

# Florida Department of Education



## School Improvement Plan (SIP)

# Form SIP-1

## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

### PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Hilda T. Turner Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough County
Principal: Rhonda McMahan	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Cynthia L. Quinta	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](#)

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

### [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	Rhonda McMahon	Ed.S. M.Ed., B.A.  National Board Certified (Early Adolescent Social Sciences)  Educational Leadership  Elementary Education (1-6)  Social Science  Gifted Endorsement	8	6	11/12: A  10/11: A, 97%AYP  09/10: A, 100% AYP  08/09: A, 100% AYP  07/08: A, 97%AYP  06/07: A, 100% AYP
Assistant Principal	Mary Ann Jenks	M. Ed. Educational Leadership, B.S. Elementary Education  (1-6), National Board Certification (Middle Child Generalist)	1	3	11/12: A (Turner)  10/11: D, 74% AYP (Roland Park K-8), A, 97% AYP (Turner)  09/10: C, 77% AYP (Roland Park K-8)

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

**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	Kalen Terrell Henry	BA Elementary Ed. M.Ed. Reading ESOL 1	3	12	11/12 A Turner 10/11: A, 97% AYP 09/10 : A, 100% AYP 08/09: A, 100% AYP Turner

**Highly Qualified Teachers**

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
Teacher Interview Day	General Directors	June	

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

Recruitment Fairs	Quincy Bell	June	
District Mentor Program	District Mentors	Ongoing	
District Peer Program	District Peers	Ongoing	
Regular Time for Teacher Collaboration	Principal	Ongoing	
Opportunities for Teacher Leadership	Principal	Ongoing	
Regular Meetings of New Teachers with Principal	Principal	Ongoing	
Partnering New Teachers with Veteran Staff	Principal	Ongoing	

**Non-Highly Qualified Instructors**

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

<b>Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly qualified.</b>	<b>Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective</b>
---	--

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16 out of field</li> </ul>	<p>Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented.</p> <p><b><u>Administrator</u></b></p> <p>Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss the progress on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completing classes needed for certification exam.</li> <li>• Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers.</li> <li>• Discussion of what teachers learned during observations.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Subject Area Leader/PLC</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The teachers will attend PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they may improve learning as a teacher and a PLC member.</li> </ul>
---	--

**Staff Demographics**

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ES OL Endorsed Teachers
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--	---	--	-----------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------

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

82	8	27	33	22	27	78	1	3	66
	10 %	33 %	40 %	27 %	33 %	95 %	1%	4%	81 %

**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
Melissa Russo	Gina Krutulis	Mrs. Russo has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement in Pre-K.	Weekly visits  Mentoring as needed  Co-planning in PLCs
Karen Toselli	Katherine Kovach	Mrs. Toselli has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement in first grade.	Weekly visits  Mentoring as needed  Co-planning in PLCs

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

Kelly Delgado	Shannon Desilva	Mrs. Delgado has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement in first grade.	Weekly visits Mentoring as needed Co-planning in PLCs
Stephanie Falcone	Meredith Evans	Mrs. Falcone has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement in first grade.	Weekly visits Mentoring as needed Co-planning in PLCs
Michael Zang	Brandi Richardson	Mr. Zang has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement in first grade.	Weekly visits Mentoring as needed Co-planning in PLCs



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

Lisa Brengel-Sullivan	Christina Swan	Mrs. Brengel has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement in second grade.	Weekly visits  Mentoring as needed  Co-planning in PLCs
Stacy Summers	Lisa Keigher	Ms. Summers has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement in third grade.	Weekly visits  Mentoring as needed  Co-planning in PLCs
Bea Cannella	Sarah Edwards	Mrs. Cannella has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement in third grade.	Weekly visits  Mentoring as needed  Co-planning in PLCs

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

Julie Lehman	Kalila Bailey	Mrs. Lehman has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement in fourth grade.	Weekly visits Mentoring as needed Co-planning in PLCs
Pattie Rodriguez	Sara Kelley	Mrs. Rodriguez has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement in fourth grade.	Weekly visits Mentoring as needed Co-planning in PLCs
Cynthia Quinta	Michael Champagne	Mrs. Quinta has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement in fifth grade.	Weekly visits Mentoring as needed Co-planning in PLCs

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

Ross Reynolds	Lyle Korpi	Mr. Reynolds has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement in physical education.	Weekly visits  Mentoring as needed
Cassandra Farrior	Stefany Wend	Ms. Farrior has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement in the Academically Gifted Program.	Weekly visits  Mentoring as needed  Co-planning in PLCs
Mary Ann Jenks	Marelisa Herbert	Mrs. Jenks has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement.	Weekly visits  Mentoring as needed

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

Mary Ann Jenks	Leah Shirley	Mrs. Jenks has strengths in the areas of curriculum, behavior management , and student achievement.	Weekly visits  Mentoring as needed
----------------	--------------	---	--

**Additional Requirements**

**Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only**

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

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III

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

Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

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

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

The RtI Leadership Team (Problem Solving Leadership Team – PSLT) includes:

Principal

Assistant Principal

Administrative Resource Teacher

Guidance Counselor

ESE Teacher

School Psychologist

Social Worker

Reading Coach

SAC Chair

Representatives from the PLC's for each grade level, K-5

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

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The Leadership team meets regularly (monthly). Specific responsibilities include:

- The major goal is for all students to achieve adequate yearly progress, make learning gains and improve other long-term outcomes (behavior, attendance, etc.). The team uses the Collaborative Culture Problem Solving Model and ALL decisions are guided by the review and analysis of student data through teacher and grade level data chats.
- To review school-wide data to address the progress of low-performing students and determine the enrichment and acceleration needs of high performing students.
- To ensure high quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and using performance level and learning rate over time to make data-based decisions to guide instruction.
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
  - Implementation and support of PLC's
  - Review of teacher/PLC curriculum assessments and data will be collected and analyzed by PLC's and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT team.
  - Communication with major stakeholders (parents, business partners) regarding student outcomes at SAC meetings.
- Determine scheduling needs, and assist teams in identifying research-based and instructional materials and intervention resources at Tier 2/3
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals.

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

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 administration, Leadership Team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.
- The Leadership/PSLT Team monitors the effectiveness of instruction and intervention by reviewing student data as well as data related to implementation fidelity (teacher walk-through data).
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams. The large part of the work is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections for school-wide goals in Reading, Writing, Math, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior as well as new goals in CTE and STEM.

### MTSS Implementation



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

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

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released tests	School Generated Excel Database	Assistant Principal, teachers in IPT checking data
Baseline and Midyear Math, Science and Reading District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Chats	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
Math Formatives Science Formatives Reading Formatives Writing Prompts	Scantron Achievement Series Data Chats PLC logs	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Chats	Reading Coach, PLC's, individual teachers
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL teacher

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

DRA-2	Excel Spreadsheet or grade book	Individual Teacher

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

<b>Data Source</b>	<b>Database</b>	<b>Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring</b>
Extended Learning Program (ELP)*	EasyCBM.com  Individual teacher assessments based on grade level and needs	ELP Teachers and Homeroom teachers-share and discuss individual students
Computer-based programs	I-Station  FASTT Math	Individual Teachers
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/Reading Coach/Individual teachers
Classroom assessments from core curriculum	Individual teacher database in Excel or grade book	PLC/Individual Teachers
HERO Tutoring Program	HERO Tutor log	HERO Tutors, Individual Teachers, PSLT

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

<p>*Students receiving pull-out tutoring during the school day or Extended Learning Program (ELP) after school will receive instruction on the specific skills they have not mastered in the core curriculum. As students work on these specific skills, they will be assessed during tutoring and ELP to ensure mastery of skills. In order to make this process effective, a communication system between classroom teacher and the tutor/ELP teacher will be developed by the PSLT and monitored for effectiveness.</p>		
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Leadership Team will continue to work with parents and other stakeholders regarding the focus of the school and our needs.</li><li>• The Leadership Team will have representatives to attend RtI trainings and report back information to share with grade levels.</li><li>• Professional Development sessions will take place during faculty meetings.</li></ul>		
<p>Describe plan to support MTSS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As a school we have a school wide vision meeting the needs of all our students in the following: behavior-management, PLC's, SAC meetings, PSLT.</li><li>• Provide continued training and support to all teachers in the areas of recording data, interpreting data and research-based and best practices for increasing student achievement.</li></ul>		

### Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

The Literacy Leadership team serves as the school's literacy Professional Learning Community. The team is comprised of:

Rhonda McMahon, Principal

Mary Ann Jenks, Assistant Principal

Kalen Terrell-Henry, Reading Coach

Elaine Kurtright, Media Specialist

Melissa Russo, ESE Teacher

Debbie Booth, Kindergarten Teacher

Karen Toselli, First Grade Teacher

Lisa Brengel, Second Grade Teacher

Kathy Bish, Third Grade Teacher

Patricia Contardo, Fourth Grade Teacher

Cynthia Quinta, Fifth Grade Teacher

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

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The LLT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading strategies on the SIP.



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

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

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

- Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading strategies across the content areas
- Professional Development
- Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas
- Data analysis (on-going)
- Implement K-12 Reading Plan

### *NCLB Public School Choice*

- Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

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

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

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

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

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

**\*High Schools Only**

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

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

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

**Postsecondary Transition**

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

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

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Reading Goals**

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

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

<p><b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).</b></p>	<p>I.1.</p> <p>-Lack of common planning time</p> <p>-Lack of training availability of seats</p> <p>-Determining which resources to use</p> <p>-Understanding vocabulary</p>	<p>I.1.</p> <p><u>Strategy</u></p> <p>Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers' direct instruction of key comprehension strategies while implementing differentiated instruction.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content and PLC action plans.</p>	<p>I.1.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Principal</p> <p>-AP</p> <p>-Reading Coach</p> <p>-Teachers</p> <p>-PLC facilitators of like grades or like subjects</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-Reading PLC logs</p> <p>-Language Arts PLC logs</p> <p>-PLC's turn in logs to administration after completed</p> <p>-Administration and coach rotate through PLC's looking for key comprehension strategies through differentiated instruction.</p> <p>-Administration shares positive outcomes observed in PLC's on a monthly basis.</p> <p>Administrative walk-through looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and accuracy.</p>	<p>I.1.</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on outcomes.</p> <p>-Teachers use on-line grading system.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-Use individual teacher data to create SMART goal.</p> <p>-PLC data is used to drive instruction.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team</u></p> <p>-PLC facilitator shares SMART goal with Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data is used to drive instruction and support.</p>	<p>I.1.</p> <p><u>3 x per year</u></p> <p>FAIR</p> <p>PMRN</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>-</p> <p>3-5 Formatives</p> <p>Course Unit Assessments</p> <p>(Pre, post, mid section, end of unit, intervention checks).</p>		
--	---	---	--	--	---	--	--



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

<u>Reading Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 78% to 80%.	<b>78%</b>	<b>80%</b>					

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

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
			<p><u>Strategy</u></p> <p>Reading comprehension improves when students can demonstrate justification of responses by finding evidence in the text.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content PLC action plans.</p>	<p><u>Who</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Principal</li> <li>-AP</li> <li>-Reading Coach</li> <li>-Teachers</li> <li>-PLC facilitators of like grades or like subjects</li> </ul> <p><u>How</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Reading PLC logs</li> <li>-Language Arts PLC logs</li> <li>-PLC's turn in logs to administration after completed</li> <li>-Administration and coach rotate through PLC's looking for key comprehension strategies through differentiated instruction.</li> <li>-Administration shares positive outcomes observed in PLC's on a monthly basis</li> <li>-Administrative walk-through looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and accuracy.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Teachers reflect on outcomes.</li> <li>-Teachers use on-line grading system.</li> </ul> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Use individual teacher data to create SMART goal.</li> <li>-PLC data is used to drive instruction.</li> </ul> <p><u>Leadership Team</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-PLC facilitator shares SMART goal with Leadership Team.</li> <li>-Data is used to drive instruction and support.</li> </ul>	<p><u>3 x per year</u></p> <p>FAIR</p> <p>PMRN</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>3-5 Formatives</p> <p>Course Unit Assessments</p> <p>(Pre, post, mid section, end of unit, intervention checks).</p>	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b>	<b>Strategy Data Check</b>	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		
			Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?			

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

<p><b>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.</b></p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>1. Teachers are at varying skill levels of higher order questioning techniques.</p> <p>2. PLC's may not be as focused on higher order questioning techniques during meetings.</p>	<p>2.1</p> <p>See 1.1</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>See 1.1</p>	<p>2.1</p> <p>See 1.1</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>See 1.1</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #2:</u></p> <p>Curriculum students scoring a Level 4-5 on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 53% to 55%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>53 %</b></p>	<p><b>55%</b></p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	

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

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

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

<p><b>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>B.1. PLC's struggle with how to structure conversation and data analysis to deepen learning. PLC's will learn to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model of the PLC "instructional unit" logs.</p>	<p>B.1. <u>Strategy</u> Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:  1. What do we expect them to learn?  2. How will we know if they have learned it?  3. How will we remediate if they don't know it?  4. How will we enrich if they know it?_</p>	<p>B.1 See 1.1</p>	<p>B.1. See 1.1</p>	<p>B.1. See 1.1</p>		
--	---	--	------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--	--

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

		<p><u>Actions/Details</u></p> <p>-Grade level/like-course PLCs use a <b>Plan-Do-Check-Act “Unit of Instruction” log</b> to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log.</p> <p>-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>					
<p><u>Reading Goal #3:</u></p> <p>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 66 points to 68 points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>66 points</b></p>	<p><b>68 points</b></p>					

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

		B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	
		B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		

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

<p><b>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>4.1. 1. Students in the bottom quartile may not have a strong support system outside of school. 2. District mini-lessons, mini-assessments, and district calendar do not always align with school student data. 3. Lack of common and/or vertical planning time.</p>	<p>4.1. <u>Action Steps</u> 1. Parents will have opportunities to attend school events as well as participate in educational planning for the student. 2. PLC's will plan together to incorporate learning tools. 3. Teachers bring common assessment data back to PLC'S. 4. Use data to determine remediation and/or enrichment.</p>	<p>4.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -Assistant Principal -Reading Coach  <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-through -Classroom walk-through observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (<i>EET tool. The F-CIM strategy will be added to the form under Instructional Practices.</i>)  - Another fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/logs</p>	<p>4.1. PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data.  -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on each mini-assessment.  -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.</p>	<p>4.1. <u>3 x per year</u> FAIR PMRN  <u>During the Grading Period</u> - 3-5 Formatives  Course Unit Assessments (Pre, post, mid section, end of unit, intervention checks).  DRA2</p>		
--	---	---	--	--	---	--	--



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

			of targeted skills.				
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u>  Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 70 points to 72 points	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>70 points</b>	<b>72 points</b>					

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

		<p>4.2.</p> <p>-The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>-Not always a direct correlation between what the student is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP.</p> <p>-Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.</p>	<p>4.2.</p> <p><u>Strategy</u></p> <p>Students' reading comprehension improves through receiving ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills that are not at the mastery level. __</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>-Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered.</p> <p>-ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level.</p> <p>-Students attend ELP sessions.</p> <p>-Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher.</p> <p>-When the students have mastered the</p>	<p>4.2.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>Administrators</p> <p><u>How Monitored</u></p> <p>Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.</p>	<p>4.2.</p> <p>Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students</p>	<p>4.2.</p> <p>Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) <i>(From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)</i></p>	
--	--	---	---	---	--	--	--

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

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

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

<p><b>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p>5A.1. <b>See Rea ding Strate gy 1.1</b></p>	<p>5A.1.</p>	<p>5A.1.</p>	<p>5A.1.</p>		
--	--	--	--------------	--------------	--------------	--	--

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

<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<p>The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 56% to 60%.</p> <p>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 72% to 75%.</p>							
	<p>White: Target Met</p> <p>Black:56%</p> <p>Hispanic:72%</p> <p>Asian: Target Met</p> <p>American Indian:n/a</p>	<p>White:</p> <p>Black:60%</p> <p>Hispanic:75%</p> <p>Asian:</p> <p>American Indian:n/a</p>					
		5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	

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

		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		
<b>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5B.1.	5B.1.  <b>See Reading Strategy 1.1</b>	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u>  The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 57% to 61%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					

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

	<b>57%</b>	<b>61%</b>					
		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:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		

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

<p><b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>5C.1. Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority.  -The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT.  -ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses.</p>	<p>5C.1. Action Steps 1. Parents will have opportunities to attend school events as well as participate in educational planning for the student. 2. PLC's will plan together to incorporate learning tools. 3. Teachers bring common assessment data back to PLC'S. 4. Use data to determine remediation and/or enrichment.  Students' reading comprehension improves through receiving ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills that are not at the mastery level.  Action Steps -Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers</p>	<p>5C.1. Who -Principal -Assistant Principal -Reading Coach  How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.  -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-through  -Classroom walk-through observing this strategy</p>	<p>5C.1. PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data.  -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on each mini-assessment.  -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.</p>	<p>5C.1. <u>3 x per year</u> FAIR PMRN  <u>During the Grading Period</u> - 3-5 Formatives  Course Unit Assessments (Pre, post, mid section, end of unit, intervention checks).  DRA2</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--



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

		<p>regarding specific skills that students have not mastered.</p> <p>-ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level.</p> <p>-Students attend ELP sessions.</p> <p>-Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher.</p> <p>-When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.</p>					
<p><u>Reading Goal #5C:</u></p> <p>The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 31% to 38%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	<b>31%</b>	<b>38%</b>					
	—	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		

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

<p><b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>5D.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher.</p>	<p>5D.1. Strategy SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations.  -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity.  -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/ SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.</p>	<p>5D.1. Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal  ESE Specialist  How IEP Progress Reports reviewed</p>	<p>5D.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.  -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.  PLC Level  -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.  -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.  -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.  Leadership Team Level  -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.  -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>5D.1. FAIR  During the Grading Period  -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance</p>		
---	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

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

<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 46% to 51%.	<b>46%</b>	<b>51%</b>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

**Reading Professional Development**

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC's	K-5	-Reading Coach	-All teachers school wide	PLC's Ongoing	Administrator Walkthroughs	Principal and Administrative Team
		-PLC Facilitators				
Gradual Release	K-5	-PSLT -Teacher leaders	School-wide	-PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-through	Principal and Administrative Team
Student Engagement	K-5	-PSLT -Teacher leaders	School-wide (Volunteered Participants)	-Demonstration Classrooms -PLCs: On-going	Optional peer teacher observations Classroom walk-through	Principal and Administrative Team
Quality Questioning		-PSLT		-Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-through	Principal and Administrative Team
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	-PSLT -Teacher leaders	School-wide	-PLCs: On-going	Optional peer teacher observations Classroom walk-through	Principal and Administrative Team
Common Core Standards		-PSLT		PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-through	Principal and Administrative Team

*End of Reading Goals*

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

**Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals**

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

<p><b>Elementary School Mathematics Goals</b></p>	<p><b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b></p>						
<p>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:</p>	<p><b>Anticipated Barrier</b></p>	<p><b>Strategy</b></p>	<p><b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p><b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p><b>Student Evaluation Tool</b></p>		



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

<p><u>Mathematics Goal #1:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 74 %to 76 %.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>74 %</b></p>	<p><b>76 %</b></p>					



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

		<p>1.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Lack of infrastructure to support technology</li> <li>-Lack of technology hardware</li> <li>-Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS</li> </ul>	<p>1.2.</p> <p><u>Strategy</u></p> <p>Students' math achievement improves through the use of technology and hands-on activities. In addition, student practice taking on-line assessments to prepare students for on-line state testing.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-PLCs use their core curriculum information to learn more about hands-on and technology activities.</li> <li>-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</li> </ul>	<p>1.2.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Principal</li> <li>-AP</li> <li>-Teachers</li> </ul> <p><u>How Monitored</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-PLCS turn their logs into administration after a unit of instruction is complete.</li> <li>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs.</li> <li>-Classroom walk-through observing this strategy.</li> <li>-Administrator aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation</li> </ul>	<p>1.2.</p> <p>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction.</p> <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends</p>	<p>1.2.</p> <p><u>2x per year</u></p> <p>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>-Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.)</p>	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b>	<b>Strategy Data Check</b>	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		
			Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?			

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

<p><b>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>1. Lack of teacher knowledge of how to implement differentiated instruction.</p> <p>2. Lack of knowledge of the resources available for enrichment in the Go Math program.</p> <p>3. Not enough challenge for gifted students</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>Strategy</p> <p>Math skills will improve through teachers using the CCIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) with core curriculum and providing differentiated instruction.</p> <p><u>Action Steps.</u></p> <p>1. AGP teachers attend district trainings and present information to the staff.</p> <p>2. Math teachers can meet during PLC's, early release days, and/or Tuesday afternoon faculty meeting times.</p> <p>3. Implement activities from Florida Enrich book and the Grab and Go center</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Principal</p> <p>-AP</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool) <i>(which has HOTS as a strategy listed on the form.)</i></p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>PLCs examine student work and data.</p> <p>Data from review of unit assessments and interactive notebooks will be analyzed at PLC meetings.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p><u>2x per year</u></p> <p>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>-Common assessments (pre, post, mid section, end of unit).</p>		
---	--	---	---	--	---	--	--

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

<p><u>Mathematics Goal #2:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 41% to 43 %.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>41 %</b></p>	<p><b>43 %</b></p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p><b>Anticipated Barrier</b></p>	<p><b>Strategy</b></p>	<p><b>Fidelity Check</b></p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p><b>Strategy Data Check</b></p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p><b>Student Evaluation Tool</b></p>		

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

<p><b>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>B.1. PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their learning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act “Instructional Unit” log.</p>	<p>B.1. <u>Strategy</u>                  Students’ math achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:                  1. What is it we expect them to learn?                  2. How will we know if they have learned it?                  3. How will we respond and remediate if they don’t learn?                  4. How will we respond and enrich if they already know it?_</p>	<p>B.1. <u>Who</u>                  -Principal                  -AP                  -PLC facilitators   <u>How</u>                  PLCs turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.                  -PLCs receive feedback on their logs.                  -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings                  -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team                  -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>B.1. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students making learning gains.                   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.</p>	<p>B.1. <u>2x per year</u>                  District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing                   -  <u>During the Grading Period</u>                  Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	---	--	--

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

		<p><u>Actions/Details</u></p> <p>-This year, grade level PLCs will administer common end-of-chapter assessments.</p> <p>-Grade level/like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check-Act “Unit of Instruction” log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log.</p> <p>-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>					
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #3:</u></p> <p>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 67 points to 69 points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	<b>67 points</b>	<b>69 points</b>					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		

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

<p><b>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>4.1.  Students may be lacking in basic skills such as lack of number sense and basic facts. It may be hard to find the time to go back and reteach these skills.  Teachers may lack knowledge of all the resources available in the GO MATH series.</p>	<p>4.1.  Strategy  The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Student's math skills will improve through the use of FCIM strategies on the identified benchmarks.  <u>Action Steps</u>  1. Through the analysis of baseline data, classroom assessments, and student performance, PLC's identify essential tested benchmarks in need of remediation.  2. Based on the data, PLC's develop a timeline for teaching the skills.  3. Teachers implement mini lessons developed</p>	<p>4.1  <u>Who</u>  Principal  Leadership Team  <u>How</u>  -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback with Leadership Team  -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-through.  -Classroom walk-through observing this strategy.  -Another fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/logs of targeted skills reviewed by the administration and Leadership Team  - PSLT will review the calendars/logs and make progress statements at the end of each nine weeks.  -EET pop-in evaluation tool.</p>	<p>4.1  -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in a data base (excel spread sheet).  -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.</p>	<p>4.1  <u>2x per year</u>  District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  <u>During the Grading Period</u>  -Benchmark mini assessments  -Unit and/or Segment assessments  - School-generated nine week assessment of all mini lesson skills covered during the nine weeks.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	---	--	--

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

		<p>in PLCs. Students are grouped according to need and given appropriate interventions in the form of ELP, Go Math reteach lessons, FASTT MATH, and Soar to Success.</p> <p>4. Based on mini-assessments, skills are moved to a maintenance or reteaching schedule.</p>					
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #4:</u></p> <p>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 64 points to 66 points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>64 points</b></p>	<p><b>66 points</b></p>					



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

		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:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	
<b>5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>							
<u>Math Goal #5:</u>							

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

<p><b>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics</b></p>	<p>5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p>5A.1. <b>See Math Strate gy 1.1</b></p>	<p>5A.1.</p>	<p>5A.1.</p>	<p>5A.1.</p>		
---	--	--	--------------	--------------	--------------	--	--

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 77% to 79%.							
The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 61% to 65%.							
	White: 77%  Black: Target Met  Hispanic: 61%  Asian: Target Met  American Indian:	White: 79%  Black:  Hispanic: 65%  Asian:  American Indian:					

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

		5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		
<b>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5B.1.	5B.1. See Math Strate gy 1.1	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

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

<p><b>Mathematics Goal #5B:</b></p> <p>The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 60% to 64%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>60%</b></p>	<p><b>64%</b></p>					
		<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	
		<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p><b>Anticipated Barrier</b></p>	<p><b>Strategy</b></p>	<p><b>Fidelity Check</b></p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p><b>Strategy Data Check</b></p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p><b>Student Evaluation Tool</b></p>		

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

<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1.  See Math Strategy 4.1</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>	<p>5C.1.</p>		
<p>Mathematics Goal #5C:  The percentage of English Language Learner students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 46% to 51%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>46%</b></p>	<p><b>51%</b></p>					

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

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

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

<b>5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5D.1.	5D.1.  See Math Strateg y 4.1	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
---	-------	--	-------	-------	-------	--	--



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

<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of SWD students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 46% to 51%.							
	<b>46%</b>	<b>51%</b>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

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

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

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

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	-Math SAL/ Coach	Math Departmental and course- specific PLCs	PLC Meetings every two weeks	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-through to monitor	Administrative Team
GoMath	K-5	District Facilitator	Math Teachers	Faculty Meeting or PLC times	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-through to monitor	Administrative Team

*End of Mathematics Goals*

**Elementary and Middle School Science Goals**

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

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

<p><b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.</b></p>	<p>1.1. -Not using Common assessments  -Teaching different leveled students  -Time constraints  -Different levels of teaching experience  -New curriculum  -Varying skill levels with higher order questioning  -Comprehension of vocabulary  -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their learning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-</p>	<p>1.1. Strategy  Tier 1: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students will develop problem solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge through higher-order thinking. Teachers will increase the number of inquiry based instruction experiences and emphasize communication skills in science.  <u>Action Steps</u>  1. Teachers will attend District Science training and share 5 E Lesson</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u>  Principal  Assistant Principal Teachers  <u>How Monitored</u>  - provides feedback.  - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administrative walk-through.  -Classroom walk-through observing inquiry based instruction.  -EET pop-in evaluation tool</p>	<p>1.1.  Science 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.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>2x per year</u>  District-level baseline and mid-year tests  <u>During the nine weeks</u>  - Mini Assessments  -Unit assessments</p>		
--	---	--	---	--	---	--	--

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

	<p>Do-Check-Act “Instructional Unit” log.</p>	<p>Plan Model information with their PLCs.</p> <p>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.)</p> <p>3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively building 5E Lesson Plans.</p> <p>4. PLC teachers instruct students using the 5 E Lesson Plans.</p> <p>5. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum</p>					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

		<p>material.</p> <p>6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>7. Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans.</p> <p>8. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of 5 E Lesson planning.</p> <p>9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.</p> <p>10. Inquiry-based Mondays</p>					
<p><u>Science Goal #1:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 69 % to 71%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	<b>69%</b>	<b>71%</b>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		

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

<p><b>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.</b></p>	<p>2.1. Lack of knowledge and resource for how to enrich those students who are high achieving but do not qualify for gifted.</p> <p>Not all teachers are able to attend trainings on the district provided date.</p>	<p>2.1. See 1.1</p>	<p>2.1. <u>Who</u> -Administration Team</p> <p><u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-through.</p> <p>-Classroom walk-through 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.</p>	<p>2.1. 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.</p>	<p>2.1. <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the nine weeks</u></p> <p>-Student work</p> <p>-Chapter tests</p>		
---	---	-------------------------	--	--	--	--	--



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

<u>Science Goal #2:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In grades 5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 30 % to 32 %.							
	<b>30 %</b>	<b>32%</b>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

**Science Professional Development**

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Hands-On Activities	K-5	PLC facilitators	Grade level PLCs	On-going in science PLCs 3 times per month	Administrator Walkthroughs	Administration Team
Inquiry and the 5E Instructional Model	K-5	PLC facilitators	Grade level PLCs	On-going in science PLCs 3 times per month	Administrator Walkthroughs	Administration Team

### *End of Science Goals*

**Writing/Language Arts Goals**

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



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

		<p>-Professional Development for updated rubric courses</p> <p>-Professional Development for instructional delivery of mode-specific writing</p> <p>-Training to facilitate data-driven PLCs</p> <p>-Using data to identify trends and drive instruction</p> <p>-Lesson planning based on the needs of students to differentiate</p> <p><u><b>Do:</b></u></p> <p>-Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points</p> <p>-Daily/ongoing conferencing</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

		<p><u>Check:</u></p> <p>Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes</p> <p>-PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs</p> <p><u>Act:</u></p> <p>-Receive additional professional development in areas of need</p> <p>-Spread the use of effective practices across the school based on evidence shown in the best practice of others</p> <p>-Use what is learned to begin the cycle again, revise as needed, increase scale if possible, etc.</p> <p>-Plan ongoing monitoring of the solution(s)</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

Writing/LA Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Points earned from students scoring a Level 3.0 or higher increase from 92 % to 94 %.							
	<b>92 %</b>	<b>94 %</b>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Writing/Language Arts Professional Development**

**Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through**

Hillsborough 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised July, 2012

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

**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
	K-5		Language Arts Teachers	On-going		
		PLC facilitators	PLC-grade level and vertical teams		PLC logs turned into administration	Principal
Writing Holistic Scoring		All teachers			Graded monthly grade-level score sheets turned in to AP	AP PLC Facilitators

*End of Writing Goals*



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

**Attendance Goal(s)**

<b>Attendance Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</b>						
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		

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

<p><b>1. Attendance</b></p>	<p>1.1. Parents do not understand the importance of attendance at the elementary school level.</p>	<p>1.1. The importance of attendance will be communicated to parents via Open Houses, school newsletter, and website.  The Administrative Team along with other appropriate staff will meet each month to discuss the Attendance Plan.  The PBS (Positive Behavior Support) team will monitor tardies through the PBS data base.</p>	<p>1.1. AP will run Attendance/Tardy meetings every month.  AP will maintain database.  Social Worker  Guidance Counselor</p>	<p>1.1. Administrative Team and the PBS will examine data monthly.</p>	<p>1.1. Attendance Report Tardy Report Attendance Plan</p>		
-----------------------------	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

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

Attendance Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
<p>1. The attendance rate will increase from 96% in 2011-2012 to 97% in 2012-2013</p> <p>2. The number of students who have 10 or more <b>unexcused</b> absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10%</p>							
	<b>96%</b>	<b>97%</b>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>					
	<b>39</b>	<b>35</b>					

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

	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive Tardies</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive Tardies</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>					
		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
Attendance Plan	Administrators	AP	At Administrator staff meeting	Throughout the year	Review plan and student data every 20 days	AP Guidance Counselor

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

*End of Attendance Goals*

**Suspension Goal(s)**

<b>Suspension Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension</b>						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		

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

<p><b>1. Suspension</b></p>	<p>1.1 There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.</p>	<p>1.1 <u>Tier 1</u> -Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey, discipline data, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations.  -Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and rules.  -Leadership team conducts walkthroughs using a PBS walk-through form (generated by the district RtI facilitators).  -The data is shared</p>	<p>1.1 <u>Who</u> -PSLT Behavior Committee -Leadership Team -Administration</p>	<p>1.1 - PSLT /Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions.</p>	<p>UNTIE , EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data</p>		
-----------------------------	--	---	---	---	---	--	--

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

		with faculty at a monthly meeting, tracking the overall improvement of the faculty.  -Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats.					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

Suspension Goal #1:	<u>2012 Total Number of</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of</u>					
	<u>In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>In-School Suspensions</u>					
1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.							
2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.							
3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.							
4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.							
	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended</u>					
	<u>In-School</u>	<u>In-School</u>					



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

	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>					
	<u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended</u> <u>Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended</u> <u>Out-of-School</u>					
	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Suspension Professional Development**

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader PBS Team	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) School Wide	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) At Faculty Meetings	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring Monthly Data Review with support from PBS Coach.  PSLT will review the attendance and behavior data on a weekly basis, providing mentoring to students, and establishing ongoing contact with parents.	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Principal and Assistant Principal and Guidance Counselor
Positive Behavior Support (PBS)	K-5					

### *End of Suspension Goals*

## **Parent Involvement Goal(s)**

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

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

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

<p><b>1. Parent Involvement</b></p> <p><u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u></p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>-Parents may not be aware of available resources.</p> <p>-Economic situations may leave families with less time and resources.</p> <p>-Language barriers</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>-Add FAQ's to our school website and keep updated annually based on parent needs.</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>-Media specialist will be responsible for making sure website is posted and updated.</p> <p>-Administration and SAC Chair will follow up for accuracy on a monthly basis.</p> <p>-SAC</p> <p>-PTA Liaison</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>Send a pre-survey mid-year to parents to see where we are on the areas that were scored low to address before actual SCIP is presented.</p>	<p>1.1.</p> <p>-Communication folders</p> <p>-Report cards</p> <p>-teacher class newsletters</p>		
<p>Based on the School Climate and Perception Survey, 36.8% of parents agree or strongly agree that the school provides information about how families can help students succeed.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>36.8%</b></p>	<p><b>40%</b></p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	

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

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

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

<p><b>2. Parent Involvement</b></p> <p><u>Parent Involvement Goal #2:</u></p>	<p>2.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Parents may not be aware of information on our website.</li> <li>-Parents may be unable to attend meetings due to work.</li> <li>-Parents may be unable to find childcare during meetings.</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Have meetings before school starts so parents may be available to attend and have time to get to work.</li> <li>-Offer childcare for children of parents to attend before school starts.</li> <li>-use the school Facebook page to keep parents up to date as well as invite new parents to attend.</li> <li>-Update school website with monthly minutes.</li> <li>-offer meetings at business partner's place of business.</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-SAC chair will monitor monthly meetings and take attendance.</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-SCIP at the end of the year to determine effectiveness</li> <li>-SAC survey to address needs and if they were met.</li> </ul>	<p>2.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results of SCIP survey</li> <li>Results of SAC survey</li> <li>SAC composition form</li> </ul>		
<p>Based on the School Climate and Perception Survey, 32.2% of parents agree or strongly agree that they are aware of the School Advisory Council and its role.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>32.2%</b></p>	<p><b>40%</b></p>					

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

		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 Goal(s)**

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to						
--------------------	----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

	<b>Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		
<b>1. Health and Fitness Goal</b>	1.1. -Volunteers for school-wide activities	1.1. -Students will receive 150 minutes per week of physical education.  -students will have the opportunity to attend a school running club (16 weeks) and selected PE clubs.  -communicate through all media (newsletters, Facebook School page, and school website) school activities in advance to solicit volunteers.	1.1. -Principal -Teachers (PE/regular)	1.1. -PLC's will determine student needs of skills based on mini assessments throughout each nine weeks(by PE teachers)  -teacher lesson plans showing teacher directed PE to reinforce skills needed  -Principal walk through checking for teacher PE as well as mini assessments during PE classes	1.1. -Daily participation in PE  -Pre test and post test data on HFZ		

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

Health and Fitness Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
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 75% on the pretest to 85% on the post test.							
	<b>75%</b>	<b>85%</b>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development**

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

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



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

PLC activity.  
 PD Content /Topic  
 and/or PLC Focus

Grade Level/  
 Subject

PD Facilitator  
 and/or  
 PLC Leader

PD Participants  
 (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or  
 school-wide)

Target Dates and Schedules  
 (e.g. , Early Release) and  
 Schedules (e.g., frequency of  
 meetings)

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for  
 Monitoring

### Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

<p><b>1. Continuous Improvement Goal</b></p>	<p>1.1. There is still confusion on how to conduct PLCs that are focused on deepening the knowledge base of teachers and improving student performance by the implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model.  -Still confusion on how the Plan-Do-Check-Act model works.  -Still some resistance to staff members attending PLCs and/or arriving on time to meetings.  -Teachers asking for more PLC collaboration time. Possibility of waiver will be explored.</p>	<p>1.1. The leadership team will become trained on the use of the PLC “Unit of Instruction” log that follows the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. Subject Area Leader and/or PLC facilitators will guide their PLCs through the Plan-Do-Check-Act model for units of instruction. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Leadership Team.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u> Principal Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC facilitators  <u>How</u> Breakdown PLC logs and aggregate data to drive instruction</p>	<p>1.1. “Quick” PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training.</p>	<p>1.1 Reading formatives Math formatives Science formatives Unit assessments Weekly assessments (depending on focus per grade level for PLC)</p>		
--	--	---	---	--	---	--	--

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

<u>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss student learning will increase from 49.3% to 60%.							
	<b>49.3%</b>	<b>60%</b>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development**

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Plan-Do-Check-Act Model	Leadership Team	Leadership Team	School-wide	PLCs meet every three weeks for Plan-Do-Check-Act PLCs.walk-through	Administrator and leadership team	Leadership Team
	All teachers	Subject Area Leaders  PLC Facilitators			Administrator and leadership attendance at PLC meetings  PLC Survey data	

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

**NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals**

<p><b>A. Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).</p>	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.		
<p><u>Reading Goal A:</u>  Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

		A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	
		A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	
<b>B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</b>	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.		

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

<u>Reading Goal B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.							
		B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	
		B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	

**NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals**

<b>CELLA Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition</b>					

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool	
<p><b>C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.</b></p>	<p>l.1.                      -Over 30 languages in school demographics                      -Bilingual staff is only Spanish speaking.                      -Administration is not bilingual.</p>	<p>l.1.                      -ELL understanding of course content will improve with student participation following day to day accommodations with core content and assessments.                      -time extended                      -small group                      -use of dictionary</p>	<p>l.1.  <u>Who</u>                      -Administrators                      -ESOL teachers and paraprofessionals</p>	<p>l.1.  <u>Leadership</u>                      -ERT will give updates to faculty monthly    <u>Teacher level</u>                      -Grade books to track student progress    <u>PLC</u>                      -grade level PLC's will discuss ELL students once a month and monitor progress interventions.</p>	<p>l.1.                      FAIR                      CELLA</p>	



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

<p><u>CELLA Goal #C:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 49% to 51%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u></p>					
	<p><b>49%</b></p>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
<p>Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</p>	<p><b>Anticipated Barrier</b></p>	<p><b>Strategy</b></p>	<p><b>Fidelity Check</b></p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p><b>Strategy Data Check</b></p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p><b>Student Evaluation Tool</b></p>	

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

<p><b>D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.</b></p>	<p>2.1. See 1.1</p>	<p>2.1. See 1.1</p>	<p>2.1. See 1.1</p>	<p>2.1. <u>Leadership</u> Administration/ERT will give updates to Reading Committee monthly and give new strategies.  <u>Teacher Level</u> Teachers use grade book to track student progress.  <u>PLC</u> Grade level PLC will discuss ELL students once per month and monitor progress interventions.</p>	<p>2.1. See 1.1</p>	
<p><u>CELLA Goal #D:</u>  The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 40% to 42%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u></p>					
	<p><b>40%</b></p>					

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

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b>	<b>Strategy Data Check</b>	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>	
			Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?		
<b>E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.</b>	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	

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

<p><u>CELLA Goal #E:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 38% to 40%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u></p>					
	<p><b>38%</b></p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>

**NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals**

<p>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:</p>	<p><b>Anticipated Barrier</b></p>	<p><b>Strategy</b></p>	<p><b>Fidelity Check</b></p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p><b>Strategy Data Check</b></p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p><b>Student Evaluation Tool</b></p>		
---	-----------------------------------	------------------------	---	--	---------------------------------------	--	--

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

<p><b>F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).</b></p>	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.		
<p>Mathematics Goal F:</p> <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
		F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	

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

		F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	
<b>G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b>	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> G:	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.							
		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**

<b>Elementary, Middle and High Science Goals</b>	<b>Problem- Solving Process to Increase</b>						
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

	<b>Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b> Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	<b>Strategy Data Check</b> How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>		
<b>J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).</b>	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.		



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

<p><u>Science Goal J:</u></p> <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p>					
		<p>J.2.</p>	<p>J.2.</p>	<p>J.2.</p>	<p>J.2.</p>	<p>J.2.</p>	
		<p>J.3.</p>	<p>J.3.</p>	<p>J.3.</p>	<p>J.3.</p>	<p>J.3.</p>	

**NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal**

<p><b>Writing Goals</b></p>	<p><b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b></p>						
-----------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>M. Florida Alternate Assessment:</b>  <b>Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).</b></p>	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.		
<p><u>Writing Goal M:</u>                       Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

		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)**

<b>STEM Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b>	<b>Strategy Data Check</b>	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<u>STEM Goal #1:</u> Expand inquiry based experiences utilizing the 5E Model.	1.1. - Need common planning time for math, science teachers for STEM.	1.1. -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established.  -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs.	1.1. PLC or grade level lead -Subject Area Leaders	1.1. Administrative walk-through	1.1. Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM per nine week. Share data with teachers and Leadership team.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

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

	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
n/a						

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to				
-------------	----------------------------	--	--	--	--

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

	<b>Increase Student Achievement</b>				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Fidelity Check</b>	<b>Strategy Data Check</b>	<b>Student Evaluation Tool</b>
<u>CTE Goal #1:</u>  Increase the amount of exposure to career options for students.	1.1.  -Not enough neither on-site nor off-site field trips nor exposure to career information.	1.1.  -Implement student assemblies that expose students to career options.  -Provide field trips to local businesses or CTE competitions.  -Use career workbooks, videos, and activities.  -Administer career surveys to students to see areas of interest or focus.	1.1.  <u>Who</u>  AP will schedule on site and off site field trips to places such as Biztown.  Public Relations committee will schedule guest speakers of careers for Great American Teach In and keep a list/log of speakers.	1.1.  <u>Who</u>  -Principal  -AP  -Teachers	1.1.  -Log of CTE field trips  -Log of school presentations  -Log of special speakers
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

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

	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
--	------	------	------	------	------

**CTE Professional Development**

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

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

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

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

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

**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.)

<b>School Differentiated Accountability Status</b>		
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.

<b>Describe the use of SAC funds.</b>			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
Basic plan-unknown yet	K- leveled reader books and big books	250.00	
	1-Common Core Expanded nonfiction readers	280.00	

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

	2-science materials-consumables	250.00	
	3-magazine subscriptions/organizers; nonfiction readers	320.00	
	4-chapter book sets	420.00	
	5-science probe books	100.00	
	AGP-science consumables;materials	400.00	
Final Amount Spent			