Florida Department of Education

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

Coleman Middle School
2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: **Coleman Middle School**	**District Name:** **Hillsborough**
Principal: **Michael L. Hoskinson**	**Superintendent:** **MaryEllen Elia**
SAC Chair: **Debbie Easler**	**Date of School Board Approval:**

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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	Michael Hoskinson	Educational Leadership	7	18	**11/12 Grade: A** 3+ Read 81%, Math 83%, Writing 92%, Science 70% Learning Gains: Read 72%, Math 77% Lowest Quartile: Read 76%, Math 63% **10/11 Grade: A** 3+ Read 88%, Math 88%, Writing 95%, Science 71% Learning Gains: Read 66%, Math 78% Lowest Quartile: Read 70%, Math 74% AYP: 92% (No) **09/10 Grade: A** 3+ Read 87%, Math 89%, Writing 99%, Science 70% Learning Gains: Read 69%, Math 74% Lowest Quartile: Read 67%, Math 68% AYP: 92% (No) **08/09 Grade: A**

					3+ Read 87%, Math 87%, Writing 99%, Science 67% Learning Gains: Read 69%, Math 74% Lowest Quartile: Read 69%, Math 68% AYP: 95% (No)

Assistant Principal	Toby Johnson	Educational Leadership	4	4	**11/12 Grade: A** 3+ Read 81%, Math 83%, Writing 92%, Science 70% Learning Gains: Read 72%, Math 77% Lowest Quartile: Read 76%, Math 63% **10/11 Grade: A** 3+ Read 88%, Math 88%, Writing 95%, Science 71% Learning Gains: Read 66%, Math 78% Lowest Quartile: Read 70%, Math 74% AYP: 92% (No) **09/10 Grade: A** 3+ Read 87%, Math 89%, Writing 99%, Science 70% Learning Gains: Read 69%, Math 74% Lowest Quartile: Read 67%, Math 68% AYP: 92% (No) **08/09: Grade: C** AYP: 67% (No)

Assistant Principal	Nannette Harvey	Educational Leadership	3	9	**11/12 Grade: A** 3+ Read 81%, Math 83%, Writing 92%, Science 70% Learning Gains: Read 72%, Math 77% Lowest Quartile: Read 76%, Math 63% **10/11 Grade: A** 3+ Read 88%, Math 88%, Writing 95%, Science 71% Learning Gains: Read 66%, Math 78% Lowest Quartile: Read 70%, Math 74% AYP: 92% (No) **09/10 Grade: A** 3+ Read 87%, Math 89%, Writing 99%, Science 70% Learning Gains: Read 69%, Math 74% Lowest Quartile: Read 67%, Math 68% AYP: 92% (No) **08/09: Grade: B** AYP: (No)

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 Coach	Kathleen Abdoney	English (Grades 6-12) ESOL Endorsement Reading (Grades K – 12) Speech (Grades 6 – 12)	21	21	**11/12 Grade: A** 3+ Read 81%, Math 83%, Writing 92%, Science 70% Learning Gains: Read 72%, Math 77% Lowest Quartile: Read 76%, Math 63% **10/11 Grade: A** 3+ Read 88%, Math 88%, Writing 95%, Science 71% Learning Gains: Read 66%, Math 78% Lowest Quartile: Read 70%, Math 74% AYP: 92% (No) **09/10 Grade: A** 3+ Read 87%, Math 89%, Writing 99%, Science 70% Learning Gains: Read 69%, Math 74% Lowest Quartile: Read 67%, Math 68% AYP: 92% (No)

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 & Assistant Principals**	**June 2012**	
2.. Performance Pay	**Principal**	**May/June 2012**	
3. Empowering Effective Teachers Program	**Principal, Mentor and Peer Teachers, and District Staff**	**Ongoing**	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

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

7	Teachers have signed Agreement to Earn and is taking courses sponsored by the district Teacher are Out of Field for ESOL/Taking courses sponsored by the district

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
61	**1.6% (1)**	**13.1% (8)**	**32.8% (20)**	**52.5% (32)**	**57.4% (35)**	**98.3% (60)**	**13.1% (8)**	**0% (0)**	**36.1% (22)**

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
N/A			

Additional Requirements

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Michael Hoskinson-Principal

Toby Johnson-Asst Principal

Nannette Harvey-Asst Principal

Brittany Bevilacqua-School Psychologist

Lesley Morter-School Counselor

Kathy Abdoney-Reading Coach

Jennifer Miller-Math SAL

Sara Russell-Science SAL

Kyle Arnold-Language Arts SAL

Teresa Rafferty-Social Studies SAL

SAL Jane Shriner-ESE Specialist

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 MTSS Leadership Team meets monthly on the first Thursday. The role of the team is to analyze school wide student academic, emotional, and attendance needs. We collaborate across all subjects and grade levels using the problem solving process to formulate strategies to address the academic, social, and attendance concerns for our students. We continue to monitor those intervention strategies at least four times per year making strategy adjustments where and when necessary.

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

The MTSS Leadership Team helps identify needs and areas of focus for the SIP. The MTSS Leadership Team helps monitor and implement the SIP, making adjustments as needed throughout the year. Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the PSLT 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, third, and fourth nine weeks. The PSLT will use the following rubric to evaluate Strategy Fidelity of Implementation and Strategy Effectiveness:

MTSS Implementation

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

	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Behavior
School-wide (Tier 1)	FCAT Results FAIR Results F-CIM	FCAT Results Hillsborough Writes Coleman Writes	FCAT Results District Assessments End of Course Semester Exams	FCAT Results Pre and Post Exams District Assessments	Referrals OSS AT OSS ISS
Supplemental Support (Tier 2)	Fair Results/OPM	Coleman Writes	Frequent Assessments Unit Tests	Frequent Assessments Unit Tests	Referrals Behavior Contracts Frequency Charts
Intensive Support (Tier 3)	Individualized for students	Individualized for students	Individualized for students	Individualized for students	Individualized for students needing FBA/BIP

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. **The MTSS Leadership Team will in-service the staff throughout the year during monthly faculty meetings or on an as needed basis for individual staff members. Additionally, data will be collected using state perceptions of MTSS Skills Survey during the first and last nine weeks.**
Describe plan to support MTSS. **The MTSS Leadership Team will meet monthly to discuss and analyze effectiveness of strategies as well as needs by the team. Administration will support MTSS Leadership Team's efforts and needs.**

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Michael Hoskinson-Principal

Toby Johnson-Ass't Principal

Nannette Harvey-Ass't Principal

Shell Wicker-School Counselor

Kathy Abdoney-Reading Coach

Jennifer Miller-Math SAL

Sara Russell-Science SAL

Kyle Arnold-Language Arts SAL

Teresa Rafferty-Social Studies SAL

Suzanne Cavaness-Reading Teacher

Julie Ball-Media Specialist

Jennifer Whitton-6th Grade Reading

Luiza Holtzberg 6th/7th Science

Belinda Speight 8th Social Studies

Teresa Cook 8th Language Arts

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
The LLT Team meets on the third Thursday of each month. The role of the team is to analyze student academic needs. We collaborate across all subjects and grade levels to come up with strategies to address the academic needs for our students. We continue to monitor those needs making strategy adjustments where and when necessary.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
The LLT's major initiative for the 2012-2013 school year is the utilization of Costas questioning strategies across all subject areas in order for a deeper understanding for our students while in class or during testing situations. We are also focusing on SpringBoard/AVID strategies and CRISS strategies in all subject areas. Professional Development opportunities and EET Strategies (Best Practices). Shifting focus towards Common Core Standards and expectations.

NCLB Public School Choice

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

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*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.

The plan of the team is to analyze student academic needs. We collaborate across all subjects and grade levels to come up with strategies to address the academic needs for our students. We continue to monitor those needs making strategy adjustments where and when necessary.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).	**1.1.** **-PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.**	**1.1.** **Strategy** **Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:** **1. What is it we expect them to learn?** **2. How will we if they have learned it?** **3. How will we respond if they don't learn?** **4. How will we respond if they already know it?**	**1.1.** **Who** **-Principal** **-AP** **-Instruction Coaches** **-Subject Area Leaders** **-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses** **How** **PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.** **-PLCs receive feedback on their logs.** **-Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings** **-Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team** **-Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.**	**1.1.** **School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/ or leadership team.**	**1.1.** **3x per year** **FAIR** **During the Grading Period** **Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)**		

		Actions/Details **-Grade level/ like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log.** **-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.** **- Teachers will utilize 10 minutes of Sustained Silent Reading during the extended lunch period each day.**					

Reading Goal #1: **In grades 6-8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 81% to 84%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	81% (753)	**84% (781)**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.	2.1. Teachers are at varying skill levels with Costas Questioning techniques PLCs need better focus on higher order questioning strategies (Costas)	2.1. **Strategy** **Students' reading comprehension will improve through participation in Costas Level Questioning (input, process, and output) in Reading, Language Arts, Science, Social Studies and Elective classes. As a result, there will be increased use of higher level questions versus lower level questions for both teachers and students.** **Action Steps.** **1. The school uses prior year's College Board Rigor form from representative walk-throughs to determine data for 1) student use of higher level questions vs. lower level questions and 2) teacher use of higher level**	2.1. **Who** **-Administration Team** **-AVID Coordinator** **-College Board** **-Subject Area Leaders** **-Reading Coach** **How** ***-College Board Rigor* walk-through form** **-Administration (see IDEAS AVID World Icon) *This form demonstrates students' use of vocabulary and higher levels of learning.* Use the forms to compute percentage of higher level vs. lower level and monitor improvement/growth** **-HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool) *(which has HOTS as a strategy listed on the form.)*** **First Nine Week Check**	2.1. **PLCs examine student work and data from the Costas quizzes.** **With teachers, administration reviews College Board Rigor walk-through form.** **Data from review of unit assessments and interactive notebooks will be analyzed at PLC meetings.** **PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership (RtI) Team and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The PSLT (MTSS) Team and LLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per month. PSLT (RtI) Team will tailor CCIM strategies used by all teachers during "Bell Work" Time.**	2.1. **2-3x Per Year** **- FAIR** **Semester Exams (All Content Areas)** **During the nine weeks** **-Student work** **-Chapter tests** **-Costas quizzes from *Tutorial Curriculum Resource*** **-Costas quizzes on the IDEAS AVID World Icon.**		

		questions vs. lower level questions. 2. AVID site team designs and plans training for staff. Demonstration classrooms are identified and training schedule designed for staff. 3. As a professional development activity, PLCs study Costas Level Questioning techniques. 4. Teachers implement lessons using Costas Level Questioning. 5. Teachers assess students by having them identify and create different levels of questions. 6. Teachers bring student work and/or assessments to PLCs. 7. As a professional development					

		activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. **8. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of Costas Level Questioning techniques.** **9. PLCs record their work on the PLC logs.** **10. Teachers will utilize 10 minutes of Sustained Silent Reading during the extended lunch period each day.**					

Reading Goal #2: **In grades 6-8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the** **2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 54% to 57%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	54% **(489)**	**57%** **(513)**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.	**See 1.1**	**See 1.1**	**See 1.1**	**See 1.1**	**See 1.1**		

Reading Goal #3: **Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 64 points to 67 points.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	72 points	**75 points**					
		See 2.1	**See 2.1**	**See 2.1**	**See 2.1**	**See 2.1**	
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**						
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	**See 1.1**	**See 1.1**	**See 1.1**	**See 1.1**	**See 1.1**		

Reading Goal #4: **Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 76 points to 79 points.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **76 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **79 points**					
		See 2.1	**See 2.1**	**See 2.1**	**See 2.1**	**See 2.1**	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
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%.		**Information on how to fill out this section/ row is forthcoming from the state.**					
Reading Goal #5:							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5A.1. **See 1.1 and 2.1**	5A.1. **See 1.1 and 2.1**	5A.1 **See 1.1 and 2.1.**	5A.1. **See 1.1 and 2.1**	5A.1. **See 1.1 and 2.1**		

Reading Goal #5A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 84 % to 86%.							
The percentage of Asian students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 82 % to 84%.							

	White: 84% Black: N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: 82% American Indian: N/A	White: 86% Black: N/A Hispanic:N/A Asian: 84% American Indian: N/A					
		5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1. **See 1.1 and 2.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1 and 2.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1 and 2.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1 and 2.1**	5B.1. **See 1.1 and 2.1**		

Reading Goal #5B: **The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 66 % to 69%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	66%	**69%**					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	

		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	**See 1.1 and 2.1**	**See 1.1 and 2.1**	**See 1.1 and 2.1**	**See 1.1 and 2.1**	**See 1.1 and 2.1**		
Reading Goal #5C: **The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 48 % to 53%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	48%	**53%**					

		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.							

Reading Goal #5D: **N/A.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	**N/A.**	**N/A.**	**N/A.**	**N/A.**	**N/A.**
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

Reading Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	**Grades 6-8**	**-Reading Coach** **-Subject Area Leaders and/or course-specific Facilitators**	**-All teachers school-wide** **-PLCs** ***(This PD also covers a similar strategy in math and science.)***	**- Early Release: Every Monday 2012/2013** **-PLCs: Ongoing**	**Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation**	**Principal and Administrative Team**
Socratic Seminars, Cornell Notes, and CRISS	**Grades 6-8**	**-Reading Coach** **-Subject Area Leaders and/or course-specific Facilitators**	**-All teachers school-wide** **-PLCs** ***(This PD also covers a similar strategy in math and science.)***	**- Early Release: Every Monday 2012/2013** **-PLCs: Ongoing**	**Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor Strategy implementation**	**Principal and Administrative Team**
Costas Level Questions	**Grades 6-8**	**-Demonstration Classrooms (by AVID, Reading Coach and other targeted teachers)** **-AVID Library** **AVIDonline.org** **SDHC AVID World** **-Subject Area Leaders and/or course-specific Facilitators**	**-All teachers school-wide** **-PLCs** ***(This PD also covers a similar strategy in math and science.)***	**- Early Release: Every Monday 2012/2013** **-Demonstration classroom:- Ongoing** **-PLCs: Ongoing**	**Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor Costas Level Questioning implementation**	**Principal and Administrative Team**
Professional Book Studies	**Grades 6-8**	**-Reading Coach**	**Available to all teachers school-wide**	**Designated Fridays throughout 2012-2013 school year.**	**Attendance and Feedback logs from Professional Book Studies**	**Principal and Administrative Team**

Complex Text/Close Reading CIS model	**Grades 6-8**	**Reading Coach, SALs and /or course-specific facilitators**	**All teachers school wide: PLCs**	**Early Release, PLCs Ongoing**	**Administrators to monitor CIS implementation**	**Principal, Administrative Team**

End of Reading Goals

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**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).	1.1. **Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum)** **-Lack of common PLC planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.** **-Lack of common PLC planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.** **-Lack of PLC planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.** **- Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.**	1.1. **Strategy** **Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the problem-solving model.** **Action Steps** **1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.)** **2. As a Professional**	1.1. **Who** **-Principal** **-APC** **-Reading Coach** **-Subject Area** **Leaders** **How** **-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.** **-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form** **EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form.** **-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.** **PSLT (MTSS) Monitoring data will be reviewed every**	1.1. **PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.** **PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership (MTSS) Team and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The PSLT (MTSS) Team and LLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per month. PSLT (MTSS) Team will tailor CCIM strategies used by all teachers during "Bell Work" Time.** **First Nine Week Check** **Second Nine Week Check** **Third Nine Week Check**	1.1. **2-3x Per Year** **District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing** **Semester Exams** **During the Nine Weeks** **-Chapter Tests** **-Benchmark mini assessments**		

	- Teachers at varying levels of impleme ntation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based DI best-practice strategies. In addition, math teachers visit math demonstration classrooms where DI is emphasized. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were	month. First Nine Week Check Frequent assessment testing Second Nine Week Check Semester Exam results, EOC results, and benchmark results Third Nine Week Check Frequent assessment testing Forth Nine Week Check Semester Exam results, EOC results, and benchmark				

		effective. **7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.** **8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).** **9. PLCs record their work in logs.**	**results**				

Mathematics Goal #1: ***In grades 6-8, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 83% to 86%.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	83% (747)	**86% (774)**					

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

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.	**2.1** **Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum)** **-Lack of common PLC planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.** **-Lack of common PLC planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.** **-Lack of PLC planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.** **- Need additional training to implement effective**	**2.1** **Strategy** **Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the problem-solving model.** **Action Steps** **1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.)** **2. As a Professional**	**2.1** **Who** **-Principal** **-APC** **-Reading Coach** **-Subject Area Leaders** **How** **-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.** **-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form.** **-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.** **PSLT (MTSS) Monitoring data will be reviewed every**	**2.1** **PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.** **PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership (MTSS) Team and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The PSLT (MTSS) Team and LLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per month. PSLT (MTSS) Team will tailor CCIM strategies used by all teachers during "Bell Work" Time.** **First Nine Week Check** **Second Nine Week Check** **Third Nine Week Check**	**2.1** **2-3x Per Year** **District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing** **Semester Exams** **During the Nine Weeks** **-Chapter Tests** **-Benchmark mini assessments**		

	PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of impleme ntation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based DI best-practice strategies. In addition, math teachers visit math demonstration classrooms where DI is emphasized. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were	month. <u>First Nine Week Check</u> Frequent assessment testing <u>Second Nine Week Check</u> Semester Exam results, EOC results, and benchmark results <u>Third Nine Week Check</u> Frequent assessment testing <u>Forth Nine Week Check</u> Semester Exam results, EOC results, and benchmark				

		effective. **7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.** **8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).** **9. PLCs record their work in logs.**	**results**				

Mathematics Goal #2: ***In grades 6-8, the percentage*** ***of Standard Curriculum*** ***students scoring a Level 4*** ***or higher on the 2013*** ***FCAT Math will increase*** ***from 52% to 55%.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	52% **(465)**	**55%** **(495)**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

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

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.	3.1. Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum) -Lack of common PLC planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common PLC planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of PLC planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.	3.1. Strategy Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the problem-solving model. Action Steps 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 2. As a Professional	3.1. Who -Principal -APC -Reading Coach -Subject Area Leaders How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. PSLT (MTSS) Monitoring data will be reviewed every	3.1. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership (MTSS) Team and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The PSLT (MTSS) Team and LLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per month. PSLT (MTSS) Team will tailor CCIM strategies used by all teachers during "Bell Work" Time. First Nine Week Check Second Nine Week Check Third Nine Week Check	3.1. 2-3x Per Year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams During the Nine Weeks -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments		

	- Teachers at varying levels of impleme ntation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based DI best-practice strategies. In addition, math teachers visit math demonstration classrooms where DI is emphasized. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were	month. First Nine Week Check Frequent assessment testing Second Nine Week Check Semester Exam results, EOC results, and benchmark results Third Nine Week Check Frequent assessment testing Forth Nine Week Check Semester Exam results, EOC results, and benchmark				

		effective. **7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.** **8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).** **9. PLCs record their work in logs.**	**results**				

Mathematics Goal #3: **Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 77 points to 80 points.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	77 points	**80 points**					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** 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**		

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	**4.1.** **Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum)** **-Lack of common PLC planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.** **-Lack of common PLC planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.** **-Lack of PLC planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.** **- Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.**	**4.1.** **Strategy** **Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the problem-solving model.** **Action Steps** **1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.)** **2. As a Professional**	**4.1.** **Who** **-Principal** **-APC** **-Reading Coach** **-Subject Area** **Leaders** **How** **-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.** **-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form** **EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form.** **-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.** **PSLT (MTSS) Monitoring data will be reviewed every**	**4.1.** **PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.** **PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership (MTSS) Team and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The PSLT (MTSS) Team and LLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per month. PSLT (MTSS) Team will tailor CCIM strategies used by all teachers during "Bell Work" Time.** **First Nine Week Check** **Second Nine Week Check** **Third Nine Week Check**	**4.1.** **2-3x Per Year** **District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing** **Semester Exams** **During the Nine Weeks** **-Chapter Tests** **-Benchmark mini assessments**		

	- Teachers at varying levels of impleme ntation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based DI best-practice strategies. In addition, math teachers visit math demonstration classrooms where DI is emphasized. 3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions. 4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were	month. First Nine Week Check Frequent assessment testing Second Nine Week Check Semester Exam results, EOC results, and benchmark results Third Nine Week Check Frequent assessment testing Forth Nine Week Check Semester Exam results, EOC results, and benchmark				

		effective. **7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.** **8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).** **9. PLCs record their work in logs.**	**results**				

Mathematics Goal #4: **Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 63 points to 67 points.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	63 points	**67 points**					
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	
		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		**Information on how to fill out this row is forthcoming from the state.**					
Math Goal #5:							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics**	5A.1. **See 1.1 – 4.1**	5A.1. **See 1.1 – 4.1**	5A.1. **See 1.1 – 4.1**	5A.1. **See 1.1 – 4.1**	5A.1. **See 1.1 – 4.1**		

Mathematics Goal #5A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of White students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 87% to 88%.							
The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 45 % to 51 %.							
The percentage of Asian students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA							

Math will increase from 88 % to 89 %.							
	White: 87% Black: 45% Hispanic: N/A Asian: 88% American Indian: N/A	White: 88% Black: 51% Hispanic:N/A Asian: 89% American Indian: N/A					
		5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.							

Mathematics Goal #5B: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. **See 1.1 – 4.1**	5C.1. **See 1.1 – 4.1**	5C.1. **See 1.1 – 4.1**	5C.1. **See 1.1 – 4.1**	5C.1. **See 1.1 – 4.1**		

Mathematics Goal #5C: **The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 48 % to 53%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	48%	**53%**					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. **See 1.1 – 4.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1 – 4.1**	5D.1 **See 1.1 – 4.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1 – 4.1**	5D.1. **See 1.1 – 4.1**		

Mathematics Goal #5D: **The percentage of SWD students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 58% to 62%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	58%	**62%**					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Algebra EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student**						

	Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).	1.1.	1.1. **See Math Goals 1, 2, 4 & 5**	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

Algebra Goal #1: **The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013Algebra EOC will increase from 95% to 98%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	95% (214)	**98% (221)**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.	2.1.	2.1. **See Math Goals 1, 2, 4 & 5**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Algebra Goal #2: **The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013Algebra EOC will increase from 69% to 72%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	69% (155)	**72% (162)**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

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

Differentiated Instruction	**Grades 6-8**	**-Reading Coach** **-Subject Area Leaders and/or course-specific Facilitators**	**-All teachers school-wide** **-PLCs** ***(This PD also covers a similar strategy in math and science.)***	**- Early Release: Every Monday 2012/2013** **-PLCs: Ongoing**	**Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation**	**Principal and Administrative Team**
Socratic Seminars, Cornell Notes, and CRISS	**Grades 6-8**	**-Reading Coach** **-Subject Area Leaders and/or course-specific Facilitators**	**-All teachers school-wide** **-PLCs** ***(This PD also covers a similar strategy in math and science.)***	**- Early Release: Every Monday 2012/2013** **-PLCs: Ongoing**	**Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor Strategy implementation**	**Principal and Administrative Team**
Costas Level Questions	**Grades 6-8**	**-Demonstration Classrooms (by AVID, Reading Coach and other targeted teachers)** **-AVID Library** **AVIDonline.org** **SDHC AVID World** **-Subject Area Leaders and/or course-specific Facilitators**	**-All teachers school-wide** **-PLCs** ***(This PD also covers a similar strategy in math and science.)***	**- Early Release: Every Monday 2012/2013** **-Demonstration classroom:- Ongoing** **-PLCs: Ongoing**	**Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor Costas Level Questioning implementation**	**Principal and Administrative Team**

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.	**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**	**1.1** **Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge. To achieve this goal, science teachers will increase the number of inquiry based instruction (such as student engagement, explore time, accountable talk and higher order questioning (Costas)) per unit of instruction.** **Action Steps** **1. Teachers will attend**	**1.1** **Who** **Principal** **APC** **Science SAL** **Science Teachers** **How Monitored** **-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.** **- Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administrative walk-throughs.** **-Classroom walk-throughs observing inquiry based instruction.** **First Nine Week Check** **Frequent assessment testing**	**1.1** **Science PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.** **PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership (RtI) Team and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The PSLT (RtI) Team and LLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per month. PSLT (RtI) Team will tailor CCIM strategies used by all teachers during "Bell Work" Time.**	**1.1** **2x per year** **District-level baseline and mid-year tests** **Semester Exams** **During the nine weeks** **- Mini Assessments** **-Unit assessments**		

	include regular discussion of student data and/or the implement ation of the inquiry model. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with the use of achievement series to accurately analyze student data.	District Science training and share information with their PLCs. 2. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling inquiry based instruction strategies. 4. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum and inquiry based	Second Nine Week Check Semester Exam results, EOC results, and benchmark results Third Nine Week Check Frequent assessment testing				

		instruction strategies. 5. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 7. Based on the data, teachers discuss inquiry based instruction strategies that were effective. 8 Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning inquiry based instruction strategies. 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.					

Science Goal #1: **The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 70% to 73%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	70% **(212)**	**73%** **(221)**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	

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

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.	**2.1** **- Teachers are at varying skill levels with Costas (higher order questioning techniques).** **- PLC meetings do not focus on higher order questioning strategies for upcoming lessons.** **- Administrators are at varying skill levels with identification of HOTS/ Costas level questioning.**	**2.1** **Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through participation in Costas Level Questioning As a result; there will be increased use of higher level questions versus lower level questions for both teachers and students.** **Action Steps** **1. AVID site team designs and plans Costas training for staff. Demonstration classrooms are identified and training schedule designed for staff.**	**2.2** **Who** **-Administration Team** **-AVID Coordinator** **-Science SAL** **-Reading Coach** **How** **-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.** **-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.** **First Nine Week Check** **Frequent assessment testing** **Second Nine Week Check** **Semester Exam results, EOC results, and benchmark results** **Third Nine Week Check** **Frequent assessment testing**	**2.2** **PLCs examine student work and data from the Costas quizzes and other assessments with HOTS questions. Data from review of unit assessments be analyzed at PLC meetings.** **PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership (RtI) Team and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The PSLT (RtI) Team and LLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per month. PSLT () Team will tailor CCIM strategies used by all teachers during "Bell Work" Time.**	**2.2** **2x per year** **District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing** **Semester Exams** **During the nine weeks** **-Student work** **-Chapter tests** **-Costas quizzes from *Tutorial Curriculum Resource*** **-Costas quizzes on the IDEAS AVID World**		

		2. Science teachers attend on-going HOTS training provided by the Reading Coach and Science SAL. **3. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.)** **4. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss Costas/HOT strategies and how they can be implemented in the upcoming lessons.** **5. Teachers implement the targeted higher order**					

		questioning strategies in their lessons. 6. Teachers implement the common assessments. 7. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. 8. PLCs study specifically students' responses to the higher order questions to assess students' higher order thinking processes. 9. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher order strategy implementation. 10. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.					

Science Goal #2: **The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 26% to 29%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **26% (79)**	2013Expected Level of Performance:* **29% (88)**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

Science Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Technology and Hands-On Activities	**Grades 6-8**	**Science SAL and Technology Resource**	**Science teachers – whole department**	**1 half day in the fall and l half day in the spring.**	**Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor Technology and Hands-On Activity implementation**	**Administration Team**
Inquiry Model	**Grades 6-8**	**Science SAL**	**Science teachers - PLCs**	**PLC meetings every two weeks.**	**Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor inquiry model.**	**Administration Team**
Socratic Seminars, Cornell Notes, and CRISS	**Grades 6-8**	**-Reading Coach** **-Subject Area Leaders and/or course-specific Facilitators**	**-All teachers school-wide** **-PLCs** ***(This PD also covers a similar strategy in math and science.)***	**- Early Release: Every Monday for 2012/2013** **-PLCs: Ongoing**	**Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor Strategy implementation**	**Principal and Administrative Team**
Costas Level Questions	**Grades 6-8**	**-Demonstration Classrooms (by AVID, Reading Coach and other targeted teachers)** **-AVID Library** **AVIDonline.org** **SDHC AVID World** **-Subject Area Leaders and/or course-specific Facilitators**	**-All teachers school-wide** **-PLCs** ***(This PD also covers a similar strategy in math and science.)***	**- Early Release: Every Monday for 2012/2013** **-Demonstration classroom:- Ongoing** **-PLCs: Ongoing**	**Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor Costas Level Questioning implementation**	**Principal and Administrative Team**

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

Writing/ Language Arts Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** 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. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.	**1.1** **-Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing.** **-Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction.** **-All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.**	**1.1** **Strategy** **Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing.** **Action Steps** **-Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.)** ***Plan:*** **-Professional Development for**	**1.1** **Who** **Principal** **APC** **SAL** **District (Writing Team, Supervisors, Writing Resources, Academic Coaches, and DRTs)** **How Monitored** **-PLC logs** **-Classroom walk-throughs** **Observation Form** **-Conferencing while writing walk-through tool (for coaches)**	**1.1** **See "Check" & "Act" action steps in the strategies column**	**1.1** **-Student monthly demand writes/ formative assessments** **-Student daily drafts** **-Student revisions** **-Student portfolios**		

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

		Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes **-PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs** ***Act:*** **-Receive additional professional development in areas of need** **-Seek additional professional knowledge through book studies/research** **-Spread the use of effective practices across the school based on evidence shown in the best practice of others** **-Use what is learned to begin the cycle again, revise as needed, increase scale if possible, etc.** **-Plan ongoing**					

		monitoring of the solution(s)					
Writing/LA Goal #1: **The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 92% to 95%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	92% (279)	95% (288)					

		1.2. -Improve the teaching of reading skills of Language Arts teachers. -Become more proficient at pacing and teaching Springboard lessons.	1.2 Strategy Students' reading, writing, language, and listening /speaking skills improves through engagement in college and career preparatory lessons/activities/tasks that promote high levels of thinking. Action Steps *Within PLCs* Before the unit -Create norms. -Unpack an assessment and rubric. -Set SMART goals for the unit of instruction. -Decide on a way to pre-assess the skills and knowledge of students. (What pre-assessment will we all use?) -Choose the anchor activities teachers will use to assess students' understanding along the way to the assessment.	1.2. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/ or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis. -Administrative walk-throughs looking for	1.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/ courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/ course, PLCs chart their overall progress	1.2. During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)	

			-Reflect on barriers and successes from the year before. -Look at student assessment exemplars (previous students' assessments if available). -Visit the pacing guide and determine the pacing for the unit. -Decide on common terminology to use with students and during PLC discussions. -Look at the grammar instruction opportunities provided in the unit and determine their potential usage. -Decide on which vocabulary terms need to be taught during the unit. -Discuss the student's curriculum checklist. -Determine how the PLC would like to grade the assessments in order for there to be consistency among grade levels. <u>During the unit</u> -Determine:	implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and coach aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation monthly. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	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.		

			--What is working? --Is there a need to enrich the instruction? How? --What isn't working? --Is there a need to supplement the instruction? How? --Are the needs of our ELL/ SWD being met? --How can civics be added into instruction? --Is there a need for a demonstration classroom and/or teacher swap? -Conduct a pacing check. -Bring anchor activities (artifacts) to assess student understanding. -Discuss effective student placement (If plausible discuss how classroom environment might help a student that is struggling in a class. Could a change of class period or teacher help?) -Plan strategies to differentiate. -Plan higher order thinking questions. -Discuss portfolio implementation (Success/ Barriers).				

			-Discuss baseline date/data from anchor activities/data from EAs. -Determine whether teachers want to add additional criteria to the EA rubric. -Discuss additions to the writer's checklists. <u>During the assessment</u> -Agree upon a date when all assessments need to be completed. -Discuss successes and challenges. <u>After the assessment</u> Participate in an assessment Norming session (Data to be discussed after EAs are all scored). <u>After all assessments have been scored</u> -Reflect on the unit. -Reflect on the effectiveness of the PLC (survey).				

			-Revisit portfolios. **-Identify the skills students struggled with and determine which activities in further lessons will readdress the skills needing to be re-taught or strengthened.** **-Recognize successes and celebrate.** ***In the classroom*** **<u>During the lessons, teachers:</u>** **-Post essential questions and daily objectives.** **-Explicitly reference connections between the following: essential questions, daily objective, and assessment.** **-Select learning strategies as needed.** **-Group students appropriately.** **-Scaffold instruction building towards higher complexity.** **-Model and provide opportunities for guided and independent practice of skills aligned with the assessment.**				

			-Select academic vocabulary from text to be used during a unit of instruction. **-Use multiple types of formative assessment and provide consistent checks for student understanding.** **-Use data during the lesson and after the assessment to inform instruction.** **<u>During the lessons, students:</u>** **-Understand the criteria which will be used to evaluate their work.** **-Understand the purpose of the lesson and its connection to the assessment.** **-Think critically and creatively.** **-Actively draw upon prior knowledge and use that knowledge to connect with lesson goals.** **-Know when, why, and how to use strategies when appropriate free of teacher support.** **-Collaborate within structured grouping.**				

			-Self assess understanding of content. **-Use academic vocabulary in written and oral responses.** **<u>After the lessons, teachers:</u>** **-Post exemplars of student work.** **-Self reflect on lessons.**				
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
	6-8	**LA SAL** **PLC facilitators** **Academic Coach**	**Language Arts Teachers** **PLC-grade level and vertical teams**	**On-going**	**PLC logs turned into administration**	**Principal** **APC** **SAL** **PLC Facilitators**
Writing Holistic Scoring Training						
	6-8	**LA SAL** **PLC facilitators** **Academic Coach**	**Language Arts Teachers** **PLC-grade level and vertical teams**	**On-going**	**-Administration or Coach walk-throughs** **-PLC logs turned into administration**	**Principal** **APC** **SAL** **PLC Facilitators**
Mode-based Writing Training						
Springboard Pacing	**6-8**	**LA SAL** **PLC facilitators** **Academic Coach**	**Language Arts Teachers** **PLC-grade level and vertical teams**	**On-going**	**-Administration or Coach walk-throughs** **-PLC logs turned into administration**	**Principal** **APC** **SAL** **PLC Facilitators**

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**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. Attendance	**1.1** **-Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance.** **-Lack of time to focus on attendance** **-Lack of staff to focus on attendance**	**1.1.** **The Administration Team along with other appropriate staff will meet every 20 days to review the school's Attendance Plan to 1) ensure that all steps are being implemented with fidelity and 2) discuss targeted students. A data base will be maintained for students with excessive unexcused absences and tardies. This data base will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of attendance interventions and to identify students in need of support beyond school wide attendance initiatives**	**1.1.** **AP will run Attendance/ Tardy meetings every 20 days with appropriate reports** **AP will maintain data base** **Social Worker** **Guidance Counselors** **<u>First Nine Weeks Data:</u>** **Review Monthly Attendance %**	**1.1.** **Administration Team and subset of PSLT will examine data monthly .1.**	**1.1.** **Attendance Report** **Tardy Report** **Attendance Plan**		

Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
1. The attendance rate will increase from 96.37% in 2011-2012 to 97% in 2012-2013. **The number of students who have 10 or more <u>unexcused</u> absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10% (39 in 2012 to 35 in 2013)** **3. The number of students who have 10 or more <u>unexcused</u> tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10% (35 in 2012 to 31 in 2013.)**							

	96.37%	**97%**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	39	**35**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	35	**31**					
		1.2. **See 1.1**	**1.2.** **When a student reaches 15 days of unexcused absences and/or unexcused tardies to school, parents and guardians are notified via mail that future absences/tardies must have a doctor note or other reason outlined in the**	**1.2.** **See 1.1**	**1.2.** **See 1.1**	**1.2.** **See 1.1**	

		1.3. -Not all teachers are comfortable with Ed Connect	1.3. All teachers will post their attendance to Ed Connect on a daily basis, allowing school to monitor attendance.	1.3 Random Administrative checks of Ed Connect postings	1.3 See 1.1	1.3 Ed Connect	

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance Plan	**Administrators**	**AP**	**At Administrator staff meting**	**August/September**	**Review plan and student data every 20 days**	**AP**
Ed Connect	**6-8**	**AP**	**As needed**	**On-going**	**Random check of Ed Connect postings**	**AP**

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension	Problem-						

Goal(s)	**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 consistency among common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.**	**1.1** **Tier 1: Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey and discussion, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations.**	**1.1** **PSLT (RtI) "behavior" subgroup**	**1.1** **PSLT (RtI) "behavior" subgroup with review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions monthly.**	**1.1** **Crystal Report 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					
1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. (77 in 2012 to 69 in 2013.)							
2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. (55 in 2012 to 49 in 2013.)							
3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions (Including ATOSS) will decrease by 10%. (36 in 2012 to 32 in 2013.)							
4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions (Including ATOSS) throughout the							

school year will decrease by 10%. (28 in 2012 to 25 in 2013.)							
	77	**69**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	55	**49**					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	36	**32**					

	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	28	**25**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

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

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

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

Positive Behavior Support (PBS)	**6-8**	**Administrati School Wide on**	**Monthly Faculty Meetings**	**Monthly Data Review.** **PSLT (RtI) Team will review the attendance and behavior data on a monthly basis, providing mentoring to students, and establishing ongoing contact with parents.**	**Principal and Assistant Principal**

End of Suspension Goals

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

N/A

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

	Problem-						

Additional Goal(s)	**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. Health and Fitness Goal	**1.1** **Engaging Middle School students in physical education.**	**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** **First Nine Weeks Data:** **All students given PDAT fitness test**	**1.1** **Checking of student schedules**	**1.1** **Student schedules** **Master schedule**		

Health and Fitness Goal #1: **During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 67% on the Pretest to 75% on the Posttest.**	2012 Current Level :* **67%**	2013 Expected Level :* **75%**					
		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.**	**1.2** **Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the Principal's designee.**	

		1.3 **Five physical education classes per week for a minimum of one semester per year with a certified physical education teacher.**	**1.3** **Physical Education Teacher**	**1.3** **Classroom walk-throughs** **Class schedules**	**1.3** **PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.**	**1.3** **Five physical education classes per week for a minimum of one semester per year with a certified physical education teacher.**	

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** 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** **- Not enough time to meet**	**1.1** **PLCs will meet twice monthly on scheduled "PLC Tuesdays"**	**1.1** **Who** **Administration** **How** **- Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback.**	**1.1** **PLST (RtI) Team will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process.**	**1.1** **PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST (RtI) team on progress of their PLC**		

Continuous Improvement Goal #1: **The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students' learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning)" will increase from % in 2012 to 75% in 2013.**	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	61.5%	**75%**					

		1.2 **- PLCs do not always have a clear focus** **- PLCs not sure what they should be doing in the meetings.**	**1.2** **PLC log templates will be used at meetings to document goals and outcomes.**	**1.2** **Who** **Administration** **Teachers who have received District training in PLCs and PLC Facilitation** **How** **- Administration will review PLCs logs.**	**1.2** **PLST (RtI) will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process.**	**1.2** **PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST (RtI) team on progress of their PLC.**	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

PLCs	**6-8**	**Teachers who have received District training**	**School-Wide**	**Preplanning-August 20** **Faculty meetings in September and October**	**Administration walk-throughs of PLC meetings**	**Administration** **SALs**

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:*					
	76% (26)	**77% (27)**					
		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:*					

	19%	**20%**					
		B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	
		B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition**					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	

C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1.	1.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
CELLA Goal #C: **The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 95% to 96%.**	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: **95%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1.	2.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

CELLA Goal #D: **The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 43% to 46%.**	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : **43%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	

E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1.	2.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
CELLA Goal #E: **The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 43% to 46%.**	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					

	43%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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

F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).	F.1.	F.1. **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:*					
	70% (24)	**74% (25)**					

		F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	
		F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	
G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	G.1.	G.1. **See Math Goal 5d**	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.		

Mathematics Goal G: **The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	18%	**20%**					
		G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	
		G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	

NEW Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(High School ONLY)

Geometry 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**		
H. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1. **See Math Goals 1, 2, 4 & 5**	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

Geometry Goal H: **The percentage of students scoring in the middle or upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Geometry Exam will increase from 100% to 100%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	100%	**100%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.	2.1.	2.1. **See Math Goals 1, 2, 4 & 5**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Geometry Goal I: **The percentage of students scoring in the upper third on the 2013 End-of-Course Geometry Exam will increase from 100% to 100%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	100%	**100%**					

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).	**J.1.** **-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 students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity.** **-Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually**	**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.** **PLC Level** **-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/ courses.** **-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.** **- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.** **Leadership Team Level** **-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.**			

		and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.		**-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.**			
Science Goal J: **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:*					
	75% **(9)**	**83%** **(10)**					
		J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	

		J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).	**M.1.** **-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.**	**M.1.** **Strategy** **SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations.** **-Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity.** **-Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.**	**M.1.** **Who** **Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal** **How** **IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC**	**M.1.** **Teacher Level** **-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.** **-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.** **PLC Level** **-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/ courses.** **-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.** **-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.** **Leadership Team Level** **-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.** **-Data is used to drive teacher support and**	**On-going writing prompts and assessments**		

				student supplemental instruction.			
Writing Goal M: **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:*					
	75% (9)	**83% (10)**					
		M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	
		M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student				

	Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
STEM Goal #1: **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.**
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional

Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Project-based learning	**6-8**	**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)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**

CTE Goal #1: **CTE Goal #1:** **Sustain/Increase the number of Career Technical Student Organization chapters from 0 in 2011-2012 to 1 in 2012-2013.** **Increase the student membership from 0 in 2011-2012 to 15 in 2012-2013.**	1.1. **Generating interest and communicating to stakeholders and community**	**1.1.** **Increase student participation in CTSO competitions/events.**	**1.1.** **CTE Teachers**	**1.1.** **Aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop next steps**	**1.1.** **Log of number of CTSO events** **Log of number of students who attend CTSO events**
	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
Establishing or growing a CTSO.	**6-8**	**District**	**CTE Teachers**	**October, 2012**	**Log of events and attendance**	**CTE Contact Teacher**

End of CTE Goal(s)

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
Priority	Focus	Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

☐ Yes No

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

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

Professional Development for Teachers **In Reading, Writing, Math, and Science**	**Kagan Strategies for classroom instruction. Research proven to improve instruction**	**$1250**	
Classroom Supplies utilized in all classrooms	**Books, supplies, technology that are utilized in the classroom to enhance classroom instruction to meet students' needs.**	**$1250**	
Final Amount Spent			