/ improvement. Action Plans 1.. Based on baseline data, PLCs write	1.1. Who Principal AP Writing Teachers How - PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. - Classroom walk-throughs observing evidence of student portfolios, embedded assessments, daily learning activity tied to instruction, use of formative assessments, and student engagement in reflection. - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -HCPS Informal Observation Pop- In Form (EET tool).	1.1. PLCs - Review of monthly formative writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric. PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching 4.0 or above on the monthly writing prompt. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	1.1. 2-3x Per Year Review of monthly formative writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric - Embedded writing assessments from the core curriculum - Student portfolios		

		SMART goals for each nine weeks. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the monthly writing prompt.) 2. 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. 3. Teachers and students will maintain writing portfolios to demonstrate student engagement in all stages of the writing process. 4. Students will complete scaffolded					

		activities prior to required Embedded Assessments and teachers will share reflections of student growth or need in order to inform instruction. 5. 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. 6. 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 students.					

		7. PLCs review nine week data, set a new goal for the following nine weeks. 8. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.					
Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 90% to 93%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **90%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **93%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through

Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
		Writing Contact	Writing Teachers	Faculty Meeting		Administration Team
STAR Interviews	K-5				STAR and SMILE Interview	
Rubric Training	K-5	Writing Contact	Writing Teachers	PLC Meetings	documents, student writing samples PLC Logs	Administration Team

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance	1.1. -Attendance committee needs to meet on a regular basis throughout the school year. -Need support in building and maintain the student database.	1.1. The school will establish an attendance committee comprised of Administrators, Guidance Counselor, SSW, teachers and other relevant personnel to review the school's attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. The attendance 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) The attendance committee meets every two months.	1.1. Attendance committee will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the Principal & others on a bi-monthly basis and share with faculty.	1.1. Attendance committee will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students.	1.1. Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/ Tardy data Ed Connect		

Attendance Goal #1: **The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease from 5% in 2012 to 3% in 2013.**	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	96.28	**97.0**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	49	**45**					

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	0	**0**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

1. Suspension	1.1. There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	1.1. <u>Tier 1</u> -Positive Behavior Support (PBS) or CHAMPS will be implemented to address school-wide 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. -Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and rules. -Leadership team conducts	1.1. <u>Who</u> -PSLT Behavior Committee -Leadership Team -Administration	1.1. - PSLT /Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions, ATOSS data bi-monthly.	1.1. AP and Guidance Counselor will view suspension data and cross-reference with mainframe discipline data.		

		walkthroughs using a PBS or CHAMPS walk-through form (generated by the district RtI facilitators). -The data is shared with faculty at a monthly meeting, tracking the overall improvement of the faculty. -Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats.					

Suspension Goal #1: The total number of In-School suspensions will decrease from 1 in 2011-2012, to 0 in 2012-2013.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	1	**0**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	1	**0**					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	4	**3**					

	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	3	**2**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention**						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement**						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1:	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Parent Involvement Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement**						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

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

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

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

1. Health and Fitness Goal	1.1. Children have not had proper exposure to physical activity.	1.1. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the school's Physical Education team.	1.1. P.E team.	1.1. Pacer pre and post results	1.1.		

Health and Fitness Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
During the 2012-2013 school year the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone on the Pacer for Assessing Aerobic Capacity and Cardiovascular Health will increase from 65% on the pre-test to 70% on the post-test.							
	65%	**70%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

Professional

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
1. Continuous Improvement Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Continuous Improvement Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).	A.1. -Not enough time to meet in PLCs.	A.1. Leadership team will use teacher survey information every nine weeks to determine next steps for PLC professional development. The leadership team will become trained on the use of the PLC on the Plan-Do-Check-Act model.. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Administration.	A.1. Who Leadership team How Leadership team aggregates the data	A.1. "Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training.	A.1. PLC Survey at end of year.		

Reading Goal A: During the 2012-2013 school year, the teachers will increase the use of classroom data to evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching from 5% to 8%, as measured by the 2013 School Climate & Perception Survey.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	5%	**8%**					
		A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	
		A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	

B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.		
Reading Goal B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	1%	**4%**					
		B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	

		B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1. Lack of time to reteach necessary benchmarks.	1.1. Finding more time to review science benchmarks with students.	1.1. Who Teacher Principal AP How Assessments from ELP	1.1. ELP pre- and post-test will determine if reteaching needs to take place or can move on to other science benchmarks	1.1. ELP Assessments	
CELLA Goal #C: Increase STEM (science) Extended Learning Programs	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: **55%**					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

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

CELLA Goal #D: See Reading Goal #1	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : **37%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	

E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
CELLA Goal #E: See Writing Goal #1	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	20%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.		

Mathematics Goal F: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	
		F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	

G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.		
Mathematics Goal G: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

		G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	
		G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	

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

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

H. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Geometry Goal H: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

Geometry Goal I: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.		
Science Goal J: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	
		J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	

NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Biology Goal K: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

Biology Goal L: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.		
Writing Goal M: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	
		M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	

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

STEM Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
STEM Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to				

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

	Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
CTE Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
Priority	Focus	Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

Yes No

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

Describe the use of SAC funds.			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount

Final Amount Spent			