

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Williams Middle Magnet School	District Name: Hillsborough County Public Schools
Principal: Pat Harrell	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Dipa Shah	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	Pat Harrell	B.S. and M.S. (English) Ed.Leadership	10	18	10-11 "A" AYP – no 11-12 "A" AYP - yes
Assistant Principal	Keith Jacobs	B.S. (Business Ed.) M.A. (Ed Leadership)	4	4	10-11 "A" AYP – no 11-12 "A" AYP - yes
Assistant Principal	Jody Locke	B.A. M.A. (Ed Leadership)	10	1	11-12 "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	Celeste Juan	B.S. Special Ed. M.A. Reading	10	14	10-11 “A” AYP – no 11-12 “A” AYP - yes

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	Principal	June 2013	
2. Magnet Interviews	Principal, magnet, teachers	Ongoing	
3. Professional Job References	Principal	Ongoing	
4. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	Ongoing	
5. District Peer Program	District Peers	Ongoing	
6. School-based teacher recognition system	Principal	Ongoing	
7. Regular time for teacher collaboration	Principal	Ongoing	
8. Opportunities for teacher leadership	Principal	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
2	Professional Development courses, in-service, and state exams.

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
52	5	5	20	18	12	50	3	1	0

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
Catherine White	Joseph Jimenez	District Protocol	2 year program on predetermined district criteria.
Catherine White	Julian McMullian	District Protocol	2 year program on predetermined district criteria.
Catherine White	Vivian Casillas	District Protocol	2 year program on predetermined district criteria.
Catherine White	Norma Rivera Ramos	District Protocol	2 year program on predetermined district criteria.
Catherine White	Sonya Lynn Hanks	District Protocol	2 year program on predetermined district criteria.

Additional Requirements

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. Pat Harrell, Principal Keith Jacobs, AP Curriculum Jody Locke, AP Facilities Erica Jamison, Psychologist Alisha Brill, Social Worker Jeralynn Campbell-Triplett, V.E. teacher Selina Brown/Aimee Fonda, Guidance</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?</p> <p>The purpose of the RtI team at Williams Middle Magnet School, IBMYP is to provide high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs. Ongoing performance and learning rate will be used to make important educational decisions to guide instruction. It is a problem solving team in which all decisions are made using data in collaboration with PLC's , to assist with the school meeting AYP, maintaining student performance in the regular education classroom setting, and improving long-term outcomes.</p>
<p>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?</p> <p>The Problem Solving Team, along with the faculty, was involved in the School Improvement Plan which included the development of activities that were conducted prior to the end of the 11-12 school year and during pre-planning for the 12-13 school year.</p> <p>The School Improvement Plan is the document that guides the work of the Problem Solving Team. The large part of the work of the Problem Solving Team is outlined in the Action Steps, Evaluation Process, Evaluation Tools, and Professional Development of the School Improvement Plan.</p> <p>Since one of the main tasks of the Problem Solving Team is to monitor student data, it will monitor the effectiveness of the Action Steps and suggest modifications if needed.</p>
MTSS Implementation

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

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)

<u>Data Source</u>	<u>Database</u>	<u>Person(s) Responsible</u>
FCAT data	School and District generated Excel Database	Reading Coach, LA SAL, Math SAL, Science SAL, Administration
Baseline, Mid-year, and District assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-Level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing and Science	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
Program Generated Assessments	Software	Individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach/Reading PLC facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Chapter/Segment tests using adopted curriculum resources	Subject Area Generated Database	SALs, individual teachers, PSLT
Semester Exams	Subject Area Generated Excel Database	SALs, individual teachers, PSLT
Mini-assessments on specific tested benchmarks	Subject Area Generated Excel Database	LA SAL, Math SAL
Referrals, OSS, ATOSS, ISS, Detentions	EASI, SDHC Mainframe	Individual teachers, Administration, PSLT, PLCs
EOC exams	State Generated Data	Math SAL, Administration

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

<u>Data Source</u>	<u>Database</u>	<u>Person(s) Responsible</u>
Extended Learning Program (ELP) , Ongoing Progress Using Edline, D & F report	School Generated Database in Excel E-Reports	PSLT/ELP Facilitator, SALs, Administration, Individual teachers
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/ Reading Coach
Ongoing assessments within Intensive Courses	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT, Reading Coach, individual teachers
FBA, BIP	EASI, SDHC Mainframe	PSLT, individual teachers, administration

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The staff will receive overview training through several faculty meetings during the 2012-2013 school year. Problem Solving Leadership team (PSLT) members with district level RtI training will serve as consultants to the PLCs to guide the process of data review and interpretation. The PSLT will work to align the efforts of other

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

school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.
 As the District’s PSLT develops resources and staff development trainings on PS/RtI, the information will be shared with school staff. Our school will invite our area RtI Facilitator to visit to review our progress in implementation of PS/RtI and provide on-site coaching and support to our PSLT/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI as they become available. PS/RtI Skills Survey will be completed at the end of the year to determine development of skills and knowledge related to PS/RtI implementation.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
<p>Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The Reading Leadership Team serves as the school’s literacy Professional learning Community. The team is comprised of: Celeste Juan (Reading Coach), Pat Harrell (Principal), Keith Jacobs (APC), Monica Dutzar (SAL), Westerman (SAL), M. Rodriguez (8th grade), Pavelko (SAL), Kristy Weg (SAL), Arlene Tannascolli (Team Leader-6th), Isidoros Passalaris (Team Leader-7th), Amparo Krug (Team Leader - 8th), Jennifer Galvin (Team Leader 7th gr), Hailee Sullivan (P.E./Electives), Aimee Fonda (Guidance)</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading strategies on the SIP. The 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 drive instruction support is provided to all teachers. The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers’ reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the Problem Solving Leadership team’s support plan. Additionally, the principal ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students. Meet after school; LLT members are representative of each content and grade.</p>
<p>What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? School-wide reading strategies, support PLCs, review FAIR data, look for reading trends, and demonstration classrooms.</p>

NCLB Public School Choice

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

***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.

<p>Project CRISS, level 1 training, which is a 12-hour initial training with a mandatory six hour follow-up component, is offered annually throughout the district.</p> <p>The reading coach is required as a part of her job description to provide on-site support of the implementation of the Project CRISS Strategic Lesson Plan model through professional development opportunities, as well as, coaching opportunities.</p> <p>Content-Specific Project CRISS follow-up trainings are offered by request at school site.</p> <p>A Reading Leadership Team is mandated by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan at each site. The principal is the chairperson of the committee and the reading coach is an integral member guiding the data review, creation of an action plan, professional monitoring of the plan and the evaluation of the plan each year. The Reading Leadership Team should have representation from each content area and is responsible for reporting back to the school their findings and instructional decisions.</p>	
---	--

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

The reading coach is responsible for assisting content teachers with the integration of differentiated instruction strategies into their content-area classrooms.

Each PLC is responsible for reviewing the students' literacy data and creating lessons that are responsive to identified student need.

Reading coach will facilitating on-going professional development through lunch & learn, small group professional development in the area of literacy to address the needs of all of the students.

Reading coach will facilitate collaboration with team and subject areas to analyze student data and assist with address student need through coaching and modeling.

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).			1.1. Teacher knowledge base of this strategy, teachers need professional development.	1.1. Student Reading comprehension improves in humanities, language arts, and reading when students are engaged in purposeful on-grade level complex reading. Teachers need to understand how to select/identify complex text ,and shift the amount of informational text used in the content curricula and share complex texts with all students. Action Steps: Action steps for this strategy are outlined on content area PLC action plans.	1.1. Who Subject area leaders Reading instructional coach	1.1. <u>Teacher level</u> Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC level</u> PLC's reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. <u>Leadership Level</u> Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction	1.1. 3 times a year FAIR Common Assessments CIS plans
Reading Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT reading will increase from 84% to 86%	84%	86%					
			1.2. Teacher knowledge base of this strategy, teachers need professional development and ongoing support throughout the year.	1.2. Teachers need to understand how to design and deliver a close reading lesson. Students reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in close reading instruction using complex text. Specific close reading strategies include,	1.2. 1.1. Who Subject area leaders Reading instructional coach	1.2.1.1. <u>Teacher level</u> Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC level</u> PLC's reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. <u>PLC meetings on a monthly</u>	1.2. 3 times a year FAIR Common Assessments CIS plans LDC task rubrics Springboard embedded assessments and rubrics

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

			multiple readings of a passage, asking text dependent questions, writing in response to reading and engaging in text-based class discussion.		basis. <u>Leadership Level</u> Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction Reading coach observations and walk-throughs	
		1.3.	1.3.All core content area teachers will focus on effective use of reading strategies to help students tackle complex text such as previewing, setting purpose, chunking, and marking text.	1.3. 1.1. Who Subject area leaders Reading instructional coach	1.3. Teacher level Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. PLC level PLC's reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. PLC meetings on a monthly basis. Leadership Level Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction Reading coach observations and walk-throughs	1.3. Common assessments 3 times a year FAIR
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.		2.1.	2.1 See Goals 1 & 4	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<u>Reading Goal #2:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 59% to 61%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 59%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 61%				
			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:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.		3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1. <u>Teacher level</u> Teacher use of informal assessments Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge	3.1. Using data from informal and formal classroom assessments to identify effective gradual release strategies and techniques.
<u>Reading Goal #3:</u> Points earned from students	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Difficulty of the curriculum, including comprehension and strategies for success.	Students' comprehension of course content improves by participating in lessons where teachers consistently follow the	How	

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

making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 76 points to 78 points.	76 points	78 points		gradual release lesson delivery model such as explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice, and independent practice.	Administrative walk through's or reading coach, Lesson plans	to drive future instruction. <u>PLC level</u> PLC's reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.	
			3.2.	3.2. Teachers will implement specific gradual release strategies for involving students in active participation in learning such as: collaborative structures, accountable talk, Socratic seminar.	3.2. Subject area leaders Reading instructional coach Administration How Administrative walk through's or reading coach, Lesson plans	3.2. <u>Teacher level</u> Teacher use of informal assessments Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC level</u> PLC's reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.	3.2. Using data from informal and formal classroom assessments to identify effective gradual release strategies and techniques.
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4.1.	4.1. Student achievement improves through teachers' collaboration with the reading coach not only in the reading department but also language arts and humanities.	4.1. Who Administration How Review of coach's log Administrative walk throughs of reading coach working with teachers (either in classrooms, PLC, or planning sessions)	a. Tracking of coach's participation in PLC's Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, professional development, and walk throughs)	4.1. 3 times a year –FAIR
Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT reading will increase from 72% points to 74% points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Reading coach scheduling time to meet regularly with teachers				
	72 points	74 points					
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

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. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.
Reading Goal #5A: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:						
			5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2
			5A.3.	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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Reading Goal #5B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

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

End of Reading Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).			1.1. Teachers make limited use of the FCAT and Algebra EOC practice resources that are available to them.	1.1. The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students’ math skills will improve through the use of FCAT and Algebra EOC practice material, technology, and hands-on activities to implement the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. <u>Action Steps</u> 1. As a Professional Development Activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling use of FCAT and Algebra EOC practice materials, technology and hands-	1.1. -Principal -APC -Math SAL -Math department	1.1. -PLC logs turned in to SAL. Entries should include list of at least 2 strategies per quarter that were shared with grade level teachers. These strategies should be ways to review FCAT or EOC material, hands-on activities, and/or ways technology could be implemented. These strategies will be shared at monthly PLCs and recorded in meeting minutes. Teachers will share positive outcomes of the strategies as observed in class. -Evidence of strategies from PLC logs seen during classroom walkthroughs by SAL and/or administration. -Administration and SAL will utilize walkthrough	1.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> -District Baseline (Formative Assessments Form A and Form B) -Semester Exams <u>During Nine Weeks</u> -Chapter tests -District written benchmark mini assessments -Springboard online mini-assessments -Teacher-created common assessments per course
<u>Mathematics Goal #1:</u> In grades 6-8 the percentage of standard curriculum students scoring at a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 86% to 88%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 86% (690)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 88% (706)					

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

				<p>on strategies.</p> <p>2. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating strategies from their PLC discussions.</p> <p>3. At least once a quarter, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material that incorporates FCAT type questions.</p> <p>4. Teachers bring assessment data back to PLCs.</p> <p>5. As a Professional Development Activity, teachers use data to discuss strategies that were effective and pinpoint areas that need further reinforcement.</p> <p>6. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine the next steps, such as choosing appropriate mini-lessons from the district provided FCIM database and/or Springboard mini-assessments.</p> <p>7. PLCs record their work in PLC logs and communicate progress at monthly math department PLCs.</p>		<p>monitoring tool that includes SIP strategies.</p> <p>-HCPS Informal Pop-In Form (EET tool)</p> <p>-PLCs will review district written formative assessment data (Form A and Form B) and document the increase in the number of students reaching mastery on the units of instruction. SAL and teachers in the math department will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. SAL will share data with administration.</p>	
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.			2.1. In some accelerated curriculum courses, not all grade level benchmarks are addressed.	2.1. The purpose of this strategy is to provide students with practice on standards that are not covered by their course, but will be tested on the FCAT Math. Students' math skills will improve through the use of mini-assessments and mini-lessons covering the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. <u>Action Steps.</u> 1. PLCs will meet to analyze data and determine strands and skills where students show a need for improvement. 2. Math teachers utilize district made mini-lessons and mini-assessments that address the areas for improvement as bell work assignments. Teachers will document student improvement in PLC logs.	2.1. -Math SAL -Math teachers	2.1. -PLC logs turned in to SAL. SAL provides feedback. -Evidence of mini-lessons and mini-assessments seen during classroom walkthroughs	2.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> -District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing -Semester exams <u>During Nine Weeks</u> Chapter tests, Benchmark mini assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal #2:</u> In grades 6-8 the percentage of standard curriculum students scoring at a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 63% to 65%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 63% (505)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 65% (521)					
			2.2. Students that are achieving above proficiency in math are often not provided with enough rigor inside and outside the classroom.	2.2. Students' math skills will improve through exposure and success with college readiness tests such as PSAT, SAT, and FCAT. By utilizing district and school-wide programs (Duke TIPS, Springboard, IB MYP, AVID, FCAT Explorer) students will identify their strengths and weaknesses in standardized testing and	2.2. -Math SAL -Math Teachers -AVID Coordinator -Guidance Counselors -IB Coordinator	2.2. -Evidence of strategies seen during classroom walkthrough -Monitor online reports for online programs (FCAT Explorer, Duke TIPS)	2.2. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> -District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing -Semester exams -SAT <u>During Nine Weeks</u> -Chapter tests -Benchmark mini-

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

			<p>focus their practice on areas of improvement.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers incorporate the IB MYP Areas of Interaction into teaching which provide students opportunity to communicate and apply their mathematical knowledge as well as reflect on it. Teachers will incorporate Springboard strategies, Cornell notes, and/or HOT (higher-order thinking) questions into their lessons. Students enrolled in AVID will be exposed to and begin to prepare for meeting college entry requirements. Identified students will be encouraged to participate in the Duke TIPs program. 			<p>assessments</p> <p>-IB Assessments</p>
		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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.		3.1. Students are not familiar with their own standardized test scores.	3.1. The purpose of this strategy is to familiarize students with their standardized test scores. Students’ math skills will improve through the use of “FCAT Chats” and the continuous monitoring of progress.	3.1. -Teachers -Students -Parents	3.1. - Math Department PLCs will review the form and document improvement on FCAT formative assessments. -Each teacher will keep on file all of their Student FCAT Information Forms with parent signature.	3.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> -District Baseline and Mid-Year testing -Semester Exams <u>During Nine Weeks</u> -Chapter tests -Benchmark mini assessments
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #3:</u></p> <p>In grades 6-8 the percentage of all curriculum students making learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math will increase from 81% to 83%.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>81% (650)</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>83% (666)</p>	<p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Math teachers will create a student FCAT Information Form. This 			

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

				<p>form will be interactive and will require the students to input the information, including scores, levels, strengths, and weaknesses.</p> <p>2. PLCs will discuss how the forms will be utilized in each grade level.</p> <p>3. Students and teachers will analyze the data together and students will set goals.</p> <p>4. Information will be shared with parents via letter sent home.</p> <p>Goals will be continually monitored by teachers, students and parents. Progress will be shared at conferences, via Edline, through weekly agenda planners, etcetera.</p>			
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1. Students are not receiving appropriate academic support outside of math classroom instruction.	4.1. Students’ math skills will improve through participation in supplemental math instruction opportunities such as ELP, after school tutoring, AVID, intensive math, Math League, etc. <u>Action Steps</u> 1. All students in the bottom quartile will be identified and invited to participate in supplemental math	4.1. -APC -Guidance Counselors -Teachers	4.1. -APC and Guidance Counselors will use Silk reports, FCAT Data, and Report Card grades to identify students that will be invited to participate. -Teachers will be asked to conduct the supplemental instruction opportunities. -APC reviews SILK, district-level baseline and mid-year assessments, semester exams, and Instructional Planning Tool data	4.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> -SILK -District Written Formative Tests (Form A and B) -Semester Exams <u>During Nine Weeks</u> -Unit Tests -Online Resource Reports
Mathematics Goal #4:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In grades 6-8 the percentage of all curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math will increase from 78% to 80%.	78% (83)	80% (85)					

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

				<p>instruction.</p> <p>2. After the first quarter, students that have a D or F in their math class will be invited to participate in after school ELP.</p> <p>3. Students that are interested, but not identified based on the criteria, may participate in ELP if there are open spots.</p> <p>4. During supplemental math instruction, the regular teacher and supplemental teacher will communicate regularly regarding students' skills that need remediation. This communication will be documented by both teachers involved.</p> <p>5. Classroom teachers will increase the use of higher order thinking questions and implement Costa's levels of questioning for student acquisition of deeper understanding.</p> <p>6. Math Department PLC will develop a plan for providing tutoring during Homeroom to identified students that are unable to attend after school ELP because of transportation issues.</p> <p>7. Math department PLC will communicate with AVID elective teacher to determine</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

				effectiveness of tutoring and tutorials.			
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	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. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.
Reading Goal #5A:			2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.			White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:			
			5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.
			5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.							
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.							
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).			1.1. See goal #1	1.1. See goal #1	1.1. See goal #1	1.1. See goal #1	1.1. See goal #1
Algebra Goal #1: In grades 6-8, the percentage of all curriculum students scoring level 3 or above on the 2013 End-of-Course Algebra Exam will increase from 93% to 95%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	93%	95%					
	(112)	(115)	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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.			2.1. See goal #2	2.1. See goal #2	2.1. See goal #2	2.1. See goal #2	2.1. See goal #2
Algebra Goal #2: In grades 6-8, the percentage of all curriculum students scoring level 4 or 5 on the 2013 End-of-Course Algebra Exam will increase from 60% to 64%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	60% (72)	64% (77)					
			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

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.			1.1. Teachers have little knowledge of appropriate vocabulary acquisition teaching strategies for science content	1.1. Increase knowledge of vocabulary acquisition strategies through county and school offered trainings. Incorporate use of classroom visuals such as a word wall to increase vocabulary acquisition.	1.1. SAL, Teachers, Reading Coach	1.1. Share data collected from formative assessments during PLC to determine appropriate steps and strategies for success.	1.1. County Semester Exams, Teacher generated tests, diagnostic pre/post tests, project based presentations and assignments.
<u>Science Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Increase reading comprehension and science content vocabulary acquisition.	77%	79%					
			1.2. Teachers have varying comfort levels in using reading comprehension strategies in the science content area.	1.2. Increase knowledge of reading comprehension strategies through county and school offered trainings. Model strategies with students and incorporate them into assigned article and textbook readings.	1.2. SAL, Teachers, Reading Coach	1.2. Share data collected from formative assessments during PLC to determine appropriate steps and strategies needed for success.	1.2. County Semester Exams, Teacher generated tests, Diagnostic Pre/Post Tests
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.			2.1. Teachers have varying comfort levels with implementing inquiry based lessons and activities.	2.1. Hold mini LIMs trainings during department meetings and PLCs. Teachers will attend county and site based trainings on inquiry. Implement more inquiry based lessons into the classroom. Teachers will have students participate in STEM based competitions such as Science Fair, Robotics, and the Water Tower competition.	2.1. SAL, APC	2.1. County Semester exams, Pre/Post diagnostic tests, teacher generated assessments, project based assessments.	2.1.
<u>Science Goal #2:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Increase the use of inquiry based lessons and activities in the science classrooms.	42%	44%					
			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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.			1.1. Achieving this high level is difficult due to the current gap in student writing skills created from changes in curriculum and testing standards.	1.1. Assimilation of writing strategies for the planning process to include specific text support and academic vocabulary across all grade levels -School will implement lessons across all grade levels which incorporate use of graphic organizers for planning their writing to include solid support and academic vocabulary. Graphic organizer use will be uniform and will incorporate organizers from AVID and also one alternative organizer created during PLC.	1.1. -Language Arts PLCs - All language arts teachers	1.1. -Quarterly writing prompts along with Springboard writing assignments evaluated for percent of students effectively utilizing planning strategies. Monthly calculation will be tabulated.	1.1. Will review quarterly formative writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency.
Writing/LA Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In grade 8, 95% of All Curriculum students will be proficient in writing on the 2013 FCAT Writing Test.	91%	95%					
			1.2. Teachers have used their own specific lessons and terms for conventions of writing for years.	1.2. Differentiation of teaching convention skills will be implemented utilizing Springboard lessons for grammar and instruction of spelling rules.	1.2. -Language Arts PLCs - All language arts teachers	1.2. -PLCs- Review quarterly formative writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the convention piece of rubric. PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching 4.0 or above on the quarterly writing prompt specifically focusing on conventions.	1.2. Quarterly formative writing assessments. Skill-checks and re-teaching. Individual assessments and peer editing.
			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	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

				meetings)		

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Goal #1.1: The attendance rate will be maintained at 96% in 2012-2013 Goal #1.2: Students with 10 or more unexcused tardies for the school year will decrease by 2%. Goal #1.3: Students with 10 or more Tardies for the school year will decrease by 2%.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	96.75%	96%					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	36	35					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	1.2.-Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance. -Large student population of car riders, rather than bus riders or walkers, contributes to student tardiness	1.2. -The Administration Team along with appropriate staff will review attendance plan to ensure policy and procedures are consistently follow.	1.2. AP will run attendance tardy reports per attendance plan guidelines and work with appropriate staff to address ongoing issues.	1.2. -Monthly data analysis	1.2. Attendance Report Tardy Report Attendance Plan
	54	53					
			1.3. See 1.2	1.3. When a student reaches 15 days of unexcused absences	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

			and/or unexcused tardies to school, parents/guardians are notified via mail that future absences/tardies must have a doctor note or other reason outlined in the Student Handbook to receive an excused absence/tardy and must be approved through an administrator. A parent-administrator-student conference is scheduled and held regarding these procedures. The goal of the conference is to create a plan for assisting the student to improve his/her attendance/tardies.			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Suspension Goal -The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease 5% from 101 in 2011-2012 to 96 in 2012-2013. -The total number of students suspended In-school will decrease 5% from 68 in 11/12 to 65 in 2012/2013. Number of out of school suspensions will be maintained . *Note: this # does not reflect ATOSS Number of students suspended out of school will decrease 5%.	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions	-Lack of parental involvement and follow-up.	1. Parent conferences 2. Student conferences 3. Response to Intervention strategies 4. Counseling services 5. Lunch work detail 6. Detention Conduct Celebrations	Administration using discipline report	Monthly monitoring of reports to determine where additional intervention assistance is needed	Monthly monitoring of discipline reports. Feedback from counselors, RTI team, and AP
	101	96					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	68	65					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	0	1					
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School						
56	54						
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Suspension Professional Development

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Health and Fitness Goal			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Health and Fitness Goal #1: During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the “Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ)” on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase 10% from the Pretest to the Posttest	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*	Language	Middle school students will engage in the equivalent of one class period per day of physical education for one semester of each year in grades 6-8.	Principal Guidance Counselors APC	Checking of student schedules	Student schedules Master Schedule
			Culture				
			Medical conditions				
			Inclement Weather				
			Attitude towards physical education				
			Lack of knowledge about fitness and health in the community.				
			Lack of support in the community				

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

		1.2.	1.2. Implementation of a fitness walk/run one day per week throughout the year.	1.2. Peer Evaluator District Supervisor	1.2. The PACER test will show us the overall cardiovascular health of each student first and second semester.	1.2. Pacer test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.
		1.3.	1.3. Five physical education classes per week for a minimum of one semester per year with a certified physical education teacher.	1.3. Physical Education Teacher	1.3. Checking of class schedules Certification of teacher	1.3. Student schedules Professional Development of Physical Education Teachers

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Continuous Improvement Goal			1.1. Training all PLCs on how to use, implement, and consistently use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model or other PLC structured format.	1.1. The leadership team will learn how to use the PLC “Unit of Instruction” log that follows the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. Subject Area Leaders and/or PLC facilitators will guide their PLCs through the Plan-Do-Check-Act model for units of instruction.	1.1. Principal Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC facilitators	1.1. Administration walk-through PLC logs	1.1. All PLC Logs will be compared with model or format adopted by Leadership Team to look for conformity and understanding of process.
<u>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</u> The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that “teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students’	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	47.7%	50%	Resistance to using new tool or adding a more defined structure to PLC process.				

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

learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning) will increase 5% from 47.7% in 2011/12 to 50% in 2012/2013.							
			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.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.
Reading Goal A: The percentage of students scoring at a Level 4 or above on the reading section of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment will increase from 47.4% to 52%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 47.4%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 52%	A.1. See Reading Goal 5d	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.
			A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.
			A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.
B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.			B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.
Reading Goal B: The percentage of students making Adequate Yearly Progress on the math section of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment will increase from 47.4% to 52%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 47.4%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 52%	B.1. See Reading Goal 5d	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.
			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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 69% to 75%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 24pt; font-weight: bold;">69%</div>	• Teachers at varying skill levels of utilizing ELL strategies during instruction. • ELL students are at varying levels of English language acquisition • Paraprofessional at varying levels of expertise in providing heritage language support • Administration and staff are at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL Program guidelines	• District ELL Resource Teacher to provide professional development. • ELL students will be provided with day-to-day accommodations of extended time, small group testing, paraprofessional support and use of heritage language dictionary in core content.	• Teachers of ELL students • ELL paraprofessional • District ELL Resource Teacher • ELL Guidance Counselor To be discussed during PLC's and PSLT.	• ELL paraprofessional will monitor progress and report to PLC's • ELL paraprofessional will report to PSLT for any ongoing concerns	• FAIR • CELLA • Academic Performance • FCAT
		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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<u>CELLA Goal #D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers at varying skill levels of utilizing ELL strategies during instruction. ELL students are at varying levels of English language acquisition Paraprofessional at varying levels of expertise in providing heritage language support Administration and staff are at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL Program guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District ELL Resource Teacher to provide professional development. ELL students will be provided with day-to-day accommodations of extended time, small group testing, paraprofessional support and use of heritage language dictionary in core content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers of ELL students ELL paraprofessional District ELL Resource Teacher ELL Guidance Counselor <p>To be discussed during PLC's and PSLT.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ELL paraprofessional will monitor progress and report to PLC's ELL paraprofessional will report to PSLT for any ongoing concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAIR CELLA Academic Performance FCAT
The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 61.5% to 70%.	61.5%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<u>CELLA Goal #E:</u>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers at varying skill levels of utilizing ELL strategies during instruction. ELL students are at varying levels of English language acquisition Paraprofessional at varying levels of expertise in providing heritage language support Administration and staff are at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL Program guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District ELL Resource Teacher to provide professional development. ELL students will be provided with day-to-day accommodations of extended time, small group testing, paraprofessional support and use of heritage language dictionary in core content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers of ELL students ELL paraprofessional District ELL Resource Teacher ELL Guidance Counselor <p>To be discussed during PLC's and PSLT.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ELL paraprofessional will monitor progress and report to PLC's ELL paraprofessional will report to PSLT for any ongoing concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAIR CELLA Academic Performance FCAT
The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 69.2% to 75%.	69.2%					
		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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
--	---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------

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

F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).			F.1.	F.1. See Math Goal 5d	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.
Mathematics Goal F: The percentage of students scoring at a Level 4 or above on the math section of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment will increase from 36.8% to 41%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	36.8%	41%					
			F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.
			F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.
G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.			G.1.	G.1. See Math Goal 5d	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.
Mathematics Goal G: The percentage of students making Adequate Yearly Progress on the math section of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment will increase from 36.8% to 41%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	36.8%	41%					
			G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.
			G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

Middle 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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).			J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.
Science Goal J: The percentage of students scoring at a Level 4 or above on the science section of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment will increase from 0% to 5%	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 0%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 5%	J.1. Developing a structure and procedure to regular and on-going review of students' IEP goals, and to ensure that appropriate accommodations and modifications are in place to support learning.	J.1. Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD will review students' IEP goals to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. Teachers of SWD will work, both individually, and within PLCs, to improve skill in implementing strategies, accommodations, and modifications within lessons.	J.1. Who: Principal and Assistant Principal ESE Team Leader How: IEP Progress Reports reviewed by ESE Team Leader and APC.	J.1. Teacher Level: Teachers will use ongoing formative assessments throughout the instruction cycle, and use this knowledge to drive further instruction. -Teachers will use on-line grading system to calculate their students' progress towards mastering the Science Access Points for their grade level, as well as students' progress towards annual IEP goals. PLC Level -Using individual teacher data, PLC will calculate mastery towards students' annual IEP goals. -PLC will reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each course, PLC will chart students' progress towards mastering the Science Access Points for each corresponding grade level. Leadership Team Level: -ESE Team leader will share data collected at the PLC level with the Leadership Team. -Data will be used to drive teacher support and supplemental instruction for students.	J.1.
			J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.
			J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).			M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.
Writing Goal M: The percentage of students scoring at a Level 4 or above on the writing section of the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment will increase to 5%	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Developing a structure and procedure to regular and on-going review of students’ IEP goals, and to ensure that appropriate accommodations and modifications are in place to support learning.	Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD will review students’ IEP goals to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. Teachers of SWD will work, both individually, and within PLCs, to improve skill in implementing strategies, accommodations, and modifications within lessons.	Who: Principal and Assistant Principal ESE Team Leader How: IEP Progress Reports reviewed by ESE Team Leader and APC.	Teacher Level: Teachers will use ongoing formative assessments throughout the instruction cycle, and use this knowledge to drive further instruction. -Teachers will use on-line grading system to calculate their students’ progress towards mastering the Science Access Points for their grade level, as well as students’ progress towards annual IEP goals. PLC Level -Using individual teacher data, PLC will calculate mastery towards students’ annual IEP goals. -PLC will reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each course, PLC will chart students’ progress towards mastering the Science Access Points for each corresponding grade level. Leadership Team Level: -ESE Team leader will share data collected at the PLC level with the Leadership Team. -Data will be used to drive teacher support and supplemental instruction for students.	
	n/a	5%					
			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)

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: Increase the Nature of Science FCAT category score from 8 to 10.	1.1. Teachers have varying levels of comfort levels with incorporation of technology used to support inquiry in the science classroom.	1.1. –Teachers will attend advanced gizmo trainings to gain skills needed to implement them successfully in the classroom - Teachers will work with Gizmo mentor to write 5E lessons incorporating gizmos as an inquiry based lesson/activity. -Teachers will work with technology specialist to learn about the latest technology offerings at the school.	1.1. SAL Gizmo Mentor Teachers Technology Specialist	1.1. –Teachers will share data collected at PLCS and discuss appropriate use of lessons and technology	1.1. –Pre/Post Diagnostic assessments, teacher generated tests, county semester exams, project based assessments
	1.2. Students do not participate in many STEM based activities outside the county curriculum.	1.2. –Teachers will have students participate in STEM Fair -Teachers will have students participate in STEM based competitions such as FLL robotics, Water Tower Competition, Rocket Launch Competition, and many others offered throughout the school year.	1.2. SAL Teachers	1.2. –Teachers will share competitions and STEM based projects their students are participating in at PLCS and discuss upcoming opportunities and how they be incorporated into the classroom to support our students success in the Nature of Science.	1.2. . –Pre/Post Diagnostic assessments, teacher generated tests, county semester exams, project based assessments
	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				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:</p> <p>CTE Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. Increase the student membership in Career and Technical Student Organizations from 163 in 2011-2012 to 180 in 2012-2013</p>	1.1. Communication with students	1.1. Increase student participation in CTSO competitions/events	1.1. comparing 2011-2012 roster to 2012-2013	1.1. Roster of participation	1.1. Review of data
	1.2. Funding for field trips	1.2. Increase the number of students participating in CEV events.	1.2. Comparing CEV event participation from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013	1.2. Report of field trip participation	1.2. Review of data
	1.3. Locating qualified speakers	1.3. Increase the number of speakers for the Great American Teach-in pertaining to career exploration	1.3. Compare teach in speakers from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013	1.3. List of speakers	1.3. Review of data

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
Establish an advisory council for FBLA	6,7,8	Brian Nanns	Elective Team	Bi-monthly	End of year report	B.Nanns

End of CTE Goal(s)

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.

X -Yes No

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

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