

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

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

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| School Name: North Tampa Alternative | District Name: Hillsborough County |
| Principal: Theophilus Hill | Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia |
| SAC Chair: Jo Ann Eady | Date of School Board Approval: |

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

[School Grades Trend Data](#) (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

Highly Qualified Administrators

List your school’s highly qualified administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) progress.

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Principal | Theophilus Hill | B.S. Health Education M.S. Education Leadership | 7 | 22 | 09-10 Met 64% AYP 10-11 Met 62% AYP 11-12 Met 00% AMO |
| Assistant Principal | Dr. Olivia Shepherd | B.S. Library Sci. M.S. Edu. Leadership Ed.D. Edu. Leadership | 8 | 19 | 09-10 Met 64% AYP 10-11 Met 62% AYP 11-12 Met 00% AMO |
| Assistant Principal | Jo Ann Eady | B.S. Elem. Education M.S. SLD Edu. Specialist Education Leadership | 5 | 6 | 09-10 Met 64% AYP 10-11 Met 62% AYP 11-12 Met 00% AMO |

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 | Lyndia Bell | B.S. Public Administration M.S Teaching & Learning Certification: Reading Endorsed; Business Education; Exceptional Education | 4.5 months | 4..5 months | 09-10 Met 64% AYP 10-11 Met 62% AYP 11-12 Met 00% AYP |

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|--|---------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 1. Teacher Interview Day | Principal | June 2012 | |
| 2. Recruitment Fairs | District Staff | July 2012 | |
| 3. District Mentor Program | District Mentors | On-going | |
| 4. District Peer Program | District Peers | On-going | |
| 6. School Orientation | Principal | August 2012 | |
| 7. Regular meetings with new teacher | Assistant Principal | Monthly | |
| 8. Partnering new teachers with mentor | Principal | On-going | |
| 9. Leadership Opportunities | Principal | On-going | |

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

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly qualified.

| Name | Certification | Teaching Assignment | Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Qualified |
|------|---------------|---------------------|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Qualified Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 24 | 0% | 12% | 6% | 6% | 33% | 100% | 6% | 0% | 29% |

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 |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

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

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 1, Part A All individualize services are provided with fidelity for students who need reinforcement and/or remediation via quality teachers through professional development and content resource teachers, and mentors. |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant Not applicable |
| Title I, Part D The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school choice. |
| Title II The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training. In addition, the funds are utilized in Salary Differential Program. |
| Title III Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners. |
| Title X- Homeless The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs. |
| Violence Prevention Programs North Tampa Alternative School offer a Student Support Services program with practitioners that are specialize in providing social work, health, and psychological services Students are eligible to receive services from these practitioners. Social, mental and physical health concerns, as well as crisis intervention counseling, are addressed by this Department. Within the school, neighborhood, and greater community, Student Support Service work toward overcoming barriers which interfere with educational success. |
| Nutrition Programs North Tampa Alternative School Food Services offers a variety of healthy meal choices for breakfast and lunch to all students through the National School Lunch and Breakfast program. The program allows more than 90% of our students that qualify through an application process to receive a free meal. Students who qualify for a free or reduced price meal, regardless of their meal status can receive a free breakfast and lunch every day. |
| Housing Programs Not applicable |
| Head Start Not applicable |
| Adult Education GED services will be provided for overage students who are unsuccessful in the alternative program. |
| Career and Technical Education The career and technical support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within title I regulations. |
| Job Training Job training support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations. |

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

Other

DACCO (Drug Abuse Comprehensive Coordinating Office) offers a multi-tiered approach to addressing the growing problem of underage drinking and other substance use and abuse which crosses all demographic and socio-economic groups in our community. Functioning at a prevention level within the school system, DACCO counselors assess at-risk students to determine their needs, establish goals, and provide group and individual counseling. Group sessions are an evidence-based psycho educational curriculum that includes drug education as well as life skills such as anger management, decision making, and self-image. Individual counseling is specific to each student and addresses their unique needs and offers referrals to additional resources as necessary.

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Principal Theophilus Hill
Assistant Principal for Curriculum Dr. Olivia Shepherd
Assistant Principal Administration Jo Ann Eady
School Psychologist Dr. Antoinette McLean
School Social Worker Harriet Bennett
Guidance Counselor Cira Pedrogo
Instructional Coaches Lyndia Bell
Department Heads:
 Mark Pearcy: Social Studies
 Pollynesia McMillan: Reading/Language Arts
 Dario Diaz: Math
 Marschette Hunter: Science
ESE Specialist
ELP Coordinator
ESOL Support Ibia Ortiz

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 primary function for the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI) team in our school is to organize and implement relevant and rigorous instruction/intervention personalized for each student and monitor performance and mastery to direct instruction. The MTSS/RtI reviews school-wide data to address the progress of academically challenged students and determine the enrichment and acceleration needs of high performing students. The major goal of the team is to ensure that all students achieve adequate yearly progress 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.

The MTSS/RtI is the main leadership team in the school.

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

1. The MTSS/RtI team will strive to improve the academic achievement of our most challenged students to meet AYP and facilitate students remaining in the traditional classroom setting as they accomplish long term outcomes.
2. The collected data from the strategic plan will pilot the RtI team decisions.
3. The MTSS/RtI Team will collaborate with the *Student Success Achievement Team* (SSAT) which also serves as one of the leadership teams in our school.
4. The MTSS/RtI Team will meet once a month.
5. The MTSS/RtI will use the RtI problem solving model to:
 - Oversee a multi-tiered model of service delivery (Core/Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3)
 - Determine scheduling needs, curriculum and intervention resources
 - Review/interpret student data (Academic, Behavior, and Attendance)
 - Organize and support systematic data collection
 - Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction:
 - Through the implementation of PLCs
 - Through the use of school-based Reinforcement Calendars, Mini Lessons and Mini Assessments

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?

1. The School Advisory Council (SAC) Chair is a member of the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI) Team.
2. The MTSS Team along with the faculty and the SAC were involved in the School Improvement Plan development activities that were conducted prior to school being out for the 2011/2012 school year and during preplanning for the 2012-2013.
3. The School Improvement Plan is the document that guides the work of the MTSS Team.
4. The most significant piece of the MTSS Team is outlined in the Action Step, Evaluation Process, Evaluation Tool, and Professional Development of the School Improvement Plan.
5. The MTSS Team will monitor student data; therefore it will monitor the effectiveness of the Action Steps and recommend modifications if required.
6. Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the MTSS Team will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies developed in problem solving plans by reviewing student data as well as data related to various levels of fidelity. Using data gathered from PLCs, the team will monitor the data and make progress statements on the School Improvement Plan at the end of the first, second and third nine weeks. The MTSS Team will use the following rubric to evaluate Strategy Fidelity of Implementation and Strategy Effectiveness:

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

| Indicator | Strategy Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Not Evident | Teacher monitoring indicates strategy implementation has not begun. | Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing no positive effect on student achievement. |
| Emerging | Some (25-75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates early or preliminary stages of implementation. | Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing minimal or poor effect on student achievement. |
| Operational | Most (>75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates active implementation. | Student data indicates that strategy implementation is mostly showing a positive effect on student achievement. |
| Highly Functional | Teacher monitoring indicates that all of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence exists that the strategy is fully integrated and effectively/consistently implemented. | Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing a significant positive effect on student achievement. |

7. The MTSS Team will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning MTSS Team members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger MTSS Team through the subject area MTSS Team.
8. The MTSS Team and PLCs both use the problem solving process: Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
 - review and analyze screening and collateral data
 - develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers)
 - develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses
 - establish methods to track students’ progress with appropriate progress monitoring assessments at intervals matched to the intensity of the interventions and/or enrichment
 - develop progress monitoring goals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify interventions and/or enrichment)
 - review goal statements to ensure they are ambitious, time-bound and meaningful (e.g., SMART goals)
 - assess the fidelity of instruction/intervention implementation and other PS/RtI processes

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.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Program Generated Assessments | Software | Individual teachers |
| FAIR | Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall | Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator |
| CELLA | Sagebrush (IPT) | ELL PSLT Representative |
| Common Assessments* (<i>see below</i>) of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources | Subject Area Generated Database | SALS, individual teachers, MTSS |
| Nine Week Exams | Subject Area Generated Excel Database | SALs, individual teachers, MTSS |
| Semester Exams | Subject Area Generated Excel Database | SALs, individual teachers, MTSS |
| Mini-Assessments on specific tested Benchmarks | Subject Area Generated Excel Database | Individual teachers |

A Common Assessment covers a “chunk” of instruction within the District adopted curriculum. It covers all of the skills taught within a certain time period. The purpose of the Common Assessment is to assess students’ knowledge of the core curriculum. The results of the Common Assessment are used to:

- Determine if the lesson plans and teaching strategies used to teach the core curriculum were effective or need to be modified.
- Determine which skills need to be taught with alternative strategies.
- Determine which skills need to be re-taught within the core curriculum and which skills need to be moved to the Reinforcement Instructional Calendar.
- Determine which students need Differentiated Instruction within the classroom and which students might need Supplemental Services.

1. Data will be collected frequently on student performance.
2. Identify students early at risk in order to provide intervention.
3. Use research-based, scientifically validated instruction/interventions (such as; Differentiated Instructional practices).
4. Multi-tiered model of service delivery (Core/Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3).
5. At the Core Level, PLCs will use the CIM for ongoing progress monitoring.
6. As students move up the Tiers, assessment becomes more frequent in order to evaluate and modify instruction.
7. All decisions made with data.

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

| Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3) | | |
|---|---|--|
| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring |
| Extended Learning Program (ELP)* (see below) Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials) | School Generated Database in Excel | MTSS / ELP Facilitator |
| FAIR OPM School Generated | School Generated Database in Excel | MTSS /Reading Coach |
| Ongoing assessments within Intensive Courses | Database provided by course materials (for courses that have one), School Generated Database in Excel | MTSS /PLC/Individual Teachers |
| Other Curriculum Based Measurement** (see below) | School Generated Database in Excel | MTSS /PLCs |

8. As students’ progress through Supplementary Support and Intensive Instruction, the number/type of supplemental services, time spent in the supplemental services and frequency of assessment will increase in duration.

9. In addition to Core assessments, progress monitoring the outcomes of intensive interventions requires additional Curriculum Based Measures (CBM) that:
 - assess the same skills over time
 - have multiple equivalent forms
 - are sensitive to small amounts of growth over time.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

1. Staff received overview training over the course of several faculty meetings during the 2011-2012 school year and during preplanning for the 2010-2011 and 2012-2013 school year.
2. MTSS members who attended the district level RtI trainings served as consultants to the PLCs to guide the process of data review and interpretation.
3. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts.
4. The MTSS Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.
5. As the District’s Problem Solving Team develops resources and staff development trainings on MTSS/RtI

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

6. , these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available.
7. Professional Development sessions will occur during Tuesday faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings.
8. Our school will invite our area RtI Facilitator to visit quarterly to review our progress in implementation of PS/RtI and provide on-site coaching and support to our PSLT/PLCs.
9. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI as they become available.
10. All teachers will complete the state perceptions of MTSS/RtI
11. Skills Survey midyear and at the end of the year to determine their development of skills and knowledge related to PS/RtI implementation

Describe plan to support MTSS.

1. Maintain a collaborative environment that encourages all stakeholders to strive for common goals consequently learning from its failures and creating new paradigm to stay aligned with the SIP.
2. Allocate time to collaborate with other stakeholders on student data to evaluate student progression and the fidelity of SIP strategies implemented.
3. Ensure a coherence focus via. required systematic and collaborative professional learning communities
4. Provide Intervention and PLC Logs.
5. Ensure that individualize services are provided with fidelity for students who need reinforcement and/or remediation via quality teachers through professional development and content resource teachers, and mentors and identify professional development and resources needed.
6. Ensure that the allocation of all financial resources (Internal funds, funds, Grants, ELL funds, Technology funds) are vision-based and that all programs or evidence-based and aligned with the SIP to support student learning gains.
7. Ensure a safe and orderly environment for students and staff by implementing with fidelity a strategic Crisis Management Plan which include but are not limited to duties and responsibilities, drills, procedures, trainings etc.
8. Provide feedback from the Whole School Effectiveness, Parent, and Student Surveys.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal, Theophilus Hill

Assistant Principal for curriculum, Olivia Shepherd

Assistant Principal Administration, Jo Ann Eady

School Psychologist, Dr. Antoinette McLean

Guidance Counselor, Cira Pedrogo

Instructional Coaches Lyndia Bell

Department Heads Mark Percy, Pollynesia McMillan, Dario Diaz, and Marschette Hunter

ESE Specialist,

ELP Coordinator,

ESOL Support, Ibia Ortiz

School Social Worker, Harriet Bennett

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

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

1. The LLT is a subset of the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI) Team
2. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading strategies on the SIP.
3. The principal is the LLT chairperson.
4. The reading coach is a member of the team and provides extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions.
5. The reading coach and principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instruction support is provided to all teachers.
6. 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.
7. 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?

1. Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading strategies across the content areas
2. Professional Development
3. Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas
4. Data analysis (on-going)

NCLB Public School Choice

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

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

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

1. Project CRISS, Level 1 training, which is a 12 hour initial training with a mandatory six hour follow-up component, is offered annually at the district level.
2. The reading coach is required as a part of his/her job description to provide on-site support of the implementation of the Project CRISS Strategic Lesson Plan model through professional development opportunities, as well as, coaching opportunities. A yearly action plan is created by the reading coach that outlines what Project CRISS professional development will be offered. A monthly written update allows the reading supervisor to monitor the progress of each coach's action plan.

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

3. Content-specific (mathematics, social studies, science and language arts) Project CRISS follow-up trainings are offered on request at school sites and as district-offered trainings throughout the school year.
4. Demonstration classroom opportunities focusing on the implementation of content-based literacy strategies are mandated by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan at each site.
5. The reading coach is responsible for scheduling and facilitating pre-observation, during observation, and post-observation activities and discussion.
6. This year Demonstration classrooms will focus on Higher Order Thinking Skills/Costas Level of Questioning and Vocabulary Development.
7. A Reading Leadership Team is mandated by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan at each site.
8. The principal is the chairperson of the committee and the reading coach is an integral member, guiding the data review, creation of an action plan, progress monitoring of the plan and evaluation of the plan each school year.
9. The RLT has representation from each content area and is responsible for reporting back to the school their findings and instructional decisions.
10. Each Subject Area PLC is responsible for reviewing their students' literacy data and creating lessons that are responsive to identified student needs. PLCs are responsible for the creation and implementation of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model Reinforcement Instructional Calendars, Mini-Lessons, and Mini-Assessments and re-teach lessons based on the on-going collection of student data.
11. Common assessments on chapter tests are used to identify effective reading strategies and guide instruction for re-teach or enrichment.
12. The Reading coach is responsible for assisting content teachers with the integration of differentiated instruction strategies into their content area classrooms.
13. With content teachers, Reading coaches co-plan, co-teach, observe and provides feedback.
14. All costs incurred for reading professional development at the school sites (stipends, consultant contracts, substitutes, materials) are paid for by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan funds.

*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](#).

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

| Reading Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5). | | | 1.1. -Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction. | 1.1. -Students’ comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher’s use of data to inform instruction. | 1.1. -AP | 1.1. -Teachers chart their students’ individual progress . | 1.1. -FAIR (3x per year) |
| Reading Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| In grades 7-12 the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 9% to 11%. | 10 | 12 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading. | | | 2.1. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. | 2.1. -Students’ comprehension of course content/standards increase through participation in higher order thinking questioning techniques. | 2.1. -Instructional Coaches -Peer/Mentor Evaluators | 2.1. -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins | 2.1. -Common assessments |
| Reading Goal #2: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| In grades 7-12, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 0% to 1%. | 0 | 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|-----------------|
| 3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading. | | | 3.1. -Teachers at varying levels of skill expertise in using checks for understanding techniques. | 3.1. -Students’ comprehension of course content improves by participation in regular Checks for Understanding during and at the close of the lesson. | 3.1. -Instructional Coaches -Peer/Mentor Evaluators -AP | 3.1. -Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins | 3.1. |
| Reading Goal #3: In grades 7-12, the percentage of All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 5% to 8%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 6 | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 9 | | | | | |
| | | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. |
| | | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | | | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. |
| Reading Goal #4: See goals 1, 2, 3, and 5. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | | | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. |
| | | | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | | |
| 5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #5: | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| 5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | | | 5A.1. -Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. | 5A.1. -Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, teachers use on-going progress monitoring data to plan and deliver mini lessons and mini-assessments. | 5A.1. -Principal -AP | 5A.1. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress. | 5A.1. -FAIR (3x per year) |
| Reading Goal #5A: In grades 7-12, 80% of the Black and Hispanic All Curriculum student subgroups will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 5%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: Black:67 Hispanic:23 Asian: American Indian: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: Black:74 Hispanic:25 Asian: American Indian: | | | | | |
| | | | 5A.2. | 5A.2 | 5A.2 | 5A.2 | 5A.2 |
| | | | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. | | | 5B.1. | 5B.1. See Goal 5A.1 | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. |
| Reading Goal #5B: In grades 7-12, 80% Economically Disadvantaged All Curriculum student will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 5%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. |
| | | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | | | 5C.1. -Unfamiliarity with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT. | 5C.1. -ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons. | 5C.1. -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers | 5C.1. -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. | 5C.1. -FAIR -CELLA |
| Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|-----------------|
| increase. | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | | 5D.1. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. | 5D.1. SWD student achievement improves through teachers’ implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications. | 5D.1. -School based Administrators | 5D.1. -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. | 5D.1. -FAIR |
| Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. |
| | | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Gradual Release of Responsibility Model | Grades 7-12 | Assistant Principal for Curriculum | School-wide | Continued updates during PLC meetings every two weeks | Administrators will conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor the Gradual Release Model | Principal and Administrative Team |
| Analyzing Student FAIR Data | Grades 7-12 | Reading Coach | Reading teachers | Early release Oct., Jan. and April | Administrator will review Reading and LA PLC logs to monitor the analysis of student data to inform instructional decisions. | Principal and Administrative Team |

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)).

| Elementary School Mathematics Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5). | | | 1. Learning Gaps | 1.1. Offering Intensive Math Classes for all gr levels. Offering ELP after school New revisions to the overall curriculum | 1.1.Department SAL, Math Teachers, Administration | 1.1. Ongoing Assessments Teacher observations and Evaluations | 1.1 Formative Assessments FCAT Achievement Series Progress Reports Midterm / EOY Exams EOC Exams Curriculum unit Assmt SB Embedded Assmt |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #1:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| To increase the level 3-5 students by 9% per year. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics. | | | 2.1. Behavior | 2.1. PBS, Creed Leaders, Increase consistency in classroom management plan, Be Cool, Stay in School Incentive Program | 2.1. Department SAL, Math Teachers, Administration | 2.1. School wide Behavior Plan Be Cool, Stay in School monthly incentives for students/ homerooms. | 2.1. Student Discipline data Graphed monthly winners |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #2:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| To increase the level 4-5 students by 9% per year. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. Attendance | 2.2. Increase parent contact | 2.2. Department SAL, Math Teachers, Administration | 2.2. Daily Attendance | 2.2. EASI program |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics. | | | 3. 1. Learning Gaps | 3.1. Offering Intensive Math Classes for all gr levels. Offering ELP after school New revisions to the overall curriculum | 3.1.Department SAL, Math Teachers, Administration | 3.1. Ongoing Assessments Teacher observations and Evaluations | 3.1 Formative Assessments FCAT Achievement Series Progress Reports Midterm / EOY Exams EOC Exams |
| <u>Mathematics Goal #3:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| To focus on closing the learning | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| gaps and remediating the identified deficit skill areas as measured by the ongoing available performance data. | | | | | | | | Curriculum unit Assmt SB Embedded Assmt |
| | | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | |
| | | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. | | | 4.1. Learning Gaps | 4.1. Offering Intensive Math Classes for all gr levels. Offering ELP after school New revisions to the overall curriculum | 4.1. Department SAL, Math Teachers, Administration | 4.1. Ongoing Assessments Teacher observations and Evaluations | 4.1 Formative Assessments FCAT Achievement Series Progress Reports Midterm / EOY Exams EOC Exams Curriculum unit Assmt SB Embedded Assmt | |
| Mathematics Goal #4: To reduce the level 1 students by 9% per year. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | | |
| | | | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | |
| | | | 4.3 | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | | | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| 5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | | | | | | | |
| Math Goal #5: To focus on closing the learning gaps and remediating the identified deficit skill areas as measured by the ongoing available performance data. | | | | | | | | |
| 5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics | | | 5A.1. *Students not receiving academic support outside of math classroom instruction. | 5A.1. *Students' math skills will improve through providing a supplemental math class. | 5A.1. - APCs - Guidance Counselors - Math Teachers | 5A.1. APC reviews SILK, District-level baseline and midyear assessments, semester exams and Instructional Planning | 5A.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> - SILK - Formative Tests | |
| Reading Goal #5A: Middle | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------|--|--|--|---|-------|
| <p>In grades 7th and 8th : 86% of the total curriculum standard student subgroups will score a level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Math or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%.</p> <p><u>High</u> The percentage of non-proficient on Algebra End of Course Exam will decrease by 10%.</p> | <p>White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p> | <p>White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p> | *Lack of pre-requisite skills | | | Tool Data | Semester Exams Unit Tests On-line resources reports | |
| | | | | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. |
| | | | | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. |
| <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> | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| <p>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> | | | 5B.1 Attendance | 5. B.1. Increase parent contact | 5. B.1. Department SAL, Math Teachers, Administration | 5. B.1 . Daily Attendance | 5.B.1 EASI program | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> To increase overall attendance by 10%</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | | |
| | | | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | |
| | | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | |
| <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> | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| <p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> | | | 5. C.1. Learning Gaps | 5. C.1. Offering Intensive Math Classes for all gr levels. Offering ELP after school New revisions to the overall curriculum | 5. C.1. .Department SAL, Math Teachers, Administration | 5.C.1.Ongoing Assessments Teacher observations and Evaluations | 5.C.1.Formativ Assessments FCAT Achievement Series Progress Reports Midterm / EOY Exams EOC Exams Curriculum unit Assmt SB Embedded Assmt | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> To focus on closing the learning gaps and remediating the identified deficit skill areas as measured by the ongoing available performance data.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | | |
| | | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | |
| | | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | |
| <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> | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|---|
| 5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | | | 5. D.1. Learning Gaps | 5. D.1. Offering Intensive Math Classes for all gr levels. Offering ELP after school New revisions to the overall curriculum | 5. D.1. Department SAL, Math Teachers, Administration | 5.D.1. Ongoing Assessments Teacher observations and Evaluations | 5.D.1. Formative Assessments FCAT Achievement Series Progress Reports Midterm / EOY Exams EOC Exams Curriculum unit Assmt SB Embedded Assmt |
| Mathematics Goal #5D: To focus on closing the learning gaps and remediating the identified deficit skill areas as measured by the ongoing available performance data. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. |
| | | | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 |

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| Algebra EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5). | | | 1.1. Learning Gaps | 1.1. Offering Intensive Math Classes for all gr levels. Offering ELP after school New revisions to the overall curriculum | 1.1 Department SAL, Math Teachers, Administration | 1.1. Ongoing Assessments Teacher observations and Evaluations | 1.1. Formative Assessments FCAT Achievement Series Progress Reports Midterm / EOY Exams EOC Exams Curriculum unit Assmt SB Embedded Assmt |
| Algebra Goal #1: To establish baseline data of students passing the Algebra EOC. To increase the number of students passing the EOC by 9%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra. | | | 2.1. Behavior | 2.1. PBS, Creed Leaders, Increase consistency in class-room management plan, Be Cool, Stay in | 2.1. Department SAL, Math Teachers, Administration | 2.1. School wide Behavior Plan Be Cool, Stay in School monthly incentives for students/ homerooms. | 2.1. Student Discipline data Graphed monthly winners |
| Algebra Goal #2: To increase the level 4-5 | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--|------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| students by 9% per year. | | | | School Incentive Program | | | |
| | 2.2. Attendance | | 2.2. Increase parent contact | 2.2. Department SAL, Math Teachers, Administration | 2.2. Daily Attendance | 2.2. EASI program | 2.2. EASI program |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Closing the learning gaps | Middle School | Dario Diaz | Harriet Mason, Carl Harrell, | Twice a month-Mondays | Meeting minutes | Math SAL |
| Closing the learning gaps | High School | Dario Diaz | Lorraine Wolfe-Richards | Twice a month-Mondays | Meeting minutes | Math SAL |
| Springboard trainings | Middle/High School | | Dario Diaz, Lorraine Wolfe-Richards Harriett Mason, Carl Harrell | As offered | Required follow-up meetings | Math SAL |

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Science Goals

| Science Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science. | | | 1.1. -Not all teachers know how to identify misconceptions and depth of student knowledge of science concepts. -Not all teachers are able to attend available science trainings on dates available by the district. -Not all teachers are knowledgeable of the strategies of inquiry based instruction such as engaging the students, explore time, accountable talk, higher order questioning, etc. -Not all PLC meetings include regular discussion of student data and/or the implementation of the inquiry model. -Every teacher has a diversity teaching skills at different levels. | 1.1. Strategy Students will incorporate one new strategy per lesson through vocabulary building, during inquiry based instruction: (such as student engagement, explore time, accountable talk and higher order questioning). Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills through science literacy. Action Steps -Teachers will attend District Science training and share information with their PLCs. -PLCs write SMART goals for units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling inquiry based instruction strategies. -PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum and inquiry based instruction strategies. | 1.1. Who Teacher Principal AP District Science Team Generalist Science SAL/DH How Monitored -Classroom walk-through observing inquiry based instruction. | 1.1. -Mini assessments -Reading for comprehension and understanding -Chapter test -Unit tests -County tests | 1.1.2x per year Pre and post District-level baseline and mid-year tests. <u>First and second Semester Exams</u> Midterm, EOC and final exams. <u>During the Grading Period</u> - Mini Assessments -Unit assessments -Teaher made tests -Series achievement tests -portfolios |
| Science Goal #1: To increase the students' achievement levels per year by 5% for the next six years. By incorporating inquiry based lessons and virtual labs into the core curriculum in Science. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Data is not available at this time. | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Data is not available at this time. | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| | | | | -Teachers use checks for understanding and common core curriculum assessments -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers discuss inquiry based | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science. | | | 2.1. Behavior | 2.1. PBS, Creed Leaders, Increase consistency in class-room management plan, Be Cool, Stay in School Incentive Progra | 2.1. Department SAL, Math Teachers, Administration | 2.1. School wide Behavior Plan Be Cool, Stay in School monthly incentives for students/ homerooms. | 2.1. Student Discipline data Graphed monthly winners |
| Science Goal #2: | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| To increase the student success by 5%. | | | | | | | |
| Science goal # 3: | 2.2. Attendance | | 2.2. Increase parent contact | 2.2. Department SAL, Science Teachers, Administration | 2.2. Daily Attendance | 2.2. EASI program | 2.2. |
| To increase the student attendance. | | | 2.3 | 2.3 Student contracts, individual awards, school wide behavioral management awards | 2.3 . Daily Attendance | 2.3 EASI program | 2.3 |

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

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(High Schools ONLY)

Science Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| PLC Meetings | 7-12 th grade | AD/staff | MS/HS-Science | First and the third Mondays of each month. | Review student assessments and student portfolios. | AD |
| PSD | Middle School | AD/staff | MS/ HS- Science | District dates | Applications of the teachers | AD |
| SAL meetings | Middle School | Department | MS/HS-science | District dates | Applications of the teachers | AD |

NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Biology EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology. | | | 1.1. Behavior Attendance Learning gaps | 1.1. More reviewing and testing in the Biology classrooms. SES services. | 1.1. Ongoing Assessments Teacher observations and Evaluations | 1.1. Formative Assessments FCAT Achievement Series Progress Reports Midterm / EOY Exams EOC Exams Curriculum unit Assmt SB Embedded Assmt | 1.1. Formative Assessments FCAT Achievement Series Progress Reports Midterm / EOY Exams EOC Exams Curriculum unit Assmt SB Embedded Assmt |
| Biology Goal K: | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| 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: | 66.18% and the goal was not met | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

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

| L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology. | | | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1. Ongoing Assessments | 1.1. Formative Assessments | 2.1. Formative Assessments |
|---|----------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| 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: Biology Students scoring proficient in Biology (Levels 3-5). | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | 1.1 More reviewing and testing in the Biology classrooms. SES services. | 1.1 General Ed teacher ,APC and the guidance. | Teacher observations and Evaluations | FCAT Achievement Series Progress Reports Midterm / EOY Exams EOC Exams Curriculum unit Assmt SB Embedded Assmt | FCAT Achievement Series Progress Reports Midterm / EOY Exams EOC Exams Curriculum unit Assmt SB Embedded Assmt |
| | 1.1. Learning Gaps, | 1.1 More reviewing and testing in the Biology classrooms. SES services. | | | | | |
| | 1.2. Attendance | | | | | | |
| | 1.3. Behavior | | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

Writing/Language Arts Goals

| Writing/Language Arts Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 4.0 or higher in writing. | | | 1.1. Maintaining student journals with school-wide consistency. | 1.1. Using the writing process, students will be given daily journal entries. All writing will be dated and recorded in a journal for monitoring of growth across time. | 1.1. SAL, PLC Team | 1.1. SAL, PLCs will identify trends (deficiencies and growth) in student writing performance and collaborate to modify instruction as appropriate. | 1.1. Student work samples Journal Entries School-wide mock writing samples |
| Writing/LA Goal #1: Improve students’ knowledge and skills in writing as measured by a 10% increase in students demonstrating success on classroom writing assignments and by maintaining the 80% proficiency of students meeting standard on the FCAT | 2012 Current Level of Performance: * | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: * | | | | | |
| | 76% | 85% | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. Writing strategies | 1.2. Staff will continue to use various writing assignments throughout the curriculum. | 1.2. SAL, PLC Team | 1.2. PLCs will participate in rubric Forming sessions to identify teacher barriers impeding effective scoring. | 1.2. Progress monitoring data |
| | | 1.3. Lack of motivation for writing. | 1.3. SAL, PLC’s will develop strategies to support students who show lack of progress. | 1.3. SAL, PLC Team | 1.3. PLCs - Review of monthly formative writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric on the monthly writing prompt. | 1.3. Progress monitoring data | |

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

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Learning Focused Strategies for writing | All Subjects | SAL | School - Wide | Weekly PLC Meeting Monday Early Release | Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Shared scoring among PLC | PLC - Team |
| Rubric Training for FCAT Writes | Reading/ Language Arts | District Trainer | Middle and High School Reading / Language Arts | District Scheduled Training | Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Shared scoring among PLC | PLC - Team |
| Spring Board Training | Reading/ Language Arts | District Trainer | Middle and High School Reading / Language Arts | District Scheduled Training | Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs Shared scoring among PLC | PLC - Team |

End of Writing Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

| Attendance Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Attendance | | | 1.1. Some students are not motivated to attend school. | 1.1. Tier 1 Consistent use of PBS and other incentives; recognition of perfect attendance and improved attendance; positive contacts by staff to parents and students; continue to emphasize that attendance is required as part of Exit Criteria and for academic progress. | 1.1. PSLT/subset-attendance committee will monitor target list of students with excessive unexcused absences. EASI system will assist with accuracy. | 1.1. Data review of progress by PLCs, HR teachers, PSLT and PBS Team. PSLT/subset will review PLC documentation data on a monthly basis. A targeted group of students with significant absences will be maintained. | Mainframe, EASI, IPT data. Daily attendance reports, attendance remediation forms, Instructional Planning Tool. |
| Attendance Goal #1: | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:* | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* | Need for improvement in communication among staff regarding monitoring and documentation of student attendance to ensure accuracy. | Tier 1 HR teachers/PLCs will maintain documentation such as consultations, logs, Attendance Intervention forms (SB90717), etc. of attendance interventions. | PLCs will review documentation of interventions to improve attendance. | | |
| The attendance rate will increase from 61% in 2011-2012 to 65% in 2012-2013. | 61% (141) | 65% (135) | | | | | |
| The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease from 141 in 2011-2012 to 135 in 2012-2013. | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 141 | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 135 | | | | | |
| The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused/excessive tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease from 10 in 2011-2012 to 9 in 2012-2013. | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 10 | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) 9 | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. Inconsistent follow up by staff with parents/guardians regarding significant unexcused tardies/unexcused absences. | 1.2. Tier 2/3 Attendance line is available for parents/guardians to contact; Parent Link contacts parents daily; HR teachers will contact parents/guardians of | 1.2. Attendance line is monitored by Data Processing Clerk; PLCs will monitor documentation of attendance interventions. | 1.2. PSLT/subset will review interventions and data submitted by PLCs. | 1.2 PLC data; Attendance Intervention forms; IPT data. |

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

| | | | | | | |
|------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2012-2013. | | | students who continue to have unexcused tardies/absences and share findings with PLCs | | | |
| | | <p>1.3. Most students with significant unexcused absences/tardies have personal/family/legal or other issues that impact school attendance.</p> <p>Some students continue to have absences in spite of interventions.</p> | <p>1.3. Tier 3</p> <p>Attendance will be emphasized with parents and students during orientation and school conferences. HR teachers will continue to contact families regarding attendance and document results. HR teacher will convey information regarding results to PLC/Attendance Committee/PSLT.</p> <p>Tier 3</p> <p>School Social Worker follow up regarding Tier 3 interventions, i.e. Truancy Court, CINS/FINS, DJJ/probation follow up, Diversion programs, etc.</p> | <p>1.3. Follow up phone calls, home visits, school conferences with parents or guardians by PSLT-subset (attendance committee). Resources will be offered when indicated.</p> <p>Court documentation, school records, contacts with DJJ, Diversion programs, etc., will be monitored by SSW/PSLT.</p> | <p>1.3. Administrative team and subset of PSLT (attendance committee) will review documentation and attendance of students who have significant number of absences on a monthly basis.</p> <p>PSLT-subgroup will monitor data from subgroup of Tier 3 students.</p> | <p>1.3. Mainframe, EASI and Instructional Planning Tool-attendance and tardy data.</p> <p>IPT, Mainframe, Driver license reports.</p> |

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

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

| Suspension Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Suspension | | | 1.1. There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior | 11. Tier 1 Positive Behavior Support 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 with faculty at a monthly meeting, tracking the overall improvement of the faculty -Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats | 1.1 PSLT Behavior Committee | 1.1. PSLT/Behavior Committee will review data on office Discipline Referrals (ODR) and out of school suspensions monthly | 1.1. EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data |
| Suspension Goal #1: | 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 437 | 393 | | | | | |
| The total number of In-School suspensions will decrease by 10% | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School | | | | | |
| | 182 | 163 | | | | | |
| | 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | | | |
| | 637 | 573 | | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | | | | | |
| 212 | 190 | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

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

Suspension Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Positive Behavior Support (PBS) | K-12 | District/USF Trainer | School-Wide | Early Release Dates | Monthly Data Review with support from PBS Coach. PSLT will review the attendance and behavior data on a monthly basis and structure school-wide support and reinforcement programs. The school's PBS system determines students in need of Tier 2 and 3 supports, provides PD for classroom teachers, plans and implements universal, supplemental and intensive supports for students, and establishes ongoing contact with parents | PSLT/Behavior Committee |
| | | | | | | |

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

| Dropout Prevention Goal(s) | | Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |
| 1. Dropout Prevention | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
| Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i> | | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current Dropout Rate:* | | | | | | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Graduation Rate:* | | | | | | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

| Dropout Prevention Goal(s) | | Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Dropout Prevention <u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i> | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | <u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u> | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| Parent Involvement Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Parent Involvement | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Parent Involvement Goal #1: | | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:* | 2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Parent Involvement Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 2. Parent Involvement | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Parent Involvement Goal #2: | | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:* | 2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity
 Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

| Additional Goal(s) | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Health and Fitness Goal | | | 1.1. | 1.1.. High School students will engage in a minimum of two semesters of physical education in grades 9-12 | 1.1. Principal Guidance Counselors APC | 1.1. Checking of student schedules | 1.1. Student schedules Master schedule |
| Health and Fitness Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from ____% on the Pretest to ____% on the Posttest. | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |
| | 25% 9 Students | 35% 13 Students | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the Principal's designee. | 1.2.. Principal's designee. | 1.2.. Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ) | 1.2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. Five physical education classes per week for a minimum of two semesters in grades 9-12 with a certified physical education teacher. | 1.3. Physical Education Teacher | 1.3.. Classroom walk-throughs of PE classes by principal. | 1.3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health |

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

| Additional Goal(s) | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Health and Fitness Goal | | | 1.1. | 1.1.1. Middle School students will engage in the equivalent of one class period per day of physical education for one semester of each year in grades 6 through 8 | 1.1. Principal Guidance Counselors APC | 1.1. Checking of student schedules | 1.1. Student schedules Master schedule |
| Health and Fitness Goal #1: | <u>2012 Current Level :*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> | | | | | |
| During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from ___% on the Pretest to ___% on the Posttest. | 35% | 45% | | | | | |
| | 20 students | 25 students | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2.. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the Principal's designee. | 1.2.. Principal's designee | 1.2. Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ) | 1.2.2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. Five physical education classes per week for a minimum of two semesters in grades 9-12 with a certified physical education teacher. | 1.3.. Physical Education Teacher | 1.3.. Classroom walk-throughs of PE classes by principal. | 1.3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health |

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

| Additional Goal(s) | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Continuous Improvement Goal | | | 1.1. -Teachers do not have a common planning time | 1.1. PLCs will meet on the 1 st and 3 rd Monday of the month during early release time. | 1.1 <u>Who</u> Administration <u>How</u> PLC logs will be submitted following each meeting. Administration will review logs and provide feedback. | 1.1. PSLT will review feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the process. | 1.1. PLC facilitators will provide feedback to PSLT on progress of their PLCs. |
| Continuous Improvement Goal #1: The percentage of teachers who agree with the indicator that “teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students’ learning, share best practices, problem solve, and develop lessons/assessments that improve student performance” will increase from 77% in 2012 to 85% in 2013. | <u>2012 Current Level :*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> | | | | | |
| | 77% | 85% | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. -Not all staff are trained in how to implement PLCs -PLC facilitators/SALs may not be trained on how to lead PLCs | 1.2. -Staff-wide training on collaborative teaching will be pursued -Staff-wide training on district procedures for PLC implementation will be pursued. | 1.2. <u>Who</u> Administration and trained staff members <u>How</u> PSLT members will attend PLCs on a rotating basis. | 1.2. PSLT will examine the feedback from PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process. | 1.2. PLC facilitators will provide feedback to PSLT on progress of their PLC. |
| | | 1.3. PLC members are not always sure of what they should focus on in PLC meetings. | 1.3. PLCs will use the Action Steps listed under each goal as a guide for PLC discussion and collaboration. | 1.3. <u>Who</u> Administration and/or PSLT <u>How</u> Review of PLC logs | 1.3. PSLT will examine the feedback from PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process. | 1.3. PLC facilitators will provide feedback to PSLT on progress of their PLC. | |

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

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic | Grade | PD Facilitator | PD Participants | Target Dates and Schedules | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for | |

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

| and/or PLC Focus | Level/Subject | and/or PLC Leader | (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | | Monitoring |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--|---|-----------------|
| Plan-Do-Check-Act Model | Leadership Team All teachers | Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC Facilitators | School-wide | PLCs meet every three weeks for Plan-Do-Check-Act PLCs. | Administrator and leadership team walk-throughs Administrator and leadership attendance at PLC meetings PLC Survey data | Leadership Team |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|------|------|------|
| A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9). | | | A.1. | A.1. See Reading Goal 5d | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. |
| Reading Goal A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. |
| | | | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. |
| B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. | | | B.1. | B.1. See Reading Goal 5d | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. |
| Reading Goal B: The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. |
| | | | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. |

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

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

| CELLA Goals | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|----------------------------------|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking. | | 1.1. Students' lack of interest. | 1.1. Students activities include but are not limited to : -pre-plan set of questions and create a format for interviews; Conduct interviews in pairs -oral presentations -recall -recite | 1.1. Ibia Ortiz, ESOL R.T. will monitor by visiting classrooms and by annual scores reviews. | 1.1. The evaluation tool will be administered annually and scores will be compared to previous years. | 1.1. CELLA |
| CELLA Goal #C: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. Sixty percent of ELL students will improve CELLA Listening/Speaking scores by, at least, 10%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 24pt;">50%</div> | 1.2. Suspensions | 1.2. Parent Involvement activities | 1.2. ESOL R. T. will conduct Parent Leadership Council twice a year. | 1.2. Comparing parents attendance to previous years. | 1.2. Attendance roster for PLC |
| | | 1.3. Absences | 1.3. Interviewing students | 1.3. ESOL R. T. | 1.3. Students' grades | 1.3. Classroom teachers' in- put |
| | | | | | | |
| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| D. Students scoring proficient in Reading. | | 2.1. Students' lack of interest | 2.1. Provide books and magazines to the students' interests with heritage dictionaries | 2.1. Ibia Ortiz, ESOL R.T. will monitor by visiting students in classrooms and by annual scores reviews. | 2.1. The evaluation tool will be administered annually and scores will be compared to previous years' scores. | 2.1. CELLA |
| CELLA Goal #D: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. Five percent of ELL students will improve CELLA Reading scores by, at least, 10%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 24pt;">1%</div> | 2.2. Suspensions | 2.2. Interviewing classroom teachers | 2.2. Ibia Ortiz, ESOL R.T. will monitor by visiting students in class. | 2.2. Comparing scores with previous years' scores. | 2.2. FAIR |
| | | Absences | 2.3. Phone calls to parents | 2.3. Ibia Ortiz, ESOL R.T. will monitor by reviewing absentee bulletin. | 2.3. Comparing scores with previous years' scores. | 2.3. FCAT |
| | | | | | | |
| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| E. Students scoring proficient in Writing. | | 2.1. | 2.1. Students' activities include | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|-------|
| CELLA Goal #E: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. Five percent of ELL students will improve CELLA Writing scores by, at least, 10%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : | Students' lack of interest | but are not limited to: Writing essays of their own interests such as: Favorite vacation places, sports, country of origin, family, etc. Heritage dictionaries will be provided. | Ibia Ortiz, ESOL R.T. will monitor by visiting students classes and by annual scores reviews. | The evaluation tool will be administered annually and scores will be compared to previous years' scores. | CELLA |
| | 1% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 2.2. Suspensions | 2.2. Conferencing with classroom teachers | 2.2. Ibia Ortiz, ESOL R.T. will monitor by visiting students in class. | 2.2. Students' behavior grades | 2.2. Classroom teachers in-put | |
| | 2.3 Absences | 2.3 Phone calls to parents. | 2.3 Ibia Ortiz, ESOL R.T. will monitor by reviewing absentee bulletin. | 2.3 Reviewing students' writings and comparing them throughout the school year | 2.3 Writing samples | |

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9). | | F.1. | F.1. See Math Goal 5d | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. |
| Mathematics Goal F: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. |
| | | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------|---------------------------------|------|------|------|
| G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. | | | G.1. | G.1. See Math Goal 5d | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. |
| Mathematics Goal G: The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | | | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. |
| | | | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. |

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

| Elementary, Middle and High Science Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9). | | | J.1. Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students’ IEPs To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year. | J.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 | J.1 Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC | J.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. | J.1. |
| Science Goal J: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------|--|------|--|------|
| | | | | 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. | | <u>PLC Level</u> -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. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -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 | |
| | | | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. |
| | | | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. |

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

| Writing Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9). | | | M.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs To address | M.1. Strategy SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' | M.1. Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal | M.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. | On-going writing prompts and assessments |
| <u>Writing Goal M:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.</p> | | | <p>this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.</p> | <p>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><u>How</u> IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC</p> | <p>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. <u>PLC Level</u> -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. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -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>2012 Current Level of Performance: M.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.</p> | <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance: M.1. <u>Strategy</u> 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</p> | <p>M.2. M.1. <u>Who</u> Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal <u>How</u> IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC</p> | <p>M.2. M.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -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. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all</p> | <p>M.2. On-going writing prompts and assessments</p> | <p>M.2. M.3.</p> | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons. | | <p>classes/courses.</p> <p>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team</u></p> <p><u>Level</u></p> <p>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|

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

| STEM Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM electives. | 1.1 Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers | 1.1 -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established. -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs. -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc. | 1.1 PLC or grade level lead -Subject Area Leaders | 1.1 Administrative/SAL walk-throughs | 1.1 Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM elective per nine week. Share data with teachers. |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

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 |
| Project-based learning | 7-11 | SALs | Science, math, ELA and technology teachers PLCs | On-going | Administrator walk-throughs | Administration |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

| CTE Goal(s) Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|--|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| CTE Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

CTE Professional Development

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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.)

| School Differentiated Accountability Status | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Priority | <input type="checkbox"/> Focus | <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent |

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

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

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