Florida Department of Education

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Hammond Elementary School	District Name: Hillsborough County School District
Principal: Lynn Rattray	Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia
SAC Chair: Veronica Botts	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	Lynn Rattray	Elem Ed; Guidance K-12; Administration ESOL	2	23	Hammond Elementary School 10-11 Grade A, Met AYP in all subgroups except SWD, Reading Mastery: 96% Math: 96% Writing: 100% Science: 85% 11-12 School Grade A, Reading Mastery 82%, Math 80%, Writing 96%, Science 80% Bellamy Elementary State Grade "A" for past 9 years; 95% AYP 2008-09

Assistant Principal	Sheri Norkas	Masters in Educational Leadership and Bachelors in Elementary and Primary Education	5	5	Hammond Elementary 07-08:School Grade A, Met AYP, Reading Mastery: 94%, Math: 94%, Writing: 92%, Science 80% 08-09: School Grade A, Met AYP, Reading Mastery: 92%, Math: 94%, Writing: 92%, Science 81% 09-10: School Grade A, Met AYP, Reading Mastery: 94%, Math: 95% , Writing: 96% , Science: 83% 10-11: School Grade A, Met AYP in all subgroups except SWD, Reading Mastery: 96% Math: 96% Writing: 100% Science: 85% 11-12 School Grade A, Reading Mastery 82%, Math 80%, Writing 96%, Science 80%

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	Kathryn Frankland	Elementary Education K-6 ESOL Endorsed	5	1	Hammond Elementary School 09-10: School Grade A, Met AYP, Reading Mastery: 94%, Math: 95% , Writing: 96% , Science: 83% 10-11: School Grade A, Met AYP in all subgroups except SWD, Reading Mastery: 96% Math: 96% Writing: 100% Science: 85% 11-12 School Grade A, Reading Mastery 82%, Math 80%, Writing 96%, Science 80%

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)
Teacher Interview Day	General Directors	June 2013	Teacher Interview Day
Recruitment Fairs	Supervisor of Teacher Recruitment	ongoing	Recruitment Fairs
Performance Pay	General Director of Federal Programs	July 2013	Performance Pay

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

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

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
60	10% (6)	26% (16)	53% (32)	10% (6)	30% (18)	100% (60)	6% (4)	6% (4)	60% (36)

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
Tamara Steele	Kimberly Breitenbach	District assigned	TIP
Tamara Steele	Jennifer Gilmore	District assigned	TIP

Tamara Steele	Cengiz Dokumaci	District assigned	TIP
Tamara Steele	Caitlin Massey	District assigned	TIP
Tamara Steele	Jennifer Gilmore	District assigned	TIP

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Principal – will provide common vision for data-based decision making. Ensure strategies for improvement are utilized. Communicates with parents regarding school improvement plans.

Maria Rojas – ESE Administrator – ensures that ESE staff knows and utilizes proper instructional strategies for mainstreamed ESE students, Collaborates with classroom teachers through co-instruction

Sheri Norkas- Assistant Principal, Heather Soltis – School Guidance Counselor, Nancy Welch, School Social Worker, Megan McNulty, School Psychologist and Ashley Rogale, 3rd Grade teacher - Participate in collection, interpretation and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation.

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 leadership team will be meeting once a week on Thursday afternoon. The purpose of the team in our school is to provide high quality researched based instruction/interventions matched to student needs and using progress monitoring over time to make important education decisions to guide intervention.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The leadership team along with faculty and SAC were involved in the SIP development activities prior to the 11-12 school year ending and during pre-planning at the beginning of the 12-13 school year. One of the main tasks of the leadership team is to monitor student data and monitor PLC effectiveness outlined in the action steps and suggest modifications as needed.
MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline Data: FAIR, FCAT, SAT 10

Mid-Year Data: FAIR, FCAT Practice, Formative Assessments, Monthly Writes

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT practice tests	Achievement series	Reading Coach
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series	Leadership Team/Reading Coach
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network	Reading Coach
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	Assistant Principal

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 & 3)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/Reading Coach

Other Curriculum Based Measurement	easyCBM	Leadership Team/PLCs/Individual Teachers

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

There will also be trainings for the staff during select faculty meeting throughout the school year.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

Administration will visit PLCs to ensure student data is discussed and the MTSS process is utilized for all students.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Megan Mierzwa, Jessica Miles, Lindsey Rottenberger, Becky Kuschmeader, Kelly McCormack, Karen Beardsley, Michelle Harrison, Cheryl Hadley and Kathryn Frankland
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT will meet in monthly PLCs and on an as needed basis. The team will gather student data and analyze areas of strength and areas where improvement is needed. They will also communicate with grade level members, update MTSS information concerning the area of reading, and any reading curriculum information that needs to be shared.

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

The LLT will work with teachers in order to support them in the MTSS Process and reading curriculum questions.

NCLB Public School Choice

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

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).	1.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	1.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? **Action Steps**	1.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	1.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	1.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans.					
Reading Goal #1: In grades 3-5, the percentage of students who will score a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 82% to 83%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	82%	**83%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.	2.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	2.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: • What is it we expect them to learn? • How will we if they have learned it? • How will we respond if they don't learn? • How will we respond if they already know it? **Action Steps**	2.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	2.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	2.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans.					
Reading Goal #2: In grades 3-5, the percentage of students who will score a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 59% to 60%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	59%	**60%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.	3.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	3.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: ● What is it we expect them to learn? ● How will we if they have learned it? ● How will we respond if they don't learn? ● How will we respond if they already know it? **Action Steps** Action	3.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	3.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	3.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans.					
Reading Goal #3: In grades 3-5, the points for students who will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 85 to 86.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	85	**86**					
		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:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	4.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: ● What is it we expect them to learn? ● How will we if they have learned it? ● How will we respond if they don't learn? ● How will we respond if they already know it? **. Action Steps**	4.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	4.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	4.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans.					
Reading Goal #4: In grades 3-5, the points for students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 74 to 75.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	74	**75**					

		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	
		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
Reading Goal #5:							

5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5A.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	5A.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: ● What is it we expect them to learn? ● How will we if they have learned it? ● How will we respond if they don't learn? ● How will we respond if they already know it? . **Action Steps**	5A.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	5A.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	5A.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans.					
Reading Goal #5A: **The percentage of white students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 81% to 83%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White:81% Black:NA Hispanic:Y Asian:80% American Indian:NA	White:83% Black:NA Hispanic: Asian:Y American 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:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1. See Goal 5A1	5B.1. See Strategy 5A1	5B.1. See Fidelity Check for 5A1	5B.1. See Strategy Data Check for 5A1	5B.1. See Student Evaluation Tool for 5A1		

Reading Goal #5B: **The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 60% to 64%.**.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	60%	**64%**					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Reading Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Y						
	_	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	

		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. See Goal 5A1	5D.1. See Strategy 5A1	5D.1. See Fidelity Check for 5A1	5D.1. See Strategy Data Check for 5A1	5D.1. See Student Evaluation Tool for 5A1		

Reading Goal #5D: **The percentage of SWD students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 48% to 53%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	48%	**53%**					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

Reading Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Close Reading	All/Reading	Kathryn Frankland/ Michelle Harrison	All classroom teachers	2x	Lesson plan submissions	Reading Coach
Words Their Way	All Reading	Kathryn Frankland	Optional for all classroom teachers	3x		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** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).	1.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	1.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: ● What is it we expect them to learn? ● How will we if they have learned it? ● How will we respond if they don't learn? ● How will we respond if they already know it? **Action Steps**	1.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	1.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	1.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans.					
Mathematics Goal #1: In grades 3-5, the percentage of students who score at a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 80% to 81%..	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	80%	**81%**					
		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**		

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.	2.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	2.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: ● What is it we expect them to learn? ● How will we if they have learned it? ● How will we respond if they don't learn? ● How will we respond if they already know it? **Action Steps** Action steps	2.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	2.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	2.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans.					
Mathematics Goal #2: In grades 3-5, the percentage students who score at a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 56% to 57%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	56%	**57%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	

		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.	3.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	3.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: • What is it we expect them to learn? • How will we if they have learned it? • How will we respond if they don't learn? • How will we respond if they already know it? **Action Steps** Action steps	3.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	3.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	3.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans.					
Mathematics Goal #3: In grades 3-5, the points for students who made learning gains on 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 77to 78.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	77	**78**					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.	

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	4.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: ● What is it we expect them to learn? ● How will we if they have learned it? ● How will we respond if they don't learn? ● How will we respond if they already know it? . **Action Steps**	4.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	4.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	4.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans.					
Mathematics Goal #4: In grades 3-5 students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 75points to 76 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	75	**76**					

		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	
		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
Math Goal #5:							

5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics**	5A.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	5A.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: ● What is it we expect them to learn? ● How will we if they have learned it? ● How will we respond if they don't learn? ● How will we respond if they already know it? . **Action Steps**	5A.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	5A.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	5A.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans.					
Math Goal #5A: The percentage of white students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 79% to 81%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 75% to 78%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	White:79% Black:NA Hispanic:75% Asian:Y American Indian:NA	White:81% Black: Hispanic:78% Asian: American Indian:					
		5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. See Goal 5A1	5B.1. See Strategy 5A1	5B.1. See Fidelity Check 5A1	5B.1. See Strategy Data Check 5A1	5B.1. See Student Evaluation Tool 5A1		

Mathematics Goal #5B: The percentage of economically disadvanged students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA will increase from 53% to 58%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	53%	**58%**					
		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:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. See Goal 5A1	5C See Strategy 5A1.1.	5C.1. See Fidelity Check 5A1	5C.1. See Strategy Data Check 5A1	5C.1. See Student Evaluation Tool 5A1		
Mathematics Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 89% to 90%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	89%	**90%**					

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

5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. See Goal 5A1	5D.1. See Strategy 5A1	5D.1. See Fidelity Check 5A1	5D.1. See Strategy Data Check 5A1	5D.1. See Student Evaluation Tool 5A1		
Mathematics Goal #5D: . The percentage of SWD students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 54% to 59%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	54%	59%					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Algebra Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.	1.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	1.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: • What is it we expect them to learn? • How will we if they have learned it? • How will we respond if they don't	1.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	1.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	1.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		learn? • How will we respond if they already know it? **Action Steps** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.					

Science Goal #1: In grade 5, the percentage of students who score at a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 80% to 81%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	80%	**81%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.	2.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	2.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: • What is it we expect them to learn? • How will we if they have learned it? • How will we respond if they don't	2.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	2.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	2.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		learn? • How will we respond if they already know it? **Action Steps** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.					

Science Goal #2: In grade 5, the percentage of students who score at a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 38% to 39%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	38%	**39%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

Science Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.	1.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	1.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: ● What is it we expect them to learn? ● How will we if they have learned it? ● How will we respond if they don't learn? ● How will we respond if they already know it?	1.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	1.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	1.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, intervention checks)		

		Action Steps Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans.					
Writing/LA Goal #1: In grade 4 the percentage of students proficient in writing on the 2013 FCAT Writing will increase from 96% to 97%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	96%	**97%**					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance**						
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
1. Attendance	1.1 There is not a system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance.	**1.1** **<u>Tier 2</u>** - Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, guidance and social work collaborate to assure that a letter is sent home to parents outlining the state statue that requires parents to send students to school.	1.1 Social Worker Guidance Counselor MTSS	1.1 PSLT will disaggregate attendance data for the "Tier 2" group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children	1.1 Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/ Tardy data		

Attendance Goal #1: **Students will attend 97% of school days during the 2013 school year.** **The number of students with excessive tardies will decrease from 25 to 24 students.**	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	96.33%	**97%**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	27	**26**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	25	**24**					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease						

	Suspension						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
1. Suspension	1.1 Teachers not implementing the common school-wide expectations and rules and not providing explicit instruction to students on the expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	1.1 PSLT will monitor the school-wide expectations and rules, and provide training to new staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations.	1.1 PSLT "Managing and Motivating" subgroup	1.1 PSLT "Managing and Motivating" subgroup with review data on Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) and out of school suspensions monthly.	1.1 "UNTIE" ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data		

Suspension Goal #1: The total number of in-school suspensions will decrease from 1 to 0 during the 2013 school year.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					

Suspension Goal #2 The total number of out of school suspensions will decrease from 1 to 0.							
	1	**0**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	--	**--**					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	1	**0**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	--	**--**					

		1.2 **Tier 1**: Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules.	1.2 PSLT "behavior" subgroup	1.2 PSLT "behavior" subgroup with review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions monthly.	1.2 Crystal Report ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data	**1.2** **Tier 1**: Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

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

1. Health and Fitness Goal	1.1. -Heat and humidity will not allow students to perform their best on the test.	1. Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5.	1. Principal	1. Classroom walkthroughs Class schedules	1. Information from classroom walkthroughs		
Health and Fitness Goal #1: During the 2012-2013 school year, 83.9% of fifth grade students fell in the Healthy Fitness Zone for cardiovascular fitness using the PACER test. By May, 2013, 93.9% of our fifth grade students will be in the Healthy Fitness Zone.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	83.9%	**93.9%**					

		1.2.	1.2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the school's H.E.A.R.T. team.	1.2. H.E.A.R.T. team.	1.2. H.E.A.R.T. team notes/agendas	1.2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	
		1.3.	1.3. Use of the playground or fitness course equipment; walk/jog/run activities in designated areas; and exercising to the outdoor activities such as the ones provided in the 150 Minutes of Elem. Physical Education folder on IDEAS.	1.3. Physical Education Teacher	1.3. Lesson plans of Physical Education Teacher	1.3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Continuous Improvement Goal	1.1. Teachers not updating websites.	1.1. School web site will be updated on a regular basis.	1.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal	1.1. Teacher Level Teachers will communicate with parents on a regular basis.	1. School Climate Servey PLC Logs		
Continuous Improvement Goal #1: Based on the 2011-2012 School Climate and Perception Survey for Parents,47.8% of the people strongly agree with the following statement: The school keeps me informed of activities. In 2013 the number of parents who strongly agree with this statement will increase to 50%.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	47.8%	**50%**					

		1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).	A.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	A.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: • What is it we expect them to learn? • How will	A.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	A.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	A.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		we if they have learned it? • How will we respond if they don't learn? • How will we respond if they already know it?					
Reading Goal A: The number of students that earn level 4-9 on the FAA Reading will maintain or increase from 15% to 16% on the 2013 FAA assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	15%	**16%**					
		A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	

		A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	

B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	B.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	B.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaborat ively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: • What is it we expect them to learn? • How will we if they have learned it? • How	B.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	B.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	B.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		will we respond if they don't learn? • How will we respond if they already know it?					
Reading Goal B: The number of students that make learning gains on FAA Reading will maintain or increase from 3% to 4% on the 2013 FAA assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	3%	**4%**					
		B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	

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

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	1.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: ● What is it we expect them to learn? ● How will we if they have learned it? ● How will we respond if they don't learn? ● How will we respond if they already know it?	1.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	1.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	1.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)	

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

CELLA Goal #C: The number of students that score proficient in listening/speaking will increase from 59% to 60% on the 2013 CELLA assessment.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: **59%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	

D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	2.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: ● What is it we expect them to learn? ● How will we if they have learned it? ● How will we respond if they don't learn? ● How will we respond if they already know it?	2.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	2.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	2.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)	

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

CELLA Goal #D: The number of students that score proficient in Reading will increase from 53% to 54% on the 2013 CELLA assessment.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : **53%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	

E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	2.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: ● What is it we expect them to learn? ● How will we if they have learned it? ● How will we respond if they don't learn? ● How will we respond if they already know it?	2.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	2.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	2.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)	

CELLA Goal #E: The number of students who score proficient will increase from 53% to 54% on the 2013 CELLA assessment.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : **53%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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

F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).	F.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	F.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: ● What is it we expect them to learn? ● How will we if they have learned it? ● How will we respond if they don't	F.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	F.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	F.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		learn? • How will we respond if they already know it?					
Mathematics Goal F: The number of students who scored levels 4-9 on the FAA math assessment will maintain or increase from 25% to 26% in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	25%	**26%**					
		F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	

		F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	

G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	G.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	G.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: ● What is it we expect them to learn? ● How will we if they have learned it? ● How will we respond if they don't	G.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	G.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	G.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		learn? • How will we respond if they already know it?					
Mathematics Goal G: The number of students who make learning gains will maintain or increase from 9 to 10 in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	9	**10**					
		G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	
		G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	

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

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

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

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

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

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

J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).	J.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	J.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: • What is it we expect them to learn? • How will we if they have learned it? • How will we respond if they don't	J.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	J.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	J.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

		learn? • How will we respond if they already know it?					
Science Goal J: The number of students scoring levels 4-9 on FAA Science will maintain or increase by 1 student in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
		J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	
		J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	

NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Biology EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

Biology Goal K: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Biology Goal L: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).	M.1. --Teachers' lack of commitment. --Time constraints --PLC's are not implemented with fidelity. --IEP meetings, parent conferences, and trainings take time. --Teacher appointments outside of school.	M.1. Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** in bi-monthly PLCs to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: • What is it we expect them to learn? • How will we if they have learned it? • How will we respond if they don't learn? • How will we respond if they already know it?	M.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal How -PLCs turn logs into administration on a bi-weekly basis -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.	M.1. Teacher Level Assess and observe students using the same teacher-created assessments. PLC/Department Level PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.	M.1. During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)		

Writing Goal M: The number of students scoring levels 4-9 on FAA Writing will maintain or increase by 1 student in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	**N/A**					
		M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	
		M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
STEM Goal #1: We will increase participation in Math Bowl, Science Olympics and Science Fair.	1.1. --Information regarding these events often comes too late for planning purposes. --Because of the above, teachers opt out of having students participate.	1.1. Through PLC's information will be given to teachers in a timely manner.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal Subject Area Contacts PLC logs	1.1. PLC logs PLC walk-throughs	1.1. Administration will require a list of students participating in these events.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
CTE Goal #1: Increase student interest in career opportunities and program selection prior to middle school. The school will increase the frequency of career exposure activities during the 2012/2013 school year.	1.1. The availability of quality speakers.	1.1 Utilize GATI to provide career options to students.	1.1. Guidance counselor	1.1. Guest sign in sheet	1.1. Guest sign in sheet
	1.2.Not enough time in the school year	1.2.Provide field trip opportunities.	1.2. Assistant Principal	1.2.	1.2. Log of CTE field trips
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development

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

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
Priority	Focus	Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

□ Yes No

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

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

Reading goal #1 - In grades 3-5, the percentage of students who will score a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 82% to 83%	The purchase of Making Meaning and Comprehension Tootkits to aid teachers with student reading comprehension.	$1,857.60	
Final Amount Spent			