

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



Cannella Elementary

School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| School Name: Cannella Elementary | District Name: Hillsborough County |
| Principal: Rachel D. Walters | Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia |
| SAC Chair: Ginny Lees-Hill | 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 | Rachel Walters | Educational Leadership, EI Ed (1- 6), Mentally Handicapped | 2 | 7 | 11/12: B 10/11: A 77% AYP 09/10: C 75% AYP |
| Assistant Principal | Jennifer Ricardo | Educational Leadership, EI Ed (K- 6), | 0 | 3 | 11/12: A |

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 0.5 units | Lianna Alexander | Elementary Ed ESOL | 1 | 4 | 11/12: B 10/11: A 77% AYP 07/08: A/D 06/07: B |
| Writing 1.0 units | Judith Hosso | BS Elem. Edu MS in Edu Leadership Certified in: Elem. Edu., ESOL, and Edu. Leadership | 15 | 8 | 11/12: B 10/11: A 77% AYP 09/10: A 85%AYP 08/09: A 95% AYP 07/08: B 100% AYP |
| Math 1.0 Units | Sheri Rodriguez | BS Elem. Edu Certified in: Elem. Edu., ESOL | | | First Year as Coach |

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 1. Teacher Interview Day | General Directors | June 2013 | |
| 2. Recruitment Fairs | Quincy Bell | June 2013 | |
| 3. District Mentor Program | District Mentors | Ongoing | |

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

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---------|--|
| 4. District Peer Program | District Peers | Ongoing | |
| 5. School-based teacher recognition program | Principal | Ongoing | |
| 6. Dedicated time for teacher collaboration | Principal | Ongoing | |

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|--|---|
| None | |

Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Qualified Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 59 | 0 | 22% (13) | 53% (31) | 25% (15) | 34% (20) | 100%(59) | 1.6% (1) | 8% (5) | 81% (48) |

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.

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

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Judi Hosso | Merlin Barrett and Emily Schroll | Teachers are new to Cannella | Monthly meetings to discuss concerns and review processes and procedures |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

| |
|--|
| <p>Title I, Part A Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school and summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors.</p> |
| <p>Title I, Part C- Migrant</p> |
| <p>Title I, Part D The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice.</p> |
| <p>Title II The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training. In addition, the funds are utilized in the Salary Differential Program at Renaissance schools.</p> |
| <p>Title III Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners</p> |
| <p>Title X- Homeless The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.</p> |
| <p>Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs.</p> |
| <p>Violence Prevention Programs</p> |

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

| |
|--|
| Nutrition Programs |
| Housing Programs |
| Head Start We utilize information from students in Head Start to transition into Kindergarten |
| Adult Education |
| Career and Technical Education The career and technical support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations |
| Job Training Job training support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations |
| Other |

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

| School-Based MTSS/Rtl Team |
|--|
| <p>Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal: Rachel Walters • Assistant Principal: Jennifer Ricardo • Guidance Counselor: Gigi Gregory • School Psychologist: Sylvia Harrison • Media specialist: Tiffany Michaud • Social Worker: Melissa Fiore-Sluka • Academic Coaches / Resource Teachers (Reading, Writing, Math): Lianna Alexander, Judith Hosso, Sheri Rodriguez • ESE teachers: Margaret Myers, Lori Hare • Team Leaders • AIS Teacher: Alyce Kushner • ELL Representative: Maureen Ramos <p>(Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals for the meeting)</p> |
| <p>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?</p> |

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

The purpose of the MTSS Leadership Team in our school is to ensure high quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and using performance level and learning rate over time to make data-based decisions to guide instruction. The MTSS Leadership Team reviews school-wide data to address the progress of low-performing students and determine the enrichment and acceleration needs of high performing students. The major goal is for all students to achieve adequate yearly progress and improve other long-term outcomes (behavior, attendance, etc.). The team uses the Collaborative Culture Problem Solving Model and ALL decisions are guided by the review and analysis of student data.

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

- Oversee the multi-layered model of service delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Based on student data, recommend, coordinate and implement supplemental services (Tiers 2 and 3) that match students’ non-mastery of skills through:
 - Tutoring during the day in small group pull-outs in reading, and math
 - Extended Learning Programs during and after school
 - Intensive Reading and Math classes
 - Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Determine scheduling needs, curriculum materials and intervention resources based on identified needs derived from data analysis
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Review and interpret student data (academic, behavior and attendance) at the school and grade levels through weekly PLCs and quarterly data sorts
- Organize and support systematic data collection as needed
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
 - Implementation and support of PLCs
 - Use of school-based *Reinforcement Instructional Calendars, Mini-Lessons* and *Mini-Assessments*
 - Implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions (e.g., Differentiated Instruction)
 - Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences
- At the end of each nine weeks, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the nine weeks.
- Assist with planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of progress monitoring.
- Coordinate/collaborate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).
- Use intervention planning forms to communicate initiatives between the MTSS Leadership Team and PLCs.

The team also meets regularly with MTSS liaisons to discuss ongoing interventions.

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. The following table contains a summary of the assessments used to measure student progress in core, supplemental and intensive instruction and their sources and management:

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

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

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

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | Data Wall | |
| District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability | Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers |
| Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science Reading Formative | Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall PLC Logs Scantron Achievement Series | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers, Reading Coach |
| FAIR | Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall | Reading Coach |
| CELLA | Sagebrush (IPT) | ELL PSLT Representative |
| Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. | Ed-Line PLC Electronic Data Wall PLC logs | Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/MTSS Liaison |
| DRA-2 | School Generated Excel Database | Individual Teacher |
| Reports on Demand/Crystal Reports | District Generated Database | Leadership Team/Specialty PSLT |

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|--|--|
| Extended Learning Program (ELP)* (see below) Ongoing Progress Monitoring using EasyCBM | School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/ ELP Facilitator |
| Differentiated mini assessments based on core curriculum assessments. | Individual teacher data base PLC/Department data base | Individual Teachers/PLCs |
| FAIR OPM | Grade Level Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/Reading Coach |
| Other Curriculum Based Measurement | easyCBM Grade level Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/PLCs/Individual Teachers |
| Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs - istation | Assessments included in computer-based programs | PLCs/Individual Teachers |

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
Each PLC will receive training from the Area 2 RTI Facilitator. Grade level MTSS Liaisons will receive additional training from the Area 2 facilitator in order to monitor the work of PLCs.

Describe plan to support MTSS.
The PSLT will monitor the progress of MTSS during weekly leadership team meetings and by having one team member attend grade level PLCs each week.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

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

- Principal: Rachel Walters
- Assistant Principal for Curriculum: Jennifer Ricardo
- Reading Coach: Lianna Alexander
- Reading / Language Arts Teachers
- Media Specialist: Tiffany Michaud

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

The LLT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading strategies on the SIP.

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

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

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

The LLT will focus on insuring fidelity of small group instruction.

Professional development

Data analysis

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.

In Hillsborough County Public schools, all kindergarten children are assessed for Kindergarten Readiness using the FLKRS (Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener.) This state-selected assessment contains a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System and the first five measures of the Florida Assessments in Reading (FAIR). The instruments used in the screening are based upon the Florida Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Education Standards. Parents are provided with a letter from Dr. Eric. J. Smith, Florida Commissioner of Education, explaining the assessments. Teachers will meet with parents after the assessments have been completed to review student performance. Data from the FAIR will be used to assist teachers in creating homogeneous groupings for small group reading instruction. Children entering Kindergarten may have benefited from the Hillsborough County Public Schools' Voluntary Prekindergarten Program. This program is offered at elementary schools in the summer and during the school year in selected Head Start classrooms. Students in the VPK program are given a district-created screening that looks at letter names, letter sounds phonemic awareness and number

Hillsborough 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised July, 2012

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

sense. This assessment is administered at the start and end of the VPK program. A copy of these assessments is mailed to the school in which the child will be registered for kindergarten, enabling the child’s teacher to have a better understanding of the child’s abilities. Parent Involvement events for Transitioning Children into Kindergarten include Kindergarten RoundUp in February. This event provides parents with an opportunity to meet the teachers and hear about the academic program. Parents are encouraged to complete the school registration procedure at this time to ensure that the child is able to start school on time.

***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 | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool |
| 1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5). | | | 1.1. Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. | 1.1. Strategy Tier 1 - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students’ reading 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 model. | 1.1. Who -Principal -APC -Reading Coach -Team Leaders -PSLT How -PLC logs turned into administration weekly. Administration provides feedback through PSLT. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). -Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. | 1.1. PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in teacher grade books 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. | 1.1. <u>3x per year</u> - FAIR <u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks with EasyCBM) |
| <u>Reading Goal #1:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 60% to 64%. | 60% | 64% | 1.1. 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. -Lack of training in best practices for reading instruction | 1.1. 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 spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 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 mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. | How -PLC logs turned into administration weekly. Administration provides feedback through PSLT. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). -Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u> | <u>1st Grading Period Check</u> <u>2nd Grading Period Check</u> <u>3rd Grading Period Check</u> | |
| Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012 | | | | | | | |

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 |
| Vocabulary Acquisition Strategies | Grades K-5 | Reading Coach PLC Facilitators ELL Resource Teacher | -All teachers school wide -PLCs | -Weekly PLC course meetings -PD on Tuesdays during PLCs -Demonstration classrooms scheduled January 2013-May 2013 | Administrative walk-throughs to observe vocabulary acquisition strategies | Administrative Team |
| School wide Enrichment Model-Reading (SEM-R) | Grades K-5 | Reading Coach Reading Resource Teacher District Resource Teacher PLC Facilitator | K-5 Grade Level PLCs | Early Release: August-December 2012 | Problem/Solving/Reading Leadership Team will monitor implementation of SEM-R using the SEM-R High Quality Indicators, along with review of student reading data. | Problem Solving/Reading Leadership Team |
| Data Collection and Analysis | Grades K-5 | Principal APC Reading Coach | All teachers school wide <i>(This PD also covers a similar strategy in math and science.)</i> | -Rolling faculty meetings (2) in September | PLST review of data | PLST |

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. | 1.1. | 1.1 | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #1: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 52% to 57%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini-lessons and NOT on the core curriculum. - Lack of knowledge of implementation of effective PLCs | Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Student’s math skills will improve through C-CIM with core curriculum and by providing differentiated instruction (DI). Action Steps 1. During the first nine weeks students in grades 3-5 will score a 70% or higher on each unit of instruction. 2. Teachers will instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies into the lessons. 3. Teachers will give common assessments at the end of an instructional unit. 4. Teachers will bring this data to PLC meetings for teachers to discuss effective strategies based on the student’s data. | Who -Principal -Assistant Principal -Math Resource How -PLC logs will be turned in to administration. Administration will provide feedback. -Classroom walkthroughs observing this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans.. | Who -Principal -Assistant Principal -Math Resource How -PLC logs will be turned in to administration. Administration will provide feedback. -Classroom walkthroughs observing this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans. | 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.) |
| | 52% | 57% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 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. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #2: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 18% to 23%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | See Goals 1, 3 & 4 | | | | |
| | 18% | 23% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Hillsborough 2012 Data CA 1 000811 | | | 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 | | | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. |

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)).

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

| Algebra 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 |
| 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 |
| SWD Co-Teaching | 3-5 | DRT | ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team DRT |
| ELL Strategies | K - 5 | English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT) | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | 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 |
| 1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science. | | | 1.3 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in using appropriate instructional, scientific and laboratory technology (animations, probeware, digital microscopy) -Administrators are at varying skill levels in using appropriate instructional, scientific and laboratory technology (animations, probeware, digital microscopy) | 1.3 Strategy Student understanding of the nature of science and scientific inquiry improves when students are intellectually active in learning important and challenging science content through the use of appropriate instructional methods, scientific processes, laboratory experiences, and uses of technology (animations, probeware, digital microscopy). Action Steps -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling technology and hands-on strategies. -Within PLCs, teachers plan for engaging exploration of science content using hands-on learning experiences, inquiry, labs, technology (such as probeware, simulations and animations) within the 5E Instructional Model. -Teachers implement the 5E Instructional Model to promote learning experiences that cause students to think, make connections, formulate and test hypotheses and draw conclusions. -Teachers facilitate student-centered learning through the use of the 5E Instructional Model. -Common Core Literacy Standards for both Reading and Writing are appropriately embedded throughout the 5E Instruction Model. -Each teacher maintains a record of the number of occurrences of engagement tasks (hands-on-learning | 1.3 Who Principal APC Science Resource Teachers (where available) Science Department Chairperson How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. | 1.3 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students’ progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | 1.3 <u>2x per year</u> District-level baseline and mid-year tests <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Unit assessments |
| Science Goal #1: | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 36% to 40%. | 36% | 40% | | | | | |
| Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012 | | | | | | | |

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 |
| Technology and Hands-On Activities (animations/Gizmos, scientific probeware, laboratory technology) | Grades k- 5 | Science Coach/SAL and Technology Resource | Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs | On-going in science PLCs 3 times per month | Administrators/science coach conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor Hands-On Activity implementation. | Administration Team |
| Inquiry and the 5E Instructional Model | Grades k- 5 | Science Coach/SAL and Technology Resource | Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs | On-going in science PLCs 3 times per month | Administrators /Science coach conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor 5 E Instructional Model lessons. | Administration Team |
| Close Reading | Grades k- 5 | Reading Coach Science SAL Reading Leadership Team | Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs | One PLC meeting per month | Reading Coach walk-throughs | Administration Team & Reading Coach |

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. | | | <p>-Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing.</p> <p>-Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction.</p> <p>-All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.</p> | <p>Strategy Students’ use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers’ Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing.</p> <p>Action Steps -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period.</p> <p>Plan: -Professional Development for updated rubric courses -Professional Development for instructional delivery of mode-specific writing -Training to facilitate data-driven PLCs -Using data to identify trends and drive instruction -Lesson planning based on the needs of students</p> <p>Do: -Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points -Daily/ongoing conferencing</p> <p>Check: Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes -PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs</p> <p>Act: -Receive additional professional development in areas of need -Seek additional professional knowledge through book studies/research -Spread the use of effective practices across the school based on evidence shown in the best practice of others -Use data to inform instruction</p> | <p><u>Who</u> Principal Writing Resource Teacher</p> <p><u>How Monitored</u> -PLC logs -Classroom walk-throughs Observation Form</p> | See “Check” & “Act” action steps in the strategies column | <p>1.1. Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios</p> |
| <u>Writing/LA Goal #1:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 82% to 87%. | 82% | 87% | | | | | |
| Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012 | | | | | | | |

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 Holistic Scoring Training | 2-5 | PLC facilitators Writing Resource teacher | Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams | On-going | PLC logs turned into administration | Principal APLC Facilitators |
| Mode-based Writing Training | 3-5 | PLC facilitators Writing resource teacher | Language Arts Teachers | On-going | -Administration walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration | Principal PLC Facilitators |
| | | | | | | |

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

| Attendance Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Attendance | | | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1. | 1.1 | 1.1. |
| Attendance Goal #1: | <u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u> | <p>Most students with significant absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance.</p> <p>Attendance Committee needs to meet on a regular basis throughout the school year.</p> | <p>Tier 1 – The school will establish and attendance committee comprised of administrators, school counselor, social worker and other relevant personnel to review the school’s attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. Each classroom teacher will have their own strategy for attendance & tardies to assist in reaching the school-wide attendance goal of 96%. If a student is absent for 2 consecutive days, the teacher will make a phone call sharing concern with the parent about their child missing school.</p> <p>Tier 2 - At the end of each 9 week grading period, teachers will have documented a parent conference (in-person or by phone) for any student with 5 or more total absences for that 9 weeks.</p> <p>At any point within the school year, teachers will report any student with 10 or more total absences to the school Social Worker so that a “Doctor’s Note Required” letter from the principal may be considered.</p> <p>At any point within the school year, teachers will fill out a “School Attendance Intervention” form for any student with 10 or more unexcused absences so that that student’s name will be brought before the CST to recommend an official referral to the school Social Worker for attendance issues</p> | <p>Attendance Committee will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the Principal on a monthly basis and shared with the faculty.</p> <p>Social Worker Guidance Counselor PSLT Teachers</p> <p>Principal and Asst. Principal – during report card checks (quarterly)</p> <p>Social Worker Counselor</p> | <p>Attendance Committee and the PSLT will disaggregate attendance data for the “Tier 2” group along with the guidance counselor and social worker and maintain communication about these children.</p> | <p>Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data Ed Connect</p> |
| 1. The attendance rate will increase from 95.15% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013. | 95.15% | 96% | | | | | |
| 2. The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease by 25% (67 in 2012 to 50 in 2013) | <u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Unexcused Absences (10 or more)</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Unexcused Absences (10 or more)</u> | | | | | |
| | 71 | 50 | | | | | |
| 3. The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 25%. (192 in 2012 to 144 in 2013) | <u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Unexcused Tardies to School (10 or more)</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Unexcused Tardies to School (10 or more)</u> | | | | | |
| | 192 | 144 | | | | | |
| 4. The number of students who have 25 or more total absences (excused and unexcused) throughout the school year will decrease by 25% (67 in 2012 to 50 in 2013) | | | | | | | |

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

| 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)

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

| 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 | | | Our school does not have a clear school-wide system for reinforcing students specifically for following expectations and rules. | PSLT will develop a system for classroom teachers and other staff to reward students for following expectations and rules. | PSLT PSLT – reviews subgroup proposal and allocates funds/resources as needed | PSLT with review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions monthly. | “UNTIE” ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data |
| Suspension Goal #1: | <u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u> | | | | | |
| The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease from 21 in 2011- 2012to 18 in 2012-2013. | 21 | 18 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> | | | | | |
| The total number of Out-of-Suspensions will decrease from 14 in 2011-2012 to 12 in 2012-2013. | 19 | 15 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | | | | | |
| The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspension will decrease from 8 in 2011- 2012 to 6 in 2012-2013. | 14 | 12 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School</u> | | | | | |
| | 8 | 6 | | | | | |
| | | | 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 |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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 | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i> | | | | | | |
| 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. |
| | | | 1.3. | 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 | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Parent Involvement Goal #1: | | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | <u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 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 | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Parent Involvement Goal #2: | | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | <u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 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. | 1.1. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the PE Teachers 2 times per week. | 1.1. PE Coaches. | 1.1. Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ) | 1.1. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health. | |
| 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” (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from <u>65</u> % on the Pretest to <u>70</u> % on the Posttest. | 65% | | | | | | 75% |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 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 |
|---|
|---|

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

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

| Additional Goal(s) | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Continuous Improvement Goal | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| <u>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level :*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> | -Teachers have not worked together on teams for many years -Not enough time to get to know team members | -Teachers will participate in teambuilding activities during faculty meetings. -Teachers will use Monday afternoons as designated planning times | Administration | Team Leaders will share feedback at monthly meetings | Teacher survey results through google docs. |
| The percentage of teachers who agree with the indicator that “The school has a culture of collegiality and trust” will increase from 64% in 2012 to 75% in 2013. | 64% | 75% | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

| 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 | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | | | | | |

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

| | | PLC Leader | school-wide) | Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | | |
|--|--|------------|--------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9). | | | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. |
| Reading Goal A: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 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: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. |
| | | | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | |

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

| CELLA Goals | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|-------------------------|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking. | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from <u>65</u> % to <u>70</u> %. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 65% | | See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 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. |
| CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from <u>30</u> % to <u>35</u> %. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : 30% | | See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 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. |
| Revised July, 2012 CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 20% | | See³⁷ Reading | | | |
| | | | | | | |

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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 |
|--|--|---|---------------------|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| 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. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 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. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 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 | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| 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:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| | | | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. |
| | | | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. |

NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

| 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. | |

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

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

| 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: Implement/Robotics learning in math and science | 1.1 Need common planning time for math, science, teachers Need to schedule the use of the robotics lab between three teachers/six classes | 1.1 -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established. -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs. -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc. | 1.1 PLC or grade level lead -Subject Area Leaders | 1.1 Administrative/SAL walk-throughs | 1.1 Logging number of robotics lessons during a nine week period. Share data with teachers. |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

STEM Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Robotics | 5 | 5 th grade team leader | 5 th grade science teachers | Monthly trainings | Administrative walkthroughs during robotics instruction PLC minutes | Administrators |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

| CTE Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| | 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 |
| <p>Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:</p> <p>CTE Goal #1: Increase student interest in career opportunities and program selection prior to middle school. The school will increase the frequency of career exposure activities/events from 113 in 2011-2012 to 200 in 2012-2013.</p> | 1.1. Teachers do not have designated time to teach career goals | 1.1. Provide field trips to local businesses Uses career worksheets, websites, videos, and other career activities Implement special speakers to visit and share with students throughout the year and during the Great American Teach-In Administer career surveys to the students to see interest areas of focus | 1.1. AP – field trip logs Counselor – lesson plans Coordinator of Teach-In, speakers log Counselor – survey data | 1.1. | 1.1. Documented field trips Calendar of career activities presented Log of career assemblies/presentations Career survey data |
| | 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 | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Priority | <input type="checkbox"/> Focus | <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent |

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

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

| 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 | | | |