# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



<mark>**Edited and updated 1/17/13**</mark>

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

**Turkey Creek Middle School**

**2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

# PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|---|---|
| School Name:  Turkey Creek Middle School | District Name:  Hillsborough |
| Principal:  Dennis Mayo | Superintendent:  MaryEllen Elia |
| SAC Chair:   Elisabeth Alexander | 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 | Dennis Mayo | Agriculture Degree in Educational Leadership | 7 | 11 | 10-11/-B-69% of AYP Targets met 09-10/-B-69 % of AYP Targets met 08-09/-A-72 % of AYP Targets met |
| Assistant Principal | Jaclyn Rowehl, Assistant Principal | Certified in Ed Leadership (all levels) and Social Science 6-12 | 1 | 1 | 10-11/A- **100%** of AYP Targets met - Barrington 09-10/-B 74%  of AYP Targets met - Barrington 08-09/B 79% of AYP Targets Met - Bartels |
| Assistant Principal | Phillip Riley,Assistant Principal | Degree in Biology/pre-med; Masters in | 8 | 6 | 10-11/-B-69% of AYP Targets met 09-10/-B-69 % of AYP Targets met 08-09-A-72% of AYP Targets met |

| | | Educational Leadership | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |

## 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 | Kate Ramsey | BA Humanities Reading Endorsement ESOL Endorsement Certification English 6 - 12 | 4 | 4 | 10-11/-B-69% of AYP Targets met 09-10/-B-69 % of AYP Targets met 08/09: B77% AYP Target met(Riverview High School) |
| Writing | Rebecca Velazquez | M.ED Educational Leadership Reading Reading Endorsement ESOL Endorsement | 1 | 1 | 10-11/-C (Marshall) 09-10/-A (Marshall) 08/09: A (Marshall) |
| Math | Colleen Ebert | BS in Math 7-12 Masters in Curriculum Certified in Mathematics 6 - 12 | 1 | 1 | Hilliard Bradley High School, Hillard, Ohio Hilliard was in improvement state. 8/2009 - 5/2012 |

## Highly Qualified Teachers

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

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Teacher Interview Day | District staff | June | |
| 2. Salary Differential (Renaissance Schools) | General of Federal Programs | ongoing | |
| 3. District Mentor Program | District Mentors | ongoing | |
| 4. District Peer Program | District Peers | 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** |
|---|---|
| Teachers:<br><br>5 are out of field | Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented.<br>**Administrators**<br>Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on:<br>• Preparing and taking the certification exam<br>• Completing classes need for certification<br>• Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers<br>• Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s)<br>**Reading and Writing Coaches**<br>• The coaches co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis<br>**Subject Area Leader/PLC**<br>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)).

**Hillsborough 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised July, 2012**

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 73 | 5%<br>4 | 20%<br>15 | 34%<br>25 | 39%<br>29 | 27%<br>20 | 93%<br>68 | 17%<br>13 | .01%<br>1 | 4%<br>3 |

# 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Dawn Thompson | Mandalyn Surfus | The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving. |
| Dawn Thompson | Clara Parker | The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving. |
| Dawn Thompson | Kristina Schipano | The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving. |
| Dawn Thompson | Ashley Venable | The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving. |
| Dawn Thompson | Harlan Wooten | The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the | Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, |

| | | areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving. |
|---|---|---|---|

# Additional Requirements

## Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

| |
|---|
| Title I, Part A Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school and summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors. |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant<br>The migrant advocate provides services and support to students and parents. The advocate works with teachers and other programs to ensure that the migrant students' needs are being met |
| Title I, Part D<br>The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice. |
| Title II  N/A |
| Title III<br>Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners |
| Title X- Homeless<br>The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)<br>SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs. |
| Violence Prevention Programs<br>N/A |
| Nutrition Programs<br>N/A |
| Housing Programs<br>N/A |
| Head Start<br>N/A |

| |
|---|
| Adult Education |
| N/A |
| Career and Technical Education |
| The career and technical support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations |
| Job Training |
| N/A |
| Other |
| N/A |

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

| **School-Based MTSS/RtI Team** |
|---|
| Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. <br> • Principal - Dennis Mayo <br> • Assistant Principal - Claude Riley <br> • Assistant Principal - Jaclyn Rowehl <br> • Guidance Counselor - Debbie Gregory <br> • Guidance Counselor - Wally Heim <br> • School Psychologist - Randy Rebman <br> • Social Worker - Cooper Turner <br> • Migrant Advocate - Melissa Rivera <br> • ESE Specialist - Debbie Coleman - Chair <br> • SAC Chair – Elisabeth Alexander <br> • Attendance Committee Representative - Debbie Coleman <br> • District Liaison – Troy Loker <br> • Reading Coach – Kate Ramsey <br> • Writing Coach - Rebecca Velazquez <br> • Math Coach – Colleen Ebert |
| 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? <br> The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: <br> 1. Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs at all grade levels, get input from teachers on students needing MTSS . <br> 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. <br> 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. <br> 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. |

The Leadership team meets weekly.  Specific responsibilities include:

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

---

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

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

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

| **MTSS Implementation** |
|---|

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

## Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible |
|---|---|---|
| FCAT released tests | School Generated Excel Database | Reading Coach/SAC Chair /AP |
| Baseline and Midyear District Assessments | Scantron Achievement Series<br>Data Wall | Leadership Team, PLCs, SAC Chair |
| District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability<br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br>Semester Exams<br><u>During the Grading Period</u><br>-Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.)<br>Monthly Writing Assessments | Scantron Achievement Series<br>Data Wall | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers |
| Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science<br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br>Semester Exams<br><u>During the Grading Period</u><br>-Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.) | Scantron Achievement Series<br>Data Wall<br>PLC Logs | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers |
| FAIR | Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network | Reading Coach |

| | Data Wall | |
|---|---|---|
| CELLA | Sagebrush (IPT) | ELL PSLT Representative |
| Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. Reading, Science, and Math | Ed-Line PLC Database PLC logs | Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/Sac Chair |
| DRA-2 | School Generated Excel Database | Sac chair |
| Reports on Demand/Crystal Reports | District Generated Database | Leadership Team/Specialty PSLT |

**Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)**

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|
| Extended Learning Program (ELP)* *(see below)* Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials) District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.) | School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/ ELP Facilitator/SAC Chair |
| Differentiated mini assessments based on core curriculum assessments. | Individual teacher data base PLC/Department data base | Individual Teachers/PLCs |
| FAIR OPM | School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/Reading Coach |
| Ongoing assessments within Intensive Courses *(Middle/High)* | Database provided by course materials (for courses that have one), School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/PLC/Individual Teachers |
| Other Curriculum Based Measurement | easyCBM School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/PLCs/Individual Teachers |
| Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs | Assessments included in computer-based programs | PLCs/Individual Teachers |

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Leadership Team/will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District's RtI Committee/RtI Facilitators develop(s) resources and staff development trainings on PS/RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions, as identified by teacher needs assessment and/or EET evaluation data, will occur during faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. The Leadership Team will send school team representatives to ongoing PS/RtI trainings/support sessions that are offered district-wide. Our school will invite our area RtI Facilitator to visit quarterly (or as needed) to review our progress in implementation of PS/RtI and provide on-site coaching and support to our Leadership Teams/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI as they become available.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

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

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

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

| School-Based Literacy Leadership Team |
|---|
| Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). <br>     • Principal - Dennis Mayo <br>     • Assistant Principal - Lana Smith <br>     • Reading Coach - Kate Ramsey <br>     • Reading Teachers - Angela Brown, Paula Flott <br>     • Media Specialist - Cheryl Trapnell <br>     • Teachers across content areas - Tecca Kilmer, Beth Alexander, Scott Whalen, Dottie Trapnell <br>     • Language Arts - Erin Consolver |
| • Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). <br><br> The principal is the LLT chairperson.  The reading coach is a member of the team and provides extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions.  The reading coach and principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instructional support is provided to all teachers. <br><br> The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the Problem Solving Leadership team's support plan.  Additionally the principal ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students. |
| • What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? <br><br> Trying to interpret AP3 (last year's final FAIR) with FCAT results – our FAIR data was much higher than FCAT outcomes Continue last year's "success" with stolen moments and a book in the hands of every students every day – this year an additional focus on actually reading the book! <br><br> • Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading goals/strategies across the content areas <br> • Professional Development <br> • Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas <br> • Data analysis (on-going) <br> • Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan <br> • Interactive Word Walls across all content areas |

## *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.

Project CRISS, Level 1 training, which is a 12 hour initial training, is offered annually through district-provided training.  Mandatory follow-up is provided at the school site by the reading coach.  Complementing the Project CRISS initiative is the inclusion of close reading lessons in the ELA, reading, and content area classrooms.
The reading coach is required as a part of his/her job description to provide on-site support of the implementation of the Project CRISS Strategic Lesson Plan model  and the design and delivery of close reading lessons through professional development opportunities, as well as, coaching opportunities.  A yearly action plan is created by the reading coach that outlines what Project CRISS and close reading model lesson professional development will be offered.  A monthly written update allows the reading supervisor to monitor the progress of each coach's action plan.

Content-specific (mathematics, social studies, science and language arts) Project CRISS close reading model lesson follow-up trainings are offered on request at school sites and as district-offered trainings throughout the school year.

Demonstration classroom opportunities focusing on the implementation of content-based literacy strategies are mandated by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan at each site.  The reading coach is responsible for scheduling and facilitating pre-observation, during observation, and post-observation activities and discussion.

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, progress monitoring of the plan and evaluation of the plan each school year.  The RLT should have representation from each content area and is responsible for reporting back to the school their findings and instructional decisions.
Each PLC is responsible for reviewing their students' literacy data and creating lessons that are responsive to identified student needs.  PLCs are responsible for the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model (Plan-Do-Check-Act) with their core curriculum and acting on the data by providing additional instruction where needed.  Common assessments on chapter tests are used to identify effective reading strategies and guide instruction for re-teach or enrichment.
Reading coaches are responsible for assisting content teachers with the integration of differentiated instruction strategies into their content area classrooms.

# 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).** | | | | SEE STAAR PLAN | | | |
| Reading Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 40% to 43% | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 40% | 43% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 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.** | | | | SEE STAAR PLAN | | | |
| Reading Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 15% to 18%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 15% | 18% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 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.** | | | | SEE | | | |

| Reading Goal #3:<br><br>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 55 points to 58 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>55 | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>58 | STAAR PLAN | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>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.** | | | SEE STAAR PLAN | | | | |
| Reading Goal #4:<br><br>Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 52 points to 55 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>52 | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>55 | | | | | |
| | | | 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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>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%.**<br>Reading Goal #5: | | | | | | |
| **5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | 5A.1.<br><br>SEE | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | |

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

| Reading Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 52% to 57%. The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 32% to 39%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 28% to 35%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:52 Black:32 Hispanic:28 Asian: American Indian: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:57 Black:39 Hispanic:35 Asian: American Indian: | STAAR PLAN | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 5A.2. | 5A.2 | 5A.2 | 5A.2 | 5A.2 |
| | | | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | 5B.1. | 5B.1 SEE STAAR PLAN. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. |
| Reading Goal #5B: . The percentage of Econ. Dis. students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 34% to 41%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 34 | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 41 | | | | | |
| | | | 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.<br><br>SEE STAAR PLAN. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal #5C:<br><br>The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 15% to 24%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>15 | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>24 | | | | | |
| | | | 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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | | | 5D.1. | 5D.1.<br><br>SEE STAAR PLAN. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. |
| Reading Goal #5D:<br><br>The percentage of SWC students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 19% to 27%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>19 | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>27 | | | | | |
| | | | 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**<br>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. |
|---|

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Differentiated Instruction | 6-8 | - District Title 1 | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | October 2012 -Demonstration classrooms | Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations | Administration Team Reading and Writing Coaches Subject Area Leaders |
| Identifying and Creating Text-Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension (K-12) | Grades 6-8 | Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders |
| Designing and Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning (K-12) | Grades 6-8 | Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders |
| IEP Training | 6-8 | ESE Teachers | ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs | On-going | Case Manager | ESE Specialist |
| SWD Co-Teaching | 6-8 | DRT | ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team DRT |
| ELL Strategies | 6-8 | English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT) | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team |
| Backwards Design Lesson Planning | 6-8 | District Title 1 | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | October 2012 | Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations | Administration Team Reading and Writing Coaches Subject Area Leaders |
| Teaching with Poverty | 6-8 | School Staff Title 1 | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | August – December 2012 | Teacher Discussions | School Staff |

*End of Reading Goals*

## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| Middle 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).** | | | | | SEE STAAR PLAN | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 44% to 47%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 44% | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 47% | | | | | | |
| | | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **2. FCAT 2.0:** **Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.** | | | | | SEE STAAR PLAN | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 15% to 18%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 15% | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 18% | | 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.** | | | | | SEE | | | |

| Mathematics Goal #3:<br><br>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 59 points to 62 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**59** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**62** | STAAR PLAN | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>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.** | | | SEE STAAR PLAN | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #4:<br><br>Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 59 points to 62 points.<br>. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**59** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**62** | | | | | |
| | | | 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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>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.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics** | | | | 5A.1. | SEE STAAR PLAN | | | |
| Reading Goal #5A:<br><br>The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 51% to 56%.<br><br>The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 40% to 46%.<br><br>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 37% to 43%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>White:51<br>Black:40<br>Hispanic:37<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>White:56<br>Black:46<br>Hispanic:43<br>Asian:<br>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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>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.** | | | | | SEE STAAR | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5B:<br>The percentage of Econ. Dis. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | | |

| students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 40% to 46%. | 40 | 46 | | PLAN | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 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.** | | | | SEE STAAR PLAN | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 24% to 32%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 24 | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 32 | | | | | |
| | | | 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.** | | | | SEE STAAR | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5D: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| The percentage of SWD students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 19% to 27%. | 19 | 27 | | PLAN | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 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).** | | | | SEE STAAR PLAN | | | |
| Algebra Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013Algebra EOC will increase from 70% to 73%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 70% | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 73% | | | | | |
| | | | 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.** | | | | SEE STAAR PLAN | | | |
| Algebra Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013Algebra EOC will | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 18% | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 21% | | | | | |

| increase from 18% to 21%. | | 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 |
| Differentiated Instruction | 6-8 | -District Staff | Math Departmental and course-specific PLCs | PLC Meetings Once a month | Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation | Administration Team |
| Analyzing first semester exams | 6-8 | -Math SAL/Coach | Math Departmental and course-specific PLCs | After the administration of the test | PLC logs | APC |
| IEP Training | 6-8 | Reading Coach | ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs | On-going | Follow up by principal | Reading Coach |
| Backwards Design Lesson Planning | 6-8 | District Title 1 | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | October 2012 | Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations | Administration Team Reading and Writing Coaches Subject Area Leaders |
| Teaching with Poverty | 6-8 | School Staff Title 1 | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | August – December 2012 | Teacher Discussions | School Staff |

*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** | **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.** | | | | SEE STAAR PLAN | | | |
| Science Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 28% to 31%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 28% | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 31% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 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.** | | | | SEE STAAR PLAN | | | |
| Science Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 5% to 8%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 5% | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 8% | | | | | |
| | | | 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 | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |

| | | PLC Leader | school-wide) | Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Technology and Hands-On Activities (animations/Gizmos, scientific probe ware, laboratory technology) | Grades 6-8 | Science Coach/SAL and Technology Resource | Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs | On-going in science PLCs 3 times per month | Administrators/science coach conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor Hands-On Activity implementation. | Administration Team |
| Inquiry and the 5E Instructional Model | Grades 6-8 | Science Coach/SAL and Technology Resource | Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs | On-going in science PLCs 3 times per month | Administrators /Science coach conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor 5 E Instructional Model lessons. | Administration Team |
| Close Reading | Grades 6-8 | Reading Coach Science SAL Reading Leadership Team | Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs | One PLC meeting per month | Reading Coach walk-throughs | Administration Team & Reading Coach |

*End of Science Goals*

## Writing/Language Arts Goals

| Writing/Language Arts Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>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.** | | | | SEE STAAR PLAN | | | |
| Writing/LA Goal #1:<br><br>**The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 73% to 76%.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>73% | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>76%. | | | | | |
| | | | 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<br>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Mode-based Writing Training | 6-8 | LA SAL<br>PLC facilitators<br>Academic Coach | Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams | On-going | -Administration or Coach walk-throughs<br>-PLC logs turned into administration | Principal<br>APC<br>SAL<br>PLC Facilitators |
| Springboard Pacing | 6-8 | LA SAL<br>PLC facilitators<br>Academic Coach | Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams | On-going | -Administration or Coach walk-throughs<br>-PLC logs turned into administration | Principal<br>APC<br>SAL<br>PLC Facilitators |
| Writing Rubric Training | 6-8 | Staff | Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams | On-going | Administration or Coach walk-throughs<br>-PLC logs turned into administration | Writing Coach |

*End of Writing Goals*

**Hillsborough 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised July, 2012**

# Attendance Goal(s)

| Attendance Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Attendance**<br><br><u>Attendance Goal #1:</u><br><br>1. The attendance rate will increase from 94.79% in 2011-2012 to 97% in 2012-2013.<br><br>2. The attendance rate will increase from 94.79% in 2011-2012 to 97% in 2012-2013. The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10%<br><br><br>3. The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:*<br><br>**94.79%**<br><br>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)<br><br>**98**<br><br>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)<br><br>**8** | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*<br><br>**97%**<br><br>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)<br><br>**88**<br><br>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)<br><br>**7** | Attendance committee needs to meet on a regular basis throughout the school year.<br>-Need support in building and maintain the student database.<br><br>Parents are not aware that their student is absent.<br><br>Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance. | **Tier 1**<br>The school will establish an attendance committee comprised of Administrators, guidance counselors, teachers and other relevant personnel to review the school's attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. The attendance committee will also maintain a database of students with significant attendance problems and implement and monitor interventions to be documented on the attendance intervention form (SB 90710) The attendance committee meets once a month.<br>**Tier 1**<br>On a daily basis, an Attendance Clerk contacts all parents whose students have an unexcused absence to school.<br><br>**Tier 3**<br>An attendance referral is generated. The social worker and other relevant personnel (e.g., guidance counselor, school psychologist, SRO) communicates with the family to create an | Attendance committee will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the Principal on a monthly basis and shared with faculty.<br><br>Examination of Parentlink contact reports by attendance team/administration<br><br>Social Worker, Guidance and Student Intervention Other PSLT members as needed<br>School Security – SRO will monitor the targeted students who have 10 or more unexcused absences. | Attendance committee will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students.<br><br>*Decrease in the unexcused absences*<br><br>Social Worker/PSLT review data monthly on Tier 3 students (provided by social worker) | Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data<br>Ed Connect<br><br>Parentlink contact reports<br>Reports on Demand<br><br>Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data |

| | | | Attendance Improvement Plan. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| 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 |
| EdLine | 6-8 | AP | School-wide | September and then an as needed basis | Random check of EdLine postings | AP |
| "Attendance Happens" training for Assistant Principals and School Social Workers. | 6-12 | District Supervisor of attendance | School Social Workers Dropout Prevention Specialists and Assistant | Preplanning | | Principal |
| | | | | | | |

*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**<br><br>Suspension Goal #1:<br><br>1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.<br><br>2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by | 2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions<br>**458**<br>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School<br>**221**<br>2012 Number of Out- | 2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions<br>**412**<br>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School<br>**198**<br>2013 Expected | Teachers need to have common school-wide expectations and rules and provide explicit instruction to students on the expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior. | Tier 1<br>PSLT will assign a Behavior Committee subgroup to develop school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey discipline data and discussions, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations as determined by school-wide program such as Positive Behavior Support (PBS) or CHAMPS. | PSLT and Behavior Committee | PSLT "Behavior Committee" will review data on Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs), ATOSS, and out of school suspensions weekly and monthly. | "UNTIE" ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data.<br><br>PSLT reviews observation data from school wide PBS or CHAMPS fidelity implementation checklist to Target areas of need |

| 10%. | of-School Suspensions | Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. 4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. | **301** | **270** | | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School | | | | | |
| | **160** | **144** | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Suspension Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Positive Behavior Support (PBS) | 6-8 | Staff | School-wide | Reviewed Weekly by Administration and Leadership Committee | Administration, district RtI facilitator and guidance walk-throughs | Administration, district RtI facilitator and guidance walk-throughs |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*End of Suspension Goals*

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

*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 |
|---|---|

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Health and Fitness Goal**<br><br>Health and Fitness Goal #1:<br><br>The number of students scoring in the "Health Fitness Zone: (HFZ on the PACER for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular healthe will increase from 34% on the Pre-Test to 50% on the Post Test. | 2012 Current Level :*<br><br>**34% (204)** | 2013 Expected Level :*<br><br>**50% (300)** | 1.1.<br><br>Students not being able to participate in PE for two consecutive semesters due to intensive reading or math. Scheduling conflicts and weather situations | 1.1<br>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 through 8<br>. | 1.1. Principal Guidance Counselors APC | 1.1. Checking of student schedules<br>1.2. Assessment of data from the PACER test. Utilizing school/district strategies in reading, writing, and AVID focus areas, to promote and educate students on fitness. | 1.1. Student schedules Master schedule PACER Test – component of the Fitness program |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

# Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

| Additional Goal(s) | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Continuous Improvement Goal<br><br><u>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</u><br><br>The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students' learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning)" will increase from 60% in 2012 to 75% in 2013. | <u>2012 Current Level :*</u><br><br>**60%** | <u>2013 Expected Level :*</u><br><br>**75%** | There is still confusion on how to conduct PLCs that are focused on deepening the knowledge base of teachers and improving student performance by the implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model.<br>-Still confusion on how the Plan-Do-Check-Act model works.<br>-Still some resistance to staff members attending PLCs and/or arriving on time to meetings.<br>-Teachers asking for more PLC collaboration time. Possibility of waiver will be explored. | The leadership team will become trained on the use of the PLC "Unit of Instruction" log that follows the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. Subject Area Leader and/or PLC facilitators will guide their PLCs through the Plan-Do-Check-Act model for units of instruction. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Leadership Team. | Who<br>Principal<br>Leadership Team<br>Subject Area Leaders<br>PLC facilitators<br><br>How<br>-Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback.<br>-Administrator walk-throughs of PLCs.<br>-Administrator and leadership team members attend PLCs on a rotating basis. | "Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year . The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training. | Leadership made survey. |
| | | | 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 | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |

| | | | | meetings) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

## NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

| A. **Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).** | | | A.1. Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year. | SWD student achievement improves through the effective and **consistent implementation of students' IEP** goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons. | Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal ESE Specialist  How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC | Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | FAIR  During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal A:  The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*  71 | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*  72 | | | | | |
| | | | 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. Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. | **Strategy/Task** SWD student achievement improves through **teachers' implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act** | Who -School based Administrators -PLC Facilitators  How | Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. | FAIR  During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data |
| Reading Goal B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | 12 | 13 | -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. | **model** in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications. | PLC logs (with specific SWD information) for like courses/grades. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 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.**<br><br>CELLA Goal #C:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 53% to 56%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:<br><br>53 to 56 | Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority. -The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development | ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/standard improves through participation in the **Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)** strategy across Reading, Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science.<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>-ESOL Resource Teacher | Who<br>-School based Administrators<br>-District Resource Teachers<br>-ESOL Resource Teachers<br><br>How<br>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from: | Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL | FAIR<br>-CELLA<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance |

| | | | (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons. | The CALLA Handbook, p. 101, Table 5.4 "Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction. | SMART goal data across all classes/courses. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 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.**<br><br>CELLA Goal #D:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 21% to 24%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :<br><br>21 to 24 | Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority. -The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT | ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves through participation in the following **day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across** Reading, LA, Math, Science, and Social Studies:<br>1. Extended time (lesson and assessments)<br>2. Small group testing<br>3. Para support (lesson and assessments)<br>4. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments) | Who<br>-School based Administrators<br>-ESOL Resource Teachers<br><br>How<br>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms | Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students. | During the Grading Period<br>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests |
| | | 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.**<br><br>CELLA Goal #E:<br>The percentage of students | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : | Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in | ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves in reading, language arts, | Who<br>-School based Administrators<br>-ESOL Resource | Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future | FAIR<br>-CELLA<br><br>During the Grading Period |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 27% to 30%. | 27 to 30 | drilling down their core assessments to the ELL level. | math, science and social studies through teachers working collaboratively to focus on ELL student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act model** to structure their way of work for ELL students. | Teachers -PLC Facilitators<br><br>How<br>PLC logs (with specific ELL information) for like courses/grades | instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. | -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance |
| | | 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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>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).**<br><br>Mathematics Goal F:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring in the middle or upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Geometry Exam will increase from 97% to100%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>97    2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>100 | Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year. | **Strategy**<br>SWD student achievement improves through the **effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals**, strategies, modifications, and accommodations.<br>-Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity.<br>-Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons. | Who<br>Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal<br><br>How<br>IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC | Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. | 2x per year<br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br><br>Semester Exams<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) |
| | | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. |

| | | | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. -General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time. | **Strategy/Task** SWD student achievement improves through teachers' implementation of the **Plan-Do-Check-Act model** in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications. <br><br>**Actions** *Plan* For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our SWD need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD? | Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <br><br>How -PLC logs turned into administration/coaches. Administration/coaches provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team | School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SWD SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team | School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period of SWD SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.** | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal G: <br><br> The percentage of students scoring in the upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Geometry Exam will increase from 72% to 75%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <br><br>**72** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <br><br>**75** | | | | | |
| | | | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. |
| | | | G.3. | 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** | **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).** | | | | | | | |
| Science Goal J:<br><br>N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | 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** | **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).** | | | | | | | |
| Writing Goal M:<br><br>N/A | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. |

| | | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

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

| STEM Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| STEM Goal #1:<br><br>Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM electives. | Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers | Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established.<br>-Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs.<br>-Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc. | PLC or grade level lead -Subject Area Leaders | Administrative/SAL walk-throughs | Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM elective per nine week. Share data with teachers. |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## STEM Professional Development

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

| CTE Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| CTE Goal #1:<br><br>N/A | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## CTE Professional Development

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

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

# Differentiated Accountability

**School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance**

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

| School Differentiated Accountability Status | | |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ Priority | X ☐ 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.

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 |
| Starting Budget | Starting Budget | 2592.00 | |
| For Suspensions | Crime Watch Vests | 170.00 | |
| Student Incentives | We use the Gobbler store for rewards for student engagement | 973.75 | |
| See Math, Goal 5a – See Action Step #3 | To help student achievement of the FCAT | 968.25 | |
| Student Incentives | Tier 1 for use with the whole school Pencils | 480.00 | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Final Amount Spent | | | 2592.00 |