

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



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

### 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

## PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Tampa Palms Elementary School	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Kimberly Keenan	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Elyse Small	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	Kimberly Keenan	MA-Ed Leadership MA-Elem Ed BA- Elem Ed 1-6 ESOL School Principal Ed Leadership	16	16	11-12: A 10-11: A AYP- No 95% 09-10: A AYP- No 95% 08-09: A AYP- No 97% 07-08: A AYP- Yes
Assistant Principal	Maryann Lippek	MA- Ed Leadership BA- Elem Ed 1-6 ESOL School Principal Ed Leadership	8	8	11-12: A 10-11: A AYP- No 95% 09-10: A AYP- No 95% 08-09: A AYP- No 97% 07-08: A AYP- Yes

### **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 Coach	Talia Hawley	MA-Ed. Leadership BS- Elem Ed 1-6 ESOL	3	3	11-12: A 10-11: A AYP- No 95% 09-10: A AYP- No 95%

### **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	District staff	June 2012	
2. District mentor program	District mentors	On-going	
3. District peer program	District peers	On-going	
4. School-based teacher recognition program	Principal	On-going	
5. Opportunities for teacher leadership	Principal	On-going	
6. Regular time for teacher collaboration	Principal	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 effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 out of field/not highly qualified</li> </ul>	<p>Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented.</p> <p><b><u>Administrators</u></b>                      Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completing classes need for certification</li> <li>Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers</li> <li>Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Academic Coach: Reading Coach</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Subject Area Leader/PLC</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teachers will attend PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all.</li> </ul>

### **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
71	8% (6)	12% (9)	45% (32)	33% (24)	42% (30)	97% (69)	2% (2)	8% (6)	54% (39)

### **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
Kimberly Keenan, Maryann Lippek	Ashley Toms	The mentors have strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

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

Kimberly Keenan, Maryann Lippek	Lauren Sala	The mentors have strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Michele Winterberg	Amber Kerns	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Michele Winterberg	Allison Scribellito	The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Kimberly Keenan, Maryann Lippek, Debra Schieler	Claudine French	The mentors have strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement	Weekly visits to include modeling, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing 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 <b>N/A</b>
Title I, Part C- Migrant <b>N/A</b>
Title I, Part D <b>N/A</b>
Title II <b>N/A</b>
Title III <b>N/A</b>
Title X- Homeless <b>N/A</b>
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) <b>N/A</b>
Violence Prevention Programs <b>N/A</b>
Nutrition Programs <b>N/A</b>
Housing Programs <b>N/A</b>

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

Head Start <b>N/A</b>
Adult Education <b>N/A</b>
Career and Technical Education <b>N/A</b>
Job Training <b>N/A</b>
Other <b>N/A</b>

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. The leadership team includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Kimberly Keenan, Principal</li><li>• Maryann Lippek, Assistant Principal, ELP Coordinator and ELL Chairperson</li><li>• Shakis Farmer, Guidance Counselor</li><li>• Erica Jamison, School Psychologist</li><li>• Angela Thomas, Social Worker, Attendance Committee Representative</li><li>• Talia Hawley, Reading Coach</li><li>• Debra Schieler, ESE Specialist, Behavior Specialist</li><li>• Kathleen Ciccarello, Kindergarten Team Leader</li><li>• Jennifer Murtha, First Grade Team Leader</li><li>• Allison Serafin, Second Grade Team Leader</li><li>• Susan Hollowell, Third Grade Team Leader</li><li>• Angela Harrelson, Fourth Grade Team Leader</li><li>• Megan Boghosian, Fifth Grade Team Leader</li><li>• Elyse Small, SAC Chair</li></ul>
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 purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs at all grade levels.</li><li>2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.</li><li>3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.</li></ol>

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

4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

The Leadership Team meets on a monthly basis.

Specific responsibilities include:

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

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

- The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the Leadership Team/PLST monitors the effectiveness of instruction and intervention by reviewing student data as well as data related to implementation fidelity (teacher walk-through data).
- The Leadership Team/PSLT communicates with and supports the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by distributing Leadership Team members across the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, the Leadership Team members who are part of the PLCs regularly report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger Leadership Team/PSLT.

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

- The Leadership Team/PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
  - Use the problem-solving model when analyzing data:
    1. What is the problem? (Problem Identification)
    2. Why is it occurring? (Problem Analysis and Barrier Identification)
    3. What are we going to do about it? (Action Plan Design and Implementation)
    4. Is it working? (Monitor Progress and Evaluate Action Plan Effectiveness)
  - Identify the problem (based on an analysis of the data disaggregated via data sorts) in multiple areas – curriculum content, behavior, and attendance.
  - Develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers).
  - Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.
  - Identify appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at regular intervals matched to the intensity of the level of instructional/intervention support provided.
  - Develop grading period or units of instruction//intervention goals that are ambitious, time-bound, and measurable (e.g., SMART goals).
  - Review progress monitoring data at regular intervals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify intervention and/or enrichment support).
  - Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring.
  - Assess the implementation of the strategies on the SIP using the following questions:
    1. Does the data show implementation of strategies are resulting in positive student growth?
    2. To what extent are we making progress toward the school’s SIP goals?
    3. If we are making progress, what can we do to sustain what is working?
    4. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?
    5. What should we do next? What should be our plan of action?

**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.

**Core Curriculum (Tier 1)**

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released tests	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach/ AP
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall/Chart	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability Math Form Assessments Science Form Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall/Chart	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science Math Form Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall/Chart PLC Logs	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers



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

Science Form Assessments Monthly Demand Writes, grades 2-5		
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall/Chart	Reading Coach, individual teachers
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. Treasures Weekly Assessments, Go Math pre, mid and post assessments, Science chapter/unit tests	Ed-Line ( if applicable) PLC Database PLC logs	Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/Leadership Team Members
DRA-2	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher
Student At risk Report on Demand/Crystal Reports	District Generated Database	Leadership Team/Specialty PSLT

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.  
 The Leadership Team/will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.  
 As the District's MTSS Committee/MTSS Facilitators develop(s) resources and staff development trainings on PS/MTSS, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions, as identified by teacher needs assessment and/or EET evaluation data, will occur during faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. The Leadership Team will send school team representatives to ongoing PS/MTSS trainings/support sessions that are offered district-wide. Our school will invite our area MTSS Facilitator to visit as needed to review our progress in implementation of PS/MTSS and provide on-site coaching and support to our Leadership Teams/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/MTSS as they become available.

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

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

**Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)**

<b>School-Based Literacy Leadership Team</b>
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kimberly Keenan, Principal</li> <li>• Maryann Lippek, Assistant Principal</li> <li>• Talia Hawley, Reading Coach</li> <li>• Vicky Hopple, Media Specialist</li> </ul>

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

- Kelly Hanlin, Media Specialist
- Kathleen Ciccarello, Kindergarten Team Leader
- Jennifer Murtha, First Grade Team Leader
- Allison Serafin, Second Grade Team Leader
- Susan Hollowell, Third Grade Team Leader
- Angela Harrelson, Fourth Grade Team Leader
- Megan Boghosian, Fifth Grade Team Leader

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 goals and strategies identified on the SIP.

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

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

- What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
- Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading goals/strategies across the content areas
  - Professional Development
  - Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas
  - Data analysis (on-going)
  - Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan

***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.

N/A

**\*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.

N/A

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

**\*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?

N/A

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?

N/A

**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](#).

N/A

## 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
<b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).</b>			1.1. -Teachers are at varying levels of understanding and using Differentiated Instruction strategies. Teachers need additional knowledge of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at differing levels of understanding how to differentiate classwork/independent work.	1.1. <u>Strategy/Task</u> Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction.  <u>Actions/Details</u> - In PLC teams, teachers will review data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, to determine DI needs. -Teachers will use flexible grouping techniques to better meet the needs of students -After instruction teachers will work in PLC teams to reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons and to determine next steps. -Teachers use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Teachers, using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided. -Teachers will also work	1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Grade Level Leaders/PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses  <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration -PLCS turn their logs into administration after a unit of instruction is complete and after meetings are held. -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.	1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in their grading system and student portfolios -Teachers use the grading system data to calculate their students’ progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. <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. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -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	1.1. <u>3x per year</u> FAIR  <u>During the Grading Period</u> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
<u>Reading Goal #1:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase from 83% to 85%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <b>83%</b>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <b>85%</b>					

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

				with ELP teachers to determine DI lessons that correlate with classroom instruction.		supplemental instruction.	
			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:			<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.</b>			2.1. - Teachers vary in the knowledge in how to differentiate instruction for above level readers within a Reader's Workshop model. -Teachers vary in knowledge regarding the identification and use of effective progress monitoring/evaluation tools for readers above proficiency.	2.1. <b>Strategy</b> Students' reading comprehension, fluency, and vocabulary will increase through use of effective independent reading strategies, text complexity model lessons, and close reading lessons that incorporate strategies that include: -increased time for students' independent reading -exposure to complex text and close reading -exposure to multiple genres -students responding critically to text -instruction in and use of higher order thinking strategies  <b>Action Steps</b> -Identify students performing above proficiency (FCAT, FAIR, and DRA2). -Administer teacher training/resource needs assessment to determine support plan. -Schedule training and plan for resources. -Grade level PLCs meet and come to consensus regarding progress	2.1. Who: -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Teachers -PLC Facilitators/Team Leaders  How: -Classroom walkthroughs observing the instructional model.	2.1. Teacher Level:  PLC/Team Leader: PLCs will review data during PLC meetings  Leadership Team: PLC Team Leaders will share information/data with the PSLT. The PSLT will review data looking for positive trends.	2.1x per year - FAIR Broad Screen /Maze/OPM for fluency.  During Grading Period: -Student's written responses reflecting higher order thinking. -Treasures Fluency Assessments -Student independent reading conference forms/documentation
<b>Reading Goal #2:</b> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase from 61% to 63%.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <b>61%</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <b>63%</b>					

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

				monitoring/evaluation tools for measuring comprehension, fluency, and vocabulary. -Teachers administer student interest surveys and progress monitoring assessment to determine base-line data and areas of strength and need. -Begin whole class implementation text complexity and close reading strategies with differentiated levels of texts and genres. -Grade level PLCs meet monthly to discuss progress of implementation. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss the text complexity and close reading implementation. -Assess students with identified progress monitoring tools monthly. -Bring assessment data to PLC for comparison. Identify trends and design lessons to target instruction. -PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.			
			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:			<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.</b>			3.1. <b>See Goals 1 and 2</b>	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
<u>Reading Goal #3:</u> Points earned from students	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase from 76 points to 78 points.	<b>76 points</b>	<b>78 points</b>					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			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:			<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>			4.1. <b>-See Goal 1</b>	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase from 63 points to 65 points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>63 points</b>	<b>65 points</b>					
			4.2. -The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skills/weaknesses of the students. ELP data collection is not consistent. -Not always a direct correlation between what is taught during the day by the content area teacher and what is taught after school by the ELP teacher. -Inconsistent communication between	4.2. - Strategy: Students’ reading comprehension improves through receiving ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills that are not at 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	4.2. Who: Administrators  How monitored: Administrators will review the ELP communication tools 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) Treasures Weekly Assessments

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

		the regular content area teacher and the ELP teacher.	skills that are not at the mastery level. -Students attend a 6-8 week ELP session. - Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or bi-weekly basis and communicated back to the regular education content area teacher. -When the student has mastered the specific skill, the student is exited from ELP.			
		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:		<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b> <b>2016-2017</b>
<b>5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>		See Reading Goal #1.				
<u>Reading Goal #5:</u> The percentage of students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 83% to 85%.						
<b>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>		5A.1.				
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> The percentage of the White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 84% to 86%.  The percentage of the Black students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 64% to 68%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> White:84% Black: 64% Hispanic: Y Asian: Y American Indian: NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> White:86% Black:68% Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: NA	5A.1.			
			5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2



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

			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
<b>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u>  The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 70% to 73%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  <b>70%</b>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  <b>73%</b>	See Reading Goal 1.				
			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
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u>  N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  <b>N/A</b>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  N/A					
			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			
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b> <b>Reading Goal #5D:</b> The percentage of SWD scoring satisfactory on the 2012-2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 63% to 67%.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.			
	See Reading Goals 1 and 2.							
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>63%</b></td> <td><b>67%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	<b>63%</b>	<b>67%</b>			
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*							
<b>63%</b>	<b>67%</b>							
	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.			
	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3			

**Reading Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction in Reading	K-5	Team Leaders Reading Coach Administrators	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	-On-going -Demonstration classrooms/model classrooms for teacher observation	Classroom walk-throughs	Administrators Reading Coach Team Leaders
Text Complexity and Close Reading	K-5	Team Leaders Reading Coach Administrators	All teachers Faculty PD/PLC presentation	-On-going Demonstration classrooms/model classrooms for teacher observation	Classroom walk-throughs	Administrators Reading Coach

*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	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool
<b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).</b>			1.1. -Teachers at varying levels of understanding and using differentiated instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson and/or independent work.	1.1. Strategy/Task: Students' math achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction. Action/Details: -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. In the classroom: -During the lessons, students are involved in flexible grouping techniques. PLCs after instruction: -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Using problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLCs.	1.1. Who: -Principal -AP -Team Leaders -Math Contact Representative	1.1. Teacher Level: -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain assessment data information PLC Level: --Using PLC data, PLCs calculate/determine goal data across math classes. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data to drive future instruction. Leadership Team Level: -Data is used to drive teacher support and student instruction.	1.1. 2x per year District baseline and mid-year testing During the Grading Period: -Common assessments such as, but not limited to, pre-tests, post-tests, mid chapter tests, end of unit tests.
<b>Mathematics Goal #1:</b> The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT2.0 Math will increase from 81% to 83%.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * <b>81%</b>	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * <b>83%</b>					
			1.2. -Teachers are at varying skill levels of understanding on how to structure curriculum and use the curriculum map to deepen their students learning.	1.2. Strategy: Students' math achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Teachers use the Plan, Do, Check, Act model to help structure their	1.2. Who: -Principal -AP -Team Leaders -Math Contact How: PLCs turn in their logs to	1.2. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during the grading period goals and outcomes to administration and Leadership Team.	1.2. 2x per year District baseline and mid-year assessments During the grading period common assessments (pre-tests, post-tests, mid-chapter tests, end of chapter/unit tests

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

			<p>instructional planning. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is it we expect the students to learn?</li> <li>2. How will we know if the students have learned it?</li> <li>3. How will we respond if they don't learn?</li> <li>4. How will we respond if the students already know it?</li> </ol> <p>Action/Details: -Math teachers will administer pre-tests prior to teaching the unit. -Teachers will use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to guide their discussions and lesson planning. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlines on grade-level/content level PLC action plans.</p>	<p>administration after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administration attends targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLC is shared at Leadership meetings -Administration shares data with faculty on a regular basis.</p>						
		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:		<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b>	<b>Strategy Data Check</b>	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>				
<b>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.</b>		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.				
<p><b>Mathematics Goal #2:</b> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math will increase from 54% to 56%.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p><b>54%</b></p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p><b>56%</b></p>	<p>2.1. <b>See goal #1.</b></p>							
							2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
							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:		<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b>	<b>Strategy Data Check</b>	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>				

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

<b>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3.1. See goal #1 & 4.2	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #3:</b> Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math will increase from 74 to 76.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * <b>74 points</b>	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * <b>76 points</b>					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			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:			<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			4.1. See goal # 1	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #4:</b> Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 math will increase from 74 to 76.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * <b>74 points</b>	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * <b>76 points</b>					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skills/weaknesses of the students. ELP data collection is not consistent. -Not always a direct correlation between what is taught during the day by the content area teacher	Strategy: Students’ math achievement 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	Who: -Administrators  How monitored: Administrators will review the communication tools/logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.	Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.	Go Math assessments CIM mini-assessments C-Palms

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

		and what is taught after school by the ELP teacher.	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 a 6-8 week ELP session. - Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or bi-weekly basis and communicated back to the regular education content area teacher. -When the student has mastered the specific skill, the student is exited from ELP.			
		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:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>
<b>5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	See Math Goal 1.					
<u>Math Goal #5:</u> The percentage of students scoring satisfactory on the 2012-2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 80% to 82%.						
<b>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics</b>	5A.1. See Math Goal 1	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2012-2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 81% to 83%.  The percentage of Black students scoring satisfactory on the 2012-2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	White: 81 Black:63 Hispanic: Asian: American	White:83 Black:67 Hispanic: Asian: American				

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

63% to 67%.	Indian:NA	Indian:NA					
			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:			<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring satisfactory on the 2012-2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 66% to 69%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <b>66%</b>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <b>69%</b>	Se Math goal 1.				
			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
			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:			<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <b>N/A</b>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

			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:			<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5D.1. See Math goal 1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #5D:</b> The percentage of SWD scoring satisfactory on the 2012-2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 62% to 66%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<b>62%</b>	<b>66%</b>					
			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)).

<b>Algebra EOC Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.



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

Algebra Goal #1: N/A	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:			<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.</b>			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra Goal #2: N/A	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**

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

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

Differentiated Instruction	K-5	Administrators Math Contact	All teachers	On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administrative 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
<b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.</b>			1.1. -Teachers are at varying levels of understanding of how to structure curriculum with Differentiated Instruction as part of the Plan-Do-Check-Act instructional model.	1.1. <u>Strategy:</u> Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning using the 5E Instructional Model. Specifically, they use the <u>Plan-Do-Check-Act model</u> to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is it we expect them to learn?</li> <li>2. How will we know if they have learned it?</li> <li>3. How will we respond if they don't learn?</li> <li>4. How will we respond if they already know it?</li> </ol> <u>Actions/Details</u> Within PLCs: -PLCs will use a PLC log to monitor the following: --Guide their Plan-Do-Check-Act conversations and way of work. --Monitor the frequency of meetings. All grade level/subject area PLCs collaborate about two times	1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP - -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration/feedback provided -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	1.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration and/or leadership team.	1.1. <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  <u>During the Grading Period</u> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
<b>Science Goal #1:</b> The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 80% to 82%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <b>80%</b>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <b>82%</b>					

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

				<p>per month for curriculum planning, reflection, and data analysis.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Working with the core curriculum, within grade level PLCs teachers will:</li> <li>--Unpack the benchmark and identify what students need to understand, know, and do.</li> <li>--Plan for checks for understanding during the unit.</li> <li>--Plan for the End-of-Unit Assessment</li> <li>--Plan upcoming lessons/units using the 5E Instructional Model.</li> <li>--Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught</li> <li>--Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments.</li> <li>--Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group.</li> <li>-PLCs will generate SMART goals for upcoming units of instruction.</li> <li>-PLCs will report SMART goal data through their logs.</li> <li>-PLC, share action plan successes and challenges of the grade levels courses.</li> <li>-PLCs will adjust action plans based on teacher walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data.</li> </ul>			
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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
<b>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.</b>			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<b>Science Goal #2:</b> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 46% to 48%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	<b>See goal #1.</b>				
	<b>46%</b>	<b>48%</b>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
DI and the 5E Instructional Model	K-5	Administrators Science Contacts	All teachers	On-going	Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor instructional model.	Administrative 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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.</b>			1.1. -Teachers are at varying levels of knowing how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing. -Teachers are at varying levels of knowing how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction. -Teachers are at varying levels of knowing how to use conferencing as a means of differentiating instruction. -All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.	1.1. <u><b>Strategy</b></u> Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing.  <u><b>Action Steps</b></u> -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.)  <u><b>Plan:</b></u> -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  <u><b>Do:</b></u> -Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points	1.1. <u>Who</u> Principal AP  District (Writing Team, Supervisors, and DRTs)  <u>How Monitored</u> -PLC logs -Classroom walk-throughs Observation Form -Conferencing while writing walk-through tool	1.1. See "Check" & "Act" action steps in the strategies column	1.1. - Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios
Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a level 3.0 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Writes will maintain at 96%.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * <b>96%</b>	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * <b>96%</b>					

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

				-Daily/ongoing conferencing			
			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**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Mode-Based Writing Training/Updates	Gr. 2-5	Administrators	All teachers in grades 2-5	On-going	Administrator walk-throughs	Administrative Team
Updated Rubric Scoring	Grades 3-5	Administrators	All writing teachers in grades 3-5	On-going- Starting October 2012	PLC logs	Administrative 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
<b>1. Attendance</b>			1.1. Attendance committee needs to meet on a regular basis throughout the school year. -Individual teachers may need support in accurately using the new Ed Connects/EASI Attendance Reporting System.	<b>Tier 1</b> The school will establish an attendance committee comprised of Administrators, social worker, guidance counselor, 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 at least one time per month.	1.1. Attendance committee will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the Principal on a monthly basis and shared 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 Connects
<b>Attendance Goal #1:</b>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
The Attendance rate will increase from 96.03% to 96.04%.	<b>96.03%</b>	<b>96.04%</b>					
The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences will decrease by 10 %.	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.	<b>48</b>	<b>43</b>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	<b>172</b>	<b>154</b>					
			1.2. There is no system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance.	<b>Tier 2</b> Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, the Attendance Committee (which is a subgroup of the Leadership Team) collaborate to ensure that a letter is sent home to parents outlining the state statute that requires parents to send students to school.	1.2. Social Worker Guidance Counselor PSLT	1.2. The attendance committee (which is a subset of the Leadership Team) will disaggregate attendance data for the “Tier 2” group along with the social worker and maintain communication about these children.	1.2. Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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
EASI Attendance Reporting System	K-5	Administrators DP Clerk	All teachers	On-going	Random check of EASI Attendance reporting system	Administrative Team

*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
<b>1. Suspension</b>			1.1. -Ensuring that all teachers, students and parents understand the common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	1.1. <u>Tier 1</u> -A school-wide Good Choice Pledge system will continue to be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules. Administration will provide information 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 walkthroughs to look for fidelity. - Data regarding office referral is shared with faculty	1.1. <u>Who</u> -PSLT Behavior Committee -Administration -Leadership Team	1.1. - PSLT /Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals and out of school suspensions data monthly	1.1. EASI discipline and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data
Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
For the 2012-2013 school year, the total number of In-School Suspensions will maintain at 0%.	0	0					
For the 2012-2013 school year, the total number of students suspended In – school will maintain at 0%.	0	0					
For the 2012-2013 school year, the number of Out-of-School suspensions will decrease from 1 to 0.	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
For the 2012-2013 school year , the number of students receiving an Out-of-School suspension will decrease from 1 to 0.	1	0					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School					



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

	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>		at a monthly meeting, tracking the overall improvement of the faculty.  -Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats.			
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.		

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates 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)).

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

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

N/A	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**

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

*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
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b> Parent Involvement Goal #1:	1.1. N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*			

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

N/A							
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
<b>Parent Involvement Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement</b>				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>2. Parent Involvement</b> Parent Involvement Goal #2:			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
N/A	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**

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

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

**Health and Fitness Goal(s)**

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

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

<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>1. Health and Fitness Goal</b>			1.1.	1.1. Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5.	1.1. Principal	1.1. Classroom walk-throughs Class/master schedules	1.1. Classroom teachers document in their lessons plans the ninety minutes of teacher Directed physical education that students have per week. This is also reflected in the master schedule. Physical education teachers' schedules reflect the remaining sixty minutes of physical education.
<b>Health and Fitness Goal #1:</b> 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 73.6% on the pre-test to 83.6% on the post-test.	<u>2012 Current Level</u> :*	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> :*					
	<b>73.6%</b>	<b>83.6%</b>					
			1.2.	1.2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the principal or designee.	1.2. Principal or designee	1.2. Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone	1.2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.
		1.3.	1.3. Use of the modular playground, walk/jog activities in designated areas; and exercising in outdoor activities such as the ones in the 150 minutes of Elementary Physical Education folder on IDEAS.	1.3. Physical education teacher	1.3. Lessons plans of the physical education teacher	1.3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health/	

**Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development**

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

**Continuous Improvement Goal(s)**

\* 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

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
<b>1. Continuous Improvement Goal</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</b> The percentage of parents who strongly agree with the indicators under Volunteering and Relationship Building on the School Climate and Perception Survey for Parents will increase from 50.7% to 55.7%.			-There is still confusion with parents as to the role of the School Advisory Council	- Information will be shared with parents and community members via the school monthly newsletter -SAC dates and information shared at PTA meeting/events -Volunteer Open House will be held -Volunteer training will be held for staff members	-Principal -AP -SAC chairperson	-Parent input/survey results will be used to determine the effectiveness of our communication skill in building a strong relationship with our volunteers. Data will be shared with the PSLT to determine what procedures or communication tools need to be reviewed or revised based.	School Climate Survey data
	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	<b>50.7%</b>	<b>55.7%</b>					
			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

<b>A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).</b>			A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.
Reading Goal A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.
The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	<b>77%</b>	<b>78%</b>	A.1. -Need to provide support for on-going review of students' IEPs by the ESE teacher.	A.1. SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	A.1. Who: -Principal -AP -ESE Specialist	A.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -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. <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. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ ESE Specialist shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	A.1. Review of IEPs and teacher created assessments, core assessments
			A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.
			A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.
<b>B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</b>			B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.
Reading Goal B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.
	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.
	<b>Subgroup consisted of 9 students</b>		B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.

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

		B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.
		B.3.	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
<b>C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.</b>		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>CELLA Goal #C:</b>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u>	-ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses. - Teachers implementation of ELL accommodations and interventions are not consistent across core courses. -Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing support.	ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through teachers working collaboratively to focus on ELL student learning. Specifically, they use the <u>Plan-Do-Check-Act model</u> to structure their way of work for ELL students.  <u>Action Steps</u> -Teachers analyze CELLA data to identify ELL students who need assistance in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing. -Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL effective teaching strategies (CALLA and A+ Rise) in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing. -Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL Differentiated Instruction lessons using the district provided ELL Differentiated Instruction binders	-Principal -AP  How: PLC logs	Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use a grading system/data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC Team Leader shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	CELLA
The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of CELLA will increase from 65% to 67%.	<b>65%</b>					

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

			(provided by the ELL Department) in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies. -PLCs generate SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs/teachers plan for upcoming lessons/units using targeted CALLA and A+ Rise strategies and Differentiated Instruction strategies based on ELLs needs in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing. -PLCs/teachers plan for accommodations for core curriculum content and assessment. -When conducting data analysis on core curriculum assessments, PLCs aggregate the ELL data. -Based on the data, PLCs/teachers plan interventions for targeted ELL students using the resources from CALLA, A+ Rise, and Differentiated instruction binders.			
		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.		<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.</b>		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<u>CELLA Goal #D:</u> The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of CELLA will increase from 52% to 54%.	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u> <b>52%</b>	<b>See CELLA Goal C.</b>				



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

		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.		<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.</b>		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<b>CELLA Goal #E:</b>	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</b>	<b>See CELLA Goal C &amp; Writing Goal 1.</b>				
The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of CELLA will increase from 48% to 50%.	<b>48%</b>					
		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:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).</b>	A.1. -Need to provide support for on-going review of students' IEPs by the ESE teacher.	A.1. SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations.	A.1. Who: -Principal -AP -ESE Specialist	A.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading	A.1. Review of IEPs and teacher created assessments, core assessments
<b>Mathematics Goal F:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>			
The percentage of					

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

students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA Math will maintain or increase by 1%.	77%	77%		-Throughout the school year teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.		system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. <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. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ ESE Specialist shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	
			F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.
			F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.
<b>G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b>			G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> G:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	---						
	(9 students in subgroup)						
		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
<b>H. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry.</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal H:  N/A	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
<b>I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.</b>			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal I:  N/A	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
<b>J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).</b>			J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.
Science Goal J:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	--						
	(5 students in subgroup)						
			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

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

<b>K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology.</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology Goal K:  N/A	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:			<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<b>L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology.</b>			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology Goal L:  N/A	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
<b>M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).</b>			M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.
<u>Writing Goal M:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	---						
	(4 students in this subgroup)						
			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
<u>STEM Goal #1:</u> Implement/Expand project/problem-based learning in math and science.	1.1. Need common planning time for math, science ELA and any other STEM teachers.	1.1. Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs. -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.	1.1. Who: -Science and Math Contacts - Team Leaders -Administrators  How: Math/Science contacts will work with team leaders to create a plan for the implementation of STEM projects. Math/Science contacts will share important	1.1. -Administrative walk-thoughts will be used to provide teachers with insight into the implementation of STEM projects.	1.1. Logging number of project-based learning in math and science each grading period. Share data with teachers.	

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

			information with teachers at faculty meetings. -Administration will conduct walk-thoughts to provide additional insight into the implementation of STEM projects.		
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**STEM Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
Attend STEM fair training	K-5	Science contacts/STEM Fair Contacts	Math and science teachers	August/September	Work with STEM Fair contacts to ensure that student projects are progressing and necessary documentation is provided	Administration

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

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

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

<p><b>CTE Goal #1:</b>                  Increase student interest in career opportunities and program selection prior to middle school. The school will increase career exposure activities from 1 in 2011-2012 to 3 in 2012-2013.</p>	1.1.	1.1. Provide students the opportunity to participate in a field trip to JA Biztown to learn about best practices in business operations.  Implement special speakers to visit and share with students about CTE careers throughout the year and during the Great American Teach-In.  Implement guidance and/or APC middle school presentations/visits from feeder schools & magnets regarding CTE options.	1.1. Who: -Guidance counselor How: Guidance counselor will share related information at faculty meetings with teachers. Guidance counselor will report on status of CTE activities at monthly administrative staff meetings.	1.1. Log presentations and CTE opportunities offered to students at the end of each grading period. Analyze data to develop next steps.	1.1. Logs of CTE events and number of students participating.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**CTE Professional Development**

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

*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
Reading goals 1 and 4	Supplemental instructional materials to be used in shared and guided reading.	\$2011.50	\$2011.50
Final Amount Spent			