FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012 – 2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

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

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Grady Elementary School	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Kristine Dosal	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Tammy Bird and Christina Cullen	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	Kristine Dosal	M.A. in Ed. Leadership B.A. in 1-6 ESOL	22	7	11/12 A 10/11 A 95% AYP 09/10 A 97% AYP 08/09 A 92% AYP
Assistant Principal	Mike Campbell	M.S. in Ed. Leadership B.A. in Early Childhood/Elementary ESOL	1	1	11/12 A Grady Elementary 10/11 A 100% AYP Westchase Elementary 09/10 A 100% AYP Westchase Elementary 08/09 A 100% AYP Westchase Elementary

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	Jennifer Widstrand	Elementary Ed. K-6 ESOL	1	1	11/12 A Grady Elementary 10/11 D 82% AYP Oak Park Elementary 09/10 C 87% AYP Oak Park Elementary 08/09 C 92% AYP Oak Park Elementary

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	General Directors	June 2012	
2. Recruitment Fairs	Supervisor of Teacher Recruitment	Ongoing	
3. MAP	Supervisor of Data Analysis	July 2012	
4. Performance Pay	General Director of Federal Programs	July 2012	
5. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal	Principal	Ongoing	
6. Partnering new teacher with veteran staff	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
7. College campus job fairs and e-recruiting at universities	Guidance Counselor	April 2013	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly qualified.	**Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective**
5	Needs to add certification to certificate or taking classes for ESOL endorsement.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
41	5% (2)	34% (14)	32% (13)	29% (12)	37% (15)	88% (36)	0% (0)	0% (0)	59% (24)

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
Julie Baker	Sydney LeVan	New teacher	TIP, EET
Julie Baker	Katy Warren	Second-year teacher	TIP, EET
Julie Baker	Tamara Hoover	Second-year teacher	TIP, EET

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 N/A
Title I, Part C- Migrant N/A
Title I, Part D N/A
Title II N/A
Title III N/A
Title X- Homeless N/A
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) N/A
Violence Prevention Programs N/A
Nutrition Programs N/A
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start N/A
Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education N/A
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. Kristine Dosal, Principal Mike Campbell, Assistant Principal Nancy Barra, Guidance Counselor Kimberly Duncan, School Psychologist Margarita Baxter, ESE Specialist Jennifer Widstrand, Reading Coach Pat Benito, School Social Worker Lynne Bennett, Speech/Language Pathologist Maria Babilonia, ELL Michael Bruce, Teacher Tammy Bird, SAC Co-Chairman
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? At Grady Elementary, the purpose of the Problem Solving/Response to Intervention Team (PS/RtI) is to promote a well-integrated system connecting all grade levels (i.e., PLC's) in a continuum of data-based, problem solving processes to provide high quality standards and instruction matched to student need. The PS/RtI functions to address the progress of all students in meeting AYP and to help students stay in the least restrictive environment while improving long term outcomes. The team will use a problem solving model in conjunction with data-based decision making to determine students' rate of improvement at each TIER of instructional support. Our RtI Team will be called the Problem Solving/Response to Intervention Team (PS/RtI Team). The PS/RtT Team will meet at least three times per month to: • Use the RtI problem solving model to: ○ Oversee a multi-tiered model of service delivery (Core/Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3) ○ Determine scheduling needs, curriculum and intervention resources ○ Review/interpret student data (Academic and Behavior) ○ Organize and support systematic data collection. ○ Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction: ▪ Through the implementation of PLCs ▪ Through the use of school-based *Reinforcement Instructional Calendars*, *Mini-Lessons* and *Mini- Assessments* ▪ Through the use of *Common Assessments* given every 6-9 weeks. ▪ Through the implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instruction/interventions ▪ Problem Solving Team will focus on Differentiated Instruction practices. ○ Plan, implement, and oversee the supplemental and intensive interventions for student progression in Tier 2 and Tier 3. ○ Monitor interventions and data assessment in Tier 2 and Tier 3.

- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model and progress monitoring
- Coordinate/collaborate with other working committees such as the Reading Leadership Team, School Advisory Council, and Leadership Team (comprised of the PLC facilitators for grades K-5)
- Assist in the implementation and monitoring of the Differentiated Accountability Model
- Identify professional development needs and resources
- For students in need of TIER III instructional intervention, the PS/RtI Team will assign a subcommittee of individuals to provide direct academic and/or behavioral consultative support to teachers and parents

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 School Advisory Council (SAC) Chair is a member of the Problem Solving Team.
- The Problem Solving Team along with the faculty and SAC were involved in School Improvement Plan development activities that were conducted prior to school being out for 11-12 school year and during preplanning for 12-13.
- The School Improvement Plan is the document that guides the work of the Problem Solving Team. The large part of the work of the Problem Solving Team is outlined in the Action Steps, Evaluation Process, Evaluation Too, and Professional Development of the School Improvement Plan.
- Since one of the main tasks of the Problem Solving Team is to monitor student data, it will monitor the effectiveness of the Action Steps and suggest modifications if needed.

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 I)

- State Level/District Level
  - FCAT released tests
  - District generated tests
  - FAIR/Universal Benchmark Screening
  - District Formative Assessment Calendar will be followed
  - Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM)
- Scantron and grade level developed common assessments (not for grading purposes)
  - Common Assessments in Math and Science will be given every 9 weeks.
  - FAIR Testing – All students will be tested 3 times a year. Level 1 and 2 students will be tested every 20 days.
- Mini-Assessments (not for grading purposes)
  - PLCs identify and build their own Mini-Assessments 4-5 questions in length using District-Adopted Assessment Materials or Scantron Testing bank of questions to be administered weekly.

Core+Supplemental (Tier II)

Students determined to need core plus supplemental Tier II support will receive all assessments listed above with the addition of the following:

- EasyCBM progress monitoring
- Teacher administered running records using commonly chosen reading assessment materials at each grade level
- Computer generated data from programs such as FASST MATH, Imagination-Station, and/or FCAT Explorer to adjust intensity/frequency in support or change intervention

Core+Supplemental+Individualized/Intensive instruction and/or behavioral support (Tier III)

Students determined to need additional methods of progress monitoring of intervention effectiveness include those interventions and assessment at Tier I and Tier II, but may also include additional assessment measures that are unique to more narrowly defined skills such as:

- Progress monitoring data on a specific target behavior or skill that is collected more frequently as a result of interventions delivered individually or to a very small group (i.e., FBA/PBIP, reading fluency by wcpm using FAIR OPM tools, running records, sight word knowledge, EasyCBM, etc.)

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

- Staff can reference previous training modules under RtI district icon.
- PS/RtI team members will conduct information sessions for PLCs in order to address each grade level's unique needs, questions, and concerns.
- Professional development opportunities will be available as needed during Tuesday faculty meeting times.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

- Doing ER (Enrichment/Remediation) at same time across school, using all instructional staff.
- Each member of PS/RtI team is assigned to a different grade level PLC to offer support.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). • Kristine Dosal, Principal • Mike Campbell, Assistant Principal • Jennifer Widstrand, Reading Coach • K-5 Reading Teachers • Nick Tsourakis, Media Specialist
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). • The LLT provides leadership for the implementation of reading strategies on the SIP. • The Reading Coach will meet with K-5 teachers to examine on-going reading data and strengthen instructional strategies. • The Principal will also ensure that time is allotted for the LLT to check and collaborate reading data.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? • Conduct annual Family Reading Night in January/February. • Professional Development • On-going data analysis • Co-planning, modeling, and observing research based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas. • Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading strategies across the content areas.

**Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition*

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

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

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

**High Schools Only*

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S., Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

READING GOALS		
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5). Reading Goal #1:		
In grades 3-5 the percentage of all curriculum students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 68% to 70%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 68% (122)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 70% (125)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?	Evaluation Tools
1.1. - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum) , as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective	1.1. Strategy: **Tier 1** - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the **Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM)** with core curriculum and providing **Differentiated Instruction (DI)** as a result of the problem-solving model. Action Steps 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to	1.1. Who -Principal -APC -Reading Coach -Subject Area Leaders How -Classroom walk-through observing this strategy. -Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson First Nine Week Check	1.1. Teacher Level PLC/Department Level PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data wall. PLC will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery of units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the problem solving leadership team. The problem solving leadership team/reading leadership team will review assessment data for positive trend at minimum of once per nine weeks. Leadership Team Level The Leadership Team will review	1.1. 2-3x Per Year - FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension During Nine Weeks - Course unit assessments

PLCs. Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 9. PLCs record their work in logs.		assessment data for positive trends and patterns at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check*	
1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.
Reading Goal #2:

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
In grades 3-5, the percentage of all curriculum students scoring a level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 46% to 48%.	46% (82)	48% (86)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?	Evaluation Tools
2.1. See 1.1	2.1. Strategy: See 1.1 Action Steps: See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1 Who How *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	2.1. See 1.1 Teacher Level PLC/Department Level Leadership Team Level *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	2.1. See 1.1 2-3x Per Year During Grading Period

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

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.
Reading Goal #3:

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
In grades 3-5 the percentage of all curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 72 to 74 points.	72 points (129)	74 points (132)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?	Evaluation Tools
3.1. See 1.1	3.1. See 1.1 Strategy: Action Steps:	3.1. See 1.1 Who How *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	3.1. See 1.1 Teacher Level PLC/Department Level Leadership Team Level *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	3.1. See 1.1 2-3x Per Year During Grading Period
3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.
Reading Goal #4:

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
In grades 3-5 the percentage of all curriculum in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT reading will increase from 72 to 74 points.	72 points (22)	74 points (23)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?	Evaluation Tools
4.1. - District mini lessons, mini assessments and District calendar do not always align with school student data. SEE 1.1	4.1. Strategy **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the **FCIM** strategy on identified tested benchmarks in reading and Language Arts classes. Action Steps 1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. 2. Based on the data, PLCs develop a 10 day projected timeline/calendar for teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify (using District resources and curriculum resources) and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs will use a combination of District and school-generated mini assessments. 4. Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/calendar. Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule. 7. At the end of each nine weeks, PLCs generate a nine-week review assessment that includes all mini skills covered in the nine weeks. Based on, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule. 7. PLCs record their work in logs.	4.1. Who Principal -APC -Reading Coach -L.A. Subject Area Leader How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form *(EET tool. The F-CIM strategy will be added to the form under Instructional Practices.)* -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. - Another fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/ logs of	4.1. -PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -With the Literacy Leadership Team, the Problem Solving Leadership Team 1) reviews FAIR OPM data to determine the percentage of students scoring medium to high and 2) reviews course-generated nine week assessment that includes all skills covered during the nine week period. -The PSLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	4.1. 2-3x Per Year -FAIR During Nine Weeks -Mini assessment data -School generated review nine week assessment (by course) of all mini skills covered during the nine weeks.

		targeted skills reviewed by the Reading Coach, LA Subject Area Leader and APC. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*		
4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Reading Goal #5: In grades 3-5, 72% of all students will be proficient on the 2013 FCAT or FAA assessment.			70%	73%	76%	79%	82%	85%
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** Reading Goal #5A: In grades 3-5, 72% of the following all curriculum student subgroups will score a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 76 Black: 55 Hispanic: 66 Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 73 Black: 58 Hispanic: 78 Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	5A.1. Lack of common planning time. -Teachers are at varying levels of understanding of the ELA vocabulary standards. - Teachers are at varying levels of understanding of the types of vocabulary items that complement content instruction. -PLC meetings do not include discussion of leveled vocabulary development and	5A.1. Strategy **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' vocabulary acquisition will improve through the implementation of appropriately leveled, **vocabulary development** lessons across all content areas. Action Steps 1. PLC schedule will provide common planning time. 2. PLCs will familiarize themselves with the content	5A.1. Who Principal -APC -Reading Coach -Subject Area Leaders and Grade Level Subject PLC Facilitators -Reading Leadership Team How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators	5A.1. PLCs-Teachers assess students using end of unit/chapter tests. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once	5A.1. 2-3x Per Year - FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring Tool (Scaffolded Discussion Templates) Semester Exams (All Content Areas) During Nine Weeks - End-of-unit/chapter tests (All Content Areas) -Program generated	

			assessment for content instruction. -PLC meetings do not include the development of vocabulary instructional activities for upcoming lessons. -Administrators and support staff are at varying skill levels with identifying appropriate levels of vocabulary development.	standards. 3. PLCs will recognize vocabulary needs within each content area. 4. PLCs come to consensus on the use of common assessments: 1) vocabulary items 5. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs 6. Teachers implement the common assessments. 7. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. PLCs study students' responses to the scaffold lessons. 8. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs use data with the problem-solving process to determine next steps in their vocabulary acquisition implementation. 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.	will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form *(EET tool - Vocabulary strategy will be added to the form under Instructional Practices.)* -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk- *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	assessments -LA embedded assessments
			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.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	See 5A.1	See 5A.1	See 5A.1	See 5A.1	See 5A.1

In grades 3-5, 67% of economically disadvantaged all curriculum students will score a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 4%	**61%**	**67%**					
			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. -ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses.	5C.1. Strategy ELLs (LYs/LFs) reading comprehension will improve through core content teachers (Reading, Language Arts, Science, Social Studies) implementing ELL strategies <u>Action Steps</u> Across all content areas, PLCs write ELL SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the **<u>ELL</u>** students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing and modeling ELL strategies PLC teachers instruct students using the core	5C.1. <u>Who</u> School based Administrators ESOL Resource Teachers <u>How</u> Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the	5C.1. ERTs are on the problem-solving leadership teams in order to update the team on ELLs (inclusive of LFs) performance data. -ERTs meet with Language Arts PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. -ERTs meet with core content teachers during PLC meetings to review ELL (inclusive of LF's) performance data. -ERTs meet with PSLT to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) PLC facilitator will share ELL data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks	5C.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> -FAIR -CELLA <u>During Nine Weeks</u> Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u> **N/A**	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

				curriculum, incorporating ELL strategies from their PLC discussions. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. Teachers bring ELL assessment data back to the PLCs. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective for ELL students. Based on the data, teachers decide what skills need to be re-taught to targeted students using DI techniques. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). PLCs record their work in logs.	entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	*1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. -Collecting data with fidelity -Understanding data and the students'	5D.1. Strategy SWDs reading comprehension will improve by **connecting individual**	5D.1. Who Principal, ESE Specialist, Assistance Principal, Classroom Teacher	5D.1. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving	5D.1. 2-3x Per Year FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension
Reading Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

In grades 3-5, 50% of SWD all curriculum students will score a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 7%.	**33%**	**50%**	disability to make instructional decisions -For general education teachers, understanding the IEP and instructional accommodations -Teachers at varying skill levels (ACP, content knowledge, certification) -Multiple preparations -Lack of common planning time -Lack of understanding of the IEP and instructional accommodations	**needs to instruction as outlined in the IEP**. Action Steps General ed. and/or SWD teachers will familiarize themselves with each student's IEP goals, strategies and accommodations. Every nine weeks the General Ed and/or SWD teacher reviews students' IEPs to ensure that all students' IEP goals, strategies and accommodations are being implemented with fidelity. Using student data, every nine weeks (along with the report card) SWD students will receive an Individual Education Plan Progress Report to inform parents of the students' progress toward mastering their IEP goals and strategies. Across all content areas, PLCs write **SWD** SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discussing implementation of IEP strategies and modifications. PLC teachers instruct students implementing IEP strategies and accommodations. At the end of the unit,	How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by AP and ESE Specialist. PSLT will identify and/or create a fidelity monitoring tool designed to check implementation of this specific strategy. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	During Nine Weeks Unit assessments for SWD students Nine weeks grades for SWD students

				teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. Teachers bring SWD assessment data back to the PLCs. Based on the data, teachers discuss techniques that were effective for SWD students. Based on the data, teachers decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students using DI techniques. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). PLCs record their work in logs.			
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
DI	K-5	-Reading Coach -PLC Facilitators	All teachers school-wide PLCs	Early Release: October - December 2011 -PLCs: Ongoing	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation	Principal and Administrative Team
Vocabulary Acquisition Strategies	K-5	Reading Coach PLC Facilitators	All teachers school wide -PLCs	-PLC course specific meetings scheduled every two weeks	Administrative walk-throughs to observe vocabulary acquisition strategies	Principal and Administrative Team

				-PD August 2011 -Demonstration classrooms scheduled October 2011-May 2012		
Analyzing student FAIR data	K-5	Reading Coach PLC Facilitators	All teachers school wide -PLCs	Data Analysis with grade level - October, January, April	Administrator will review reading logs to monitor the analysis of student data to inform instructional decisions.	Principal and Administrative Team
Data Collection and Analysis	K-5	Reading Coach PLC Facilitators Principal Assistant Principal	All teachers school wide	PLCs, faculty meetings - Oct, Jan, and April Data Analysis by Grade Level – October, January and April	PSLT review of data	PSLT

End of Reading Goals

Mathematics Goals

Goal 1 – Elementary and Middle using FCAT Math Data

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).

Mathematics Goal #1:

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
In grades 3-5, the percentage of all curriculum students scoring a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 66% to 68%.	66% (118)	68% (122)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?	Evaluation Tools
1.1. - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.	1.1. Strategy **Tier 1** - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the **Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM)** with core curriculum and providing **Differentiated Instruction (DI)** as a result of the problem-solving model. Action Steps As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based DI best-practice strategies. In addition, math teachers visit math demonstration classrooms where DI is emphasized. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 9. PLCs record their work in logs.	1.1. Who -Principal -APC How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. -Monitoring data will	1.1. PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data wall PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	1.1. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Nine Weeks Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments

- Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).		be reviewed every nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*		
1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Goal 1-EOC – Middle and High using Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Math Data

1. Students scoring in the Middle and Upper Thirds on the End-of-Course Algebra exam.

Mathematics Goal #1:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
	N/A ()	N/A ()

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?	Evaluation Tools
1.1.	1.1. Strategy:	1.1. Who	1.1. Teacher Level	1.1. 2-3x Per Year

	Action Steps:	How *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	PLC/Department Level Leadership Team Level *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	During Grading Period
1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Goal 2 – Elementary and Middle using FCAT Math Data

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.
Mathematics Goal #2:

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
In grades 3-5, the percentage of all curriculum students scoring a level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 34% to 36%.	34% (61)	36% (65)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?	Evaluation Tools
2.1. Not all teachers know how to identify student's needs from assessments. Not all teachers know how to ask higher order/open ended	2.1 Strategy The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through participation in **HOTS** activities. Teachers will analyze data, plan instruction based on data, include HOT questions designed to increase rigor in lesson plans. Action Steps: 1.Offer Assessment and Data Analysis in the Elementary Mathematics	2.1. Who Teacher Principal AP How PLC logs turned into	2.1. PLCs – Periodic (weekly or bi-weekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment. PLCs will review unit	2.1. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing -BOY test -MYT tests -EOY test

questions during instruction. Not all teachers are able to attend mathematics trainings on dates available by the district.	Classroom training 2. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 3.Take strategies learned from training and discuss in PLC 4. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss HOT strategies and how they can be implemented in the upcoming lessons. 5. Teachers implement the targeted higher order questioning strategies in their lessons. 6. Teachers implement the common assessments. 7. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 8. PLCs study specifically students' responses to the higher order questions to assess students' higher order thinking processes. 9. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher order strategy implementation. 10. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.	administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. -Elementary Mathematics Walk-through Form -Mathematics PLC Recording Document *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	During Nine Weeks Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments
2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

Goal 2-EOC – Middle and High using Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Math Data

2. Students scoring in the Upper Third on the End-of-Course Algebra exam.
Mathematics Goal #2:

	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	N/A ()	N/A ()

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?	Evaluation Tools
2.1.	2.1. Strategy: Action Steps:	2.1. Who How *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	2.1. Teacher Level PLC/Department Level Leadership Team Level *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	2.1. 2-3x Per Year During Grading Period
2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

Goal 3 – Elementary and Middle using FCAT Math Data

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.
Mathematics Goal #3:

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
In grades 3-5, the percentage of all curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 70 to 72 points.	70 points (125)	72 points (129)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?	Evaluation Tools

3.1. Lack of infrastructure to support technology -Lack of technology hardware -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the NGSSS Teachers lack of understanding of the new county implemented textbook curriculum.	3.1. Strategy The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through the use of **technology and hands-on activities** to implement the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. Action Steps 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling technology and hands-on strategies. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating strategies from their PLC discussions. 5. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 7. As a Professional Development activity, teachers use data to discuss strategies that were effective. 8. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning technology and hands-on strategies. 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.	3.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. -HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	3.1. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	3.1. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Nine Weeks Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments
3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.
Mathematics Goal #4:

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
In grades 3-5, the percentage of all curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 53% to 55%.	53% (16)	55% (17)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?	Evaluation Tools
4.1. Teachers at varying skill levels with the FCIM model. - Teachers' implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across math classes. - Lack of common planning time to develop/identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring. - Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. - Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within	4.1. Strategy The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the **FCIM** strategy on identified tested benchmarks*(middle school uses this as bell work)*. Action Steps 1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons/assessments. 4. Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/calendar. Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule. 7. As a PLC, teachers develop a school-based assessment that covers all mini lesson skills taught within the nine week period. 8. PLCs record their work in logs.	4.1. Who Teacher Principal Assistant Principal How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. -Another fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/ logs of targeted skills reviewed by the administration and/or Math	4.1. -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in a course specific PLC data wall. -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on each mini-assessment. PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team reviews data that includes all skills covered during the nine week period. *1st Grading Period Check*	4.1. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Nine Weeks Benchmark mini assessments

the District pacing guide.		Coach. - PSLT will review the calendars/logs and make progress statements at the end of each nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	*2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	
4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

Goal 4-EOC – Middle and High using Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Math Data

4 . Students scoring in the Lower Third on the End-of-Course Algebra exam.
Mathematics Goal #4:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*
	N/A ()	N/A ()

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?	Evaluation Tools
4.1.	4.1. Strategy: Action Steps:	4.1. Who How	4.1. Teacher Level PLC/Department Level Leadership Team Level	4.1. 2-3x Per Year

		1st Grading Period Check 2nd Grading Period Check 3rd Grading Period Check	1st Grading Period Check 2nd Grading Period Check 3rd Grading Period Check	During Grading Period
4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Math Goal #5: **In grades 3-5, 69% of all students will be proficient on the 2013 FCAT or FAA assessment.**			67%	70%	73%	76%	79%	82%
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics** Mathematics Goal #5A: In grades 3-5, 69% of the following all curriculum student subgroups will score a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 73 Black: 40 Hispanic: 68 Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 73 Black: 46 Hispanic: 71 Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	5A.1. Students not receiving academic support outside of math classroom instruction. - Lack pre-requisite skills	5A.1. Strategy The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through participation in **Differentiated Instruction** (DI) lessons. These DI lesson will provide both re-teaching and enrichment where needed. Students will be regrouped for DI lessons based on classroom performance. Action Steps PLCs write SMART goals	5A.1. Who Teacher Principal AP How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing lessons designed with Differentiated Instruction. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans	5A.1. PLCs – Periodic (weekly or bi-weekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores, teacher observations, and response through modification of lesson plans based on data are reviewed to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of	5A.1. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing -BOY test -MYT tests -EOY test During Nine Weeks Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments	

				based on each nine weeks of material 3. Based on classroom performance and the use of the Evaluation Tools listed in the last column, teachers provide DI lessons and regroup students for both re-teaching and remediation. 4. Teachers assess the skills taught in the DI lessons to ensure mastery. 5. As a Professional Development activity, in PLCs teachers discuss the outcomes of their DI lessons and share the effectiveness of their lessons. 6. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of DI lesson planning. 7. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.	seen during administration walk-throughs. -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. -Elementary Mathematics Walk-through Form -Mathematics PLC Recording Document *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	
			5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.
			5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5B.1. See 5A.1	5B.1. See 5A.1	5B.1. See 5A.1	5B.1. See 5A.1	5B.1. See 5A.1
Mathematics Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

In grades 3-5, 56% economically disadvantaged all curriculum students will score a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 4%.	**56%**	**65%**					
			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses.	5C.1. Strategy ELLs (LYs/LFs) reading comprehension will improve through core content teachers (Reading, Language Arts, Science, Social Studies) implementing ELL strategies <u>Action Steps</u> Across all content areas, PLCs write ELL SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the **<u>ELL</u>** students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) As a Professional Development activity in	5C.1. <u>Who</u> School based Administrators ESOL Resource Teachers <u>How</u> Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that	5C.1. ERTs are on the problem-solving leadership teams in order to update the team on ELLs (inclusive of LFs) performance data. -ERTs meet with Language Arts PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. -ERTs meet with core content teachers during PLC meetings to review ELL (inclusive of LF's) performance data. -ERTs meet with PSLT to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) PLC facilitator will share ELL data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving	5C.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing <u>During Nine Weeks</u> -Benchmark mini assessments -Unit assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> **N/A**	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

				their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing and modeling ELL strategies PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating ELL strategies from their PLC discussions. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. Teachers bring ELL assessment data back to the PLCs. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective for ELL students. Based on the data, teachers decide what skills need to be re-taught to targeted students using DI techniques. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). PLCs record their work in logs.	includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. Collecting data with fidelity -Understanding data and the students' disability to make instructional decisions -For general education teachers, understanding the IEP and instructional accommodations -Teachers at varying skill levels (ACP, content knowledge, certification) -Multiple preparations -Lack of common planning time -Lack of understanding of the IEP and instructional accommodations	5D.1. Strategy SWDs math skills will improve by **connecting individual needs to instruction as outlined in the IEP**. Action Steps General ed. and/or SWD teachers will familiarize themselves with each student's IEP goals, strategies and accommodations. Every nine weeks the General Ed and/or SWD teacher reviews students' IEPs to ensure that all students' IEP goals, strategies and accommodations are being implemented with fidelity. Using student data, every nine weeks (along with the report card) SWD students will receive an Individual Education Plan Progress Report to inform parents of the students' progress toward mastering their IEP goals and strategies. Across all content areas, PLCs write **SWD** SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. As a Professional Development activity in	5D.1. Who Principal Assistant Principal ESE Specialist Classroom Teacher How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by AP and ESE Specialist. PSLT will identify and/or create a fidelity monitoring tool designed to check implementation of this specific strategy. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	5D.1. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	5D.1. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Nine Weeks Benchmark mini assessments -Unit assessments
Mathematics Goal #5D: **In grades 3-5, 48% of SWD all curriculum students will score a level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math test or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 7%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **31%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **48%**					

				their PLCs, teachers discussing implementation of IEP strategies and modifications. PLC teachers instruct students implementing IEP strategies and accommodations. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. Teachers bring SWD assessment data back to the PLCs. Based on the data, teachers discuss techniques that were effective for SWD students. Based on the data, teachers decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students using DI techniques. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). PLCs record their work in logs.			
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Hands-On Activities	K-5	PLC facilitators	All math teachers	Course specific PLC meetings-ongoing throughout the year	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation	Principal/Administration Team
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	PLC facilitators	All math teachers	Course specific PLC meetings-ongoing throughout the year	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation	Principal/Administration Team

End of Mathematics Goals

Science Goals

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science. Science Goal #1:		
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
In grade 5, the percentage of all curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 49% to 51%.	49% (28)	51% (30)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?	Evaluation Tools
1.1. -Teachers are at varying skill levels of long-term investigations. -Not all teachers integrate long term investigations into science instruction to provide students with opportunities to collect data over time.	1.1. Strategy **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science skills will improve through increased participation in **long-term investigations.** Action Steps Teachers will utilize the Curriculum Maps to identify appropriate long term investigations throughout the year based on the Hillsborough county science curriculum calendar and the NGSSS.	1.1. Who Teacher Principal AP Science Resource Teacher How Curriculum maps and lesson plans turned into the AP. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	1.1. Science investigations will be evaluated using a rubric. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	1.1. Science investigations 2-3x Per Year During Nine Weeks Chapter Tests

1.2. - Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.	1.2. Strategy**Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science comprehension will improve through teachers using the **Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM)** with core curriculum and providing **Differentiated Instruction** as a result of the problem-solving model Action Steps . PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional Development activity, teachers use district textbook adopted materials and resources within their PLCs to plan and deliver lessons. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling research-based best-practice DI strategies. In addition, science teachers visit science demonstration classrooms where DI is emphasized. 4. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 5. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 7. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective. 8. Based on the data, teachers 1) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, 2) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class 3) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.	1.2. Who -Principal -AP -Classroom Teacher How PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration classroom walk-throughs -Elementary Science Classroom Walk-Through form *(available from Elementary Science Department.)* -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	1.2. PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	1.2. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During Nine Weeks Unit assessments
1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.
Science Goal #2:

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
In grade 5, the percentage of all curriculum students scoring a level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 12% to 14%.	12% (7)	14% (8)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?	Evaluation Tools
2.1. Teachers are at varying skill levels of long-term investigations. -Not all teachers integrate long term investigations into science instruction to provide students with opportunities to collect data over time.	2.1 Strategy **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science skills will improve through increased participation in **laboratory experiences**. The goal will be to complete one lab per week. Action Steps. Teachers utilize curriculum maps, science calendars and curriculum resources to implement the lab experience in the classroom.	2.1. Who Classroom teacher Assistant principal How Curriculum maps and lesson plans turned into the AP. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	2.1. Science investigations will be evaluated using a rubric. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	2.1. Science investigations 2-3x Per Year During Nine Weeks Unit Assessments
2.2. SEE 1 1.2	2.2. SEE 1 1.2 Strategy Action Steps	2.2. SEE 1 1.2 Who How First Nine Week Check Second Nine Week Check Third Nine Week Check	2.2. SEE 1 1.2 First Nine Week Check Second Nine Week Check Third Nine Week Check	2.2. SEE 1 1.2 2-3x Per Year During Nine Weeks
2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	Science Contact	All Science Teachers	PLC Meetings	Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation	Administration Team
Hands-On Activities	K-5	Science Contact	All Science Teachers	PLC Meetings	Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation	Administration Team
Connecting NatGeo Science and Reading	K-5	Science Contact, Reading Coach	K-5 Teachers	PSD – August	Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation	Administration Team

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.		
In grade 4, the percentage of all curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing will increase from 96% to 98%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 96% (54)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 98% (55)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy implementation? What do you plan to do with the data	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? **Nine Week Check** What is the level of strategy effectiveness? What do you plan to do with the data?	Evaluation Tools
2.1. Teachers and students lack ongoing monitoring of progress in writing (skills)	2.1 Strategy The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' writing skills will improve through teachers using the **Core Continuous Improvement Model** (C-CIM) with core curriculum. School will implement embedded writing assessments in the core curriculum and **monthly/ongoing formative writing assessments** to monitor student progress/improvement. Action Plans 1.. Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each nine weeks. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the monthly writing prompt.) 2. As a Professional Development activity PLCs participate in discussions that share PLC data, trends, and best-practice instructional strategies. These discussions are held in both horizontal (across course) and vertical (across grade levels) groups. 3. Teachers and students will maintain writing portfolios to demonstrate student engagement in all stages of the writing process. 4. Students will complete scaffolded activities prior to required Embedded Assessments and teachers will share reflections of student growth or need in order to inform instruction. 5. Teachers and students will engage in metacognitive reflection of embedded assessments to celebrate attainment of writing skills and goals and to identify continuing needs and adjust instruction. 6. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs meet and discuss data in order to implement effective teaching strategies and lesson plans targeted to meet the needs of students. 7. PLCs review nine week data, set a new goal for the following nine weeks. 8. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.	2.1. Who Principal AP Writing Teachers How - PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. - Classroom walk-throughs observing evidence of student portfolios, embedded assessments, daily learning activity tied to instruction, use of formative assessments, and student engagement in reflection. - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	2.1. PLCs - Review of monthly formative writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric. PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching 4.0 or above on the monthly writing prompt. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*	2.1. 2-3x Per Year Review of monthly formative writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric - Embedded writing assessments from the core curriculum - Student portfolios *1st Grading Period Check* *2nd Grading Period Check* *3rd Grading Period Check*

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	Writing contact	Writing Teachers	PLC Meetings	Administrative walk-through to monitor Differentiated Instruction	Administration Team
Rubric Training	2-5	Writing Contact	Writing Teachers	PLC Meetings	PLC Logs	Administration Team
STAR Interviews	K-5	Writing Contact	Writing Teachers	Faculty Meeting	STAR and SMILE Interview documents, student writing samples	Administration Team

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

ATTENDANCE GOAL(S)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Evaluation Tools
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: **The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease from 5% in 2012 to 3% in 2013.**	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* **96.22% (384)** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Unexcused Absences (10 or more) **18** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Unexcused Tardies to School (10 or more) **0**	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* **97.22% (388)** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Unexcused Absences (10 or more) **12** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Unexcused Tardies to School (10 or more) **0**	1.1. -Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance. -Lack of time to focus on attendance -Lack of staff to focus on attendance	1.1. The Administration Team along with other appropriate staff will meet every 20 days to review the school's Attendance Plan to 1) ensure that all steps are being implemented with fidelity and 2) discuss targeted students. A data base will be maintained for students with excessive unexcused absences and tardies. This data base will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of attendance interventions and to identify students in need of support beyond school wide attendance initiatives	1.1. Administration team will run Attendance/Tardy meetings every 20 days with appropriate reports Administration team will maintain data base Social Worker Guidance Counselors	1.1. Administration Team and subset of PSLT will examine data monthly	1. Attendance Report Tardy Report Attendance Plan
			1.2. See 1.1	1.2. When a student reaches 15 days of unexcused absences and/or unexcused tardies to school, parents and guardians are notified via mail that future absences/tardies must have a doctor note or other reason outlined in the Student Handbook to receive an excused absence/tardy and must be approved through an administrator. A parent-administrator-student conference is scheduled and	1.2. See 1.1	1.2. See 1.1	1.2. See 1.1

			held regarding these procedures. The goal of the conference is to create a plan for assisting the students to improve his/her attendance/tardies.			
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance Plan	Administrators	Guidance Counselor	Staff Meetings	August through June	Review plans and student data every 20 days.	Guidance Counselor, AP, Principal

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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?	Evaluation Tools
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:			1.1. There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	1.1 **Tier 1**: Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey and discussion, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations.	1.1. AP and Guidance Counselor will discuss behaviors at weekly administrative staff meetings.	1.1. AP and Guidance Counselor will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions monthly.	1.1. AP and Guidance Counselor will view suspension data and cross-reference with mainframe discipline data.
The total number of In-School suspensions will decrease from 2 in 2011-2012, to 1 in 2012-2013.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	2	1					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	2	1					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	0	0					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	0	0					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Practical Classroom	K-5	Guidance	School Wide	Once a month classroom	Lesson plans implementing the	Guidance Counselor

Management Strategies		Counselor		lessons	classroom management strategies.	Principal AP

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

DROPOUT PREVENTION GOAL(S)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Evaluation Tools
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2013 school year.*			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
N/A	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.*					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1:			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
N/A	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
2. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #2:			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
N/A	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

N/A						

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Health and Fitness

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

Health and Fitness Goal			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?	Evaluation Toola
1. Health and Fitness Goal Health and Fitness Goal #1:			1.1. Children have not had proper exposure to physical activity.	1.1. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the school's Physical Education team.	1.1. P.E team.	1.1. Pacer pre and post results	1.1. Student schedules and results of Pacer test.
During the 2012-2013 school year the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone on the Pacer for Assessing Aerobic Capacity and Cardiovascular Health will increase from 56% on the pre-test to 58% on the post-test.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	56%	**58%**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attend monthly PE PLC meetings	1-5/PE		Elementary school PE coaches	Monthly	Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor implementation of strategies.	Principal and Administrative Team

Continuous Improvement

Note: If you wrote Parent Involvement goals above and they are also appropriate for Continuous Improvement, you may do a "copy and paste."

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

Continuous Improvement Goal			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?	Evaluation Tools
1. Continuous Improvement Goal Continuous Improvement Goal #1:							
The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicators under Commitment to Continuous Improvement on the School and Perception Survey for Instructional Staff will increase from 87% in 2012, to 89% in 2013.	2012 Current Level :* **87%**	2013 Expected Level :* **89%**	1.1. - Not all staff is trained in PLCs. - PLC Facilitators/Subject Area Leaders are not all trained to lead PLCs. - Difficulty making the transition for keeping meetings curriculum and student focused.	1.1. Key staff will provide training on PLCs to the Problem-Solving Leadership Team. PSLT members will implement skills learned within the grade level/subject area/Department PLCs. A faculty study will be conducted during the first semester.	1.1. Who Principal and trained staff members How - Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback.	1.1. PSLT will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process.	1.1. PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PSLT team on progress of their PLC.
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC	K-5	Team Leaders	School Wide	All Year	Administration walk-throughs of PLC meetings	Administration Team

End of Additional Goal(s)

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).</td><td>A.1.</td><td>A.1.</td><td>A.1.</td><td>A.1.</td><td>A.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Reading Goal A:

N/A</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>%</td><td>%</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>A.2.</td><td>A.2.</td><td>A.2.</td><td>A.2.</td><td>A.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>A.3.</td><td>A.3.</td><td>A.3.</td><td>A.3.</td><td>A.3.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</td><td>B.1.</td><td>B.1.</td><td>B.1.</td><td>B.1.</td><td>B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Reading Goal B:

N/A</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>%</td><td>%</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>B.2.</td><td>B.2.</td><td>B.2.</td><td>B.2.</td><td>B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>B.3.</td><td>B.3.</td><td>B.3.</td><td>B.3.</td><td>B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #C: **The number of students scoring proficient on the Listening/Speaking section of CELLA will increase from 55% to 57%**	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: **55%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.		2.1. See Reading Goal 1.	2.1 See Reading Goal 1.	2.1. See Reading Goal 1.	2.1. See Reading Goal 1.	2.1. See Reading Goal 1.
CELLA Goal #D: **The number of students scoring proficient on the Reading section of CELLA will increase from 45% to 47%.**	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : **45%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #E: **The number of students scoring proficient on the Writing section of CELLA will increase from 45% to 47%.**	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : **45%**	See Writing Goal 1.	See Writing Goal 1.	See Writing Goal 1.	See Writing Goal 1.	See Writing Goal 1.
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).			F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.
Mathematics Goal F: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.
			F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.

G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.		G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.
Mathematics Goal : N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		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

Elementary, Middle and High Science Goals			**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).			J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.
Science Goal J: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			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).			M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.
Writing Goal M: 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: **Increase STEM (science) Extended Learning Programs**	1.1. Lack of time to reteach necessary benchmarks.	1.1. Finding more time to review science benchmarks with students.	1.1. Who Teacher Principal AP How Assessments from ELP	1.1. ELP pre- and post-test will determine if re-teaching needs to take place or can move on to other science benchmarks	1.1. ELP Assessments
	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
ELP Training Session	5	Area Generalist	ELP Teachers	October or November meeting	Turn in assessments to AP	AP

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: **Expose students to various jobs in the career and technical education (CTE) field.**	1.1. Finding guest speakers in different fields	1.1. Implement special speakers to visit and share with students about CTE careers throughout the year and during the Great American Teach-In.	1.1. Guidance Counselor	1.1. Review survey data to help schedule speakers for the next year	1.1. Student Survey Log of CTE special speakers
	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
Integration of career opportunities in core academic areas	K-5	Science Dept.	Science Contacts	Monthly meetings	Holding science events/STEM Fair	AP

End of CTE Goal(s)

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐ Priority	☐ Focus	☐ Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Describe the use of SAC funds.			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
		$1,218.00	
Final Amount Spent			