

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



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

Proposed for 2012-2013

**2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

**PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS**

**School Information**

School Name:Robles Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Bonnie McDaniel	Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia
SAC Chair: Jennifer Bump	Date of School Board Approval:

**Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:**

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

**Administrators**

List your school's 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.

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

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	Beatrice McDaniel	<i>Degrees:</i> BA-1-6 MA-Ed. Leadership K-12 <i>Certification:</i> Elementary Education 1-6 Educational Leadership K-12 School Principal (All Levels) ESOL Endorsement	12	12	11/12: D <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievement Level: Reading 35% Math 27%</li> <li>• Learning Gains: Reading 67% Math 59%</li> <li>• Bottom Quartile: Reading 72% Math 62%</li> </ul> 10/11: C 82% AYP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievement Level: Reading 37% Math 35%</li> <li>• Learning Gains: Reading- 56% Math- 53%</li> <li>• Bottom Quartile: Reading- 48% Math- 53%</li> </ul> 09/10: C 85% AYP 08/09: C 97% AYP 07/08: D 77%AYP
Assistant Principal	Donald Link	<i>Degrees:</i> BA- K-6 MA-Ed. Leadership K-12 <i>Certification:</i> Elementary Education 1-6 Educational Leadership K-12	11	5	11/12: D <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievement Level: Reading 35% Math 27%</li> <li>• Learning Gains: Reading 67% Math 59%</li> <li>• Bottom Quartile: Reading 72% Math 62%</li> </ul> 10/11: C 82% AYP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievement Level: Reading 37% Math 35%</li> <li>• Learning Gains: Reading- 56% Math- 53%</li> <li>• Bottom Quartile: Reading- 48% Math- 53%</li> </ul> 09/10: C 85% AYP 08/09: C 97% AYP 07/08: B 90%AYP (former school MOSI Partnership)

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

### Instructional Coaches

List your school's 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 ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Jennifer Bump	BS K-6 ESE ESOL	7	7	11/12: D <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievement Level: Reading 35%</li> <li>• Learning Gains: Reading 67%</li> <li>• Bottom Quartile: Reading 72%</li> </ul> 10/11: C 82% AYP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievement Level: Reading 37%</li> <li>• Learning Gains: Reading- 56%</li> <li>• Bottom Quartile: Reading- 48%</li> </ul> 09/10: C 85% AYP 08/09: C 97% AYP 07/08: D 77% AYP
Behavior Specialist	Christopher Asberry	BS Social Work	9	10	11/12: D <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-School Suspensions: 4</li> <li>• Out of School Suspensions: 7</li> </ul> 10/11: C 82% AYP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-School Suspensions: 5</li> <li>• Out of School Suspensions: 31</li> </ul> 09/10: C 85% AYP 08/09: C 97% AYP 07/08: D 77% AYP
Science	Christine Danger	BS Elementary Ed. National Board	11	5	11/12: D <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievement Level: Science 47%</li> </ul> 10/11: C 82% AYP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievement Level: Science 22%</li> </ul> 09/10: C 85% AYP 08/09: C 97% AYP 07/08: D 77% AYP

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

Writing Resource	Beverly Bowden- Humbert	BA Psychology MS- Ed. Leadership	9	5	11/12: D <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achievement Level: Writing 68%</li> </ul> 10/11: C 82% AYP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achievement Level: Writing 95%</li> </ul> 09/10: C 85% AYP 08/09: C 97% AYP 07/08: D 77% AYP
Reading Resource Int.	Sherrie Williams	BS Elem. Ed. MS Ed. Curriculum/ Instruction	9	4	11/12: D <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achievement Level: Reading 35%</li> <li>Learning Gains: Reading 67%</li> <li>Bottom Quartile: Reading 72%</li> </ul> 10/11: C 82% AYP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achievement Level: Reading 37%</li> <li>Learning Gains: Reading- 56%</li> <li>Bottom Quartile: Reading- 48%</li> </ul> 09/10: C 85% AYP 08/09: C 97% AYP
Reading Resource Pri.	Hattie Mercer-Gilley	BS Business Prof. Management MS Social Work	9	5	11/12: D <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achievement Level: Reading 35%</li> <li>Learning Gains: Reading 67%</li> <li>Bottom Quartile: Reading 72%</li> </ul> 10/11: C 82% AYP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achievement Level: Reading 37%</li> <li>Learning Gains: Reading- 56%</li> <li>Bottom Quartile: Reading- 48%</li> </ul> 09/10: C 85% AYP 08/09: C 97% AYP 07/08: D 77% AYP
Math Resource Teacher	Adam Kloper	BA Elementary Ed. MS- Education	1	7	NA

**Effective and Highly Effective Teachers**

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

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Teacher Interview Day	District staff	June
2. Salary Differential (Renaissance Schools)	General of Federal Programs	ongoing
3. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	ongoing
4. District Peer Program	District Peers	ongoing
5. School-based teacher recognition system	Principal	ongoing
6. Opportunities for teacher leadership	Principal	ongoing
7. Regular time for teacher collaboration	Principal	ongoing

***Non-Highly Effective Instructors***

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Teachers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 19 out of field</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Administrators</u></b>                      Meet with the teachers two times per year to discuss progress on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completing ESOL Endorsement Classes</li> </ul> <p><b><u>ELL Para</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide strategies to teachers to use with ELL students.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Subject Area Leader/PLC</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The teachers will attend PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all.</li> </ul>

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

### 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	% of Highly Qualified teachers	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
59	14% (8)	36% (21)	34% (20)	17% (10)	39% (23)	68% (40)	7% (4)	3% (2)	53% (31)

### Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan 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
Velvet Caldwell District EET Mentor	Karena Johnson	The District Based Mentor is with the EET Initiative. The mentor has strengths in the area of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Velvet Caldwell District EET Mentor	Rodriquez Perry	The District Based Mentor is with the EET Initiative. The mentor has strengths in the area of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Velvet Caldwell District EET Mentor	Rachel Kothmann	The District Based Mentor is with the EET Initiative. The mentor has strengths in the area of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Velvet Caldwell District EET Mentor	Shannon Wilkinson	The District Based Mentor is with the EET Initiative. The mentor has strengths in the area of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Velvet Caldwell District EET Mentor	Nicole Manguso	The District Based Mentor is with the EET Initiative. The mentor has strengths in the area of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Velvet Caldwell District EET Mentor	Augustine Bautista	The District Based Mentor is with the EET Initiative. The mentor has strengths in the	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing data, developing

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

		area of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement	assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Velvet Caldwell District EET Mentor	Maira Kearns	The District Based Mentor is with the EET Initiative. The mentor has strengths in the area of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Velvet Caldwell District EET Mentor	Jessica Morton	The District Based Mentor is with the EET Initiative. The mentor has strengths in the area of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Velvet Caldwell District EET Mentor	Dana Oconnor	The District Based Mentor is with the EET Initiative. The mentor has strengths in the area of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Velvet Caldwell District EET Mentor	Daphney Wong	The District Based Mentor is with the EET Initiative. The mentor has strengths in the area of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Jennifer Bump School Based Mentor	Susan Floyd	Mrs. Bump is the school's reading coach	Ongoing co-planning, modeling of lessons and observations with feedback
Christine Danger School Based Mentor	Tessa Blosser	Mrs. Danger is the school's science resource teacher and is national board certified	Ongoing co-planning, modeling of lessons and observations with feedback
Sherri Williams School Based Mentor	Jennifer Key	Mrs. Williams is the school's reading resource teacher	Ongoing co-planning, modeling of lessons and observations with feedback
Hattie Mercer-Gilley School Based Mentor	Lindsey Meyer	Mrs. Gilley is the school's primary reading resource teacher	Ongoing co-planning, modeling of lessons and observations with feedback
Jennifer Bump School Based Mentor	Philander Lee	Mrs. Bump is the school's reading coach	Ongoing co-planning, modeling of lessons and observations with feedback
Hattie Mercer-Gilley School Based Mentor	Cathy Haynes	Mrs. Gilley is the school's primary reading resource teacher	Ongoing co-planning, modeling of lessons and observations with feedback
Sherri Williams School Based Mentor	Abigail Miller	Mrs. Williams is the school's reading resource teacher	Ongoing co-planning, modeling of lessons and observations with feedback



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

### Additional Requirements

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

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

Title I, Part A Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school and summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors.
Title I, Part C- Migrant N/A
Title I, Part D N/A
Title II The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training. In addition, the funds are utilized in the Salary Differential Program at Renaissance schools.
Title III Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners
Title X- Homeless The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs.
Violence Prevention Programs N/A
Nutrition Programs N/A
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start We utilize information from students in Head Start to transition into Kindergarten.

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

Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education N/A
Job Training N/A
Other

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

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

#### School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

- Principal; Beatrice: McDaniel
- Assistant Principal: Donald Link
- Guidance Counselor: Samiat Antigha
- School Psychologist: Marissa Casamassino
- Social Worker: Luz Bovell
- Academic Coaches:
  - Reading Coach: Jennifer Bump
  - Reading Resource: Sherri Williams
  - Reading Resource Primary: Hattie Mercer-Gilley
  - Writing Resource: Beverly Bowden-Humbert
  - Science Resource: Christine Danger
  - Math: Adam Kloper
- ESE Contact: Audrey Young
- Representatives from the PLCs for each grade level
  - Annette Rawls-Gibson
  - Sachia Hogue-Brown
  - Yolanda Pittman
  - Tamika Lawson
- SAC Chair: Jennifer Bump
- ELP Coordinator: Donald Link
- ELL Representative: Yamile Ocana

(Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals for the meeting)

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 purpose of the PSLT in our school is to ensure high quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and using performance level and learning rate over time to make data-based decisions to guide instruction. The PSLT reviews school-wide data to address the progress of low-performing students and determine the enrichment and acceleration needs of high performing students. The major goal is for all students to achieve adequate yearly progress and improve other long-term outcomes (behavior, attendance, etc.). The team uses the Collaborative Culture Problem Solving Model and ALL decisions are guided by the review and analysis of student data.

The PSLT is considered the main leadership team in our school. The PSLT will meet 2-4 times monthly and use the problem solving process to:

- Oversee the multi-layered model of service delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Based on student data, recommend, coordinate and implement supplemental services (Tiers 2 and 3) that match students' non-mastery of skills through:

**August 2012**

**Rule 6A-1.099811**

**Revised April 29, 2011**

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

- Tutoring during the day in small group pull-outs in reading, math and science
- Extended Learning Programs after school
- Saturday Academies
- Intensive Reading Intrevention
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Review and interpret student data (academic, behavior and attendance) at the school and grade levels
- Organize and support systematic data collection as needed
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
  - Implementation and support of PLCs
  - Use of school-based *Reinforcement Instructional Calendars, Mini-Lessons* and *Mini-Assessments*
  - Use of Mini Assessments (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)
  - Use of *Common Core Assessments* at the end of segments/chapters (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)
  - Implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions (e.g., Differentiated Instruction)
  - Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences
- At the end of each Grading Period, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the Grading Period.
- Assist with planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) and F-CIM (Florida Continuous Improvement Model on specific tested benchmarks) and progress monitoring.
- Coordinate/collaborate/*integrate* with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).
- Use intervention planning forms to communicate initiatives between the PSLT and PLCs.

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

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

- The Chair of SAC is a member of the PSLT.
- The PSLT and SAC were involved in the School Improvement Plan development that was initiated prior to the end of the 2011-12 school year and during preplanning for the 2011-12 school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the PSLT. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the 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 and third Grading Period. The PSLT will use the following rubric to evaluate Strategy Fidelity of Implementation and Strategy Effectiveness:

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

- The PSLT will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning PSLT members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger PSLT team through the *grade level (elementary) or subject area (middle) or department (high)* PSLT representatives.
- The PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process: Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
  - review and analyze screening and collateral data
  - develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers)
  - develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses
  - establish methods to track students' progress with appropriate progress monitoring assessments at intervals matched to the intensity of the interventions and/or enrichment
  - develop progress monitoring goals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or

August 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

- school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify interventions and/or enrichments)
- review goal statements to ensure they are ambitious, time-bound and meaningful (e.g., SMART goals)
- assess the fidelity of instruction/intervention implementation and other PS/RtI processes

### MTSS Implementation

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. The following table contains a summary of the assessments used to measure student progress in core, supplemental and intensive instruction and their sources and management:

#### Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Electronic Data Wall	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing and Science	Scantron Achievement Series Electronic Data Wall	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
Program Generated Assessments	Software	Individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Common Assessments* ( <i>see below</i> ) of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources	Subject Area Generated Database	Resource Teachers, individual teachers, PSLT
Mini-Assessments on specific tested Benchmarks	Subject Area Generated Excel Database	Individual teachers

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

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

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

August 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised April 29, 2011

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

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP)* ( <i>see below</i> ) Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials)	Achievement Series/Scantron Instructional Planning Tool (IPT) Easy CBM Monthly Robles/HillsboroughWrites School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/ ELP Facilitator
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/ Reading Coach
Other Curriculum Based Measurement** ( <i>see below</i> )	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/PLCs

\*Students receiving pull-out tutoring during the school day or Extended Learning Program (ELP) after school will receive instruction on the specific skills they have not mastered in the core curriculum. As students work on these specific skills, they will be assessed during tutoring and ELP to ensure mastery of skills. In order to make this process effective, a communication system between classroom teacher and the tutor/ELP teacher will be developed by the PSLT and monitored for effectiveness throughout the school year. As students progress through Supplementary Support and Intensive Instruction, the number/type of supplemental services, time spent in the supplemental services and frequency of assessment will increase in duration.

\*\* In addition to Core assessments, progress monitoring the outcomes of intensive interventions requires additional Curriculum Based Measures (CBM) that:

- assess the same skills over time
- have multiple equivalent forms
- are sensitive to small amounts of growth over time.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff received overview training over the course of several faculty meetings during the 2010-2011 school year. PSLT members who attended the district level RtI trainings served as consultants to the PLCs to guide the process of data review and interpretation. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

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

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

***Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)***

**August 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Reading Resource Primary Reading Resource Intermediate School Social Worker Media Specialist Academic Intervention Specialist ESE Resource Teacher
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading strategies on the SIP.  The principal is the LLT chairperson. The reading coach is a member of the team and provides extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions. The reading coach and principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instruction support is provided to all teachers.  The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the Problem Solving Leadership team's support plan. Additionally the principal ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading strategies across the content areas</li><li>• Professional Development</li><li>• Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas</li><li>• Data analysis (on-going)</li><li>• Implement K-12 Reading Plan</li></ul>

### ***Public School Choice***

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**  
*Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.*



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

### *\*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.

In Hillsborough County Public schools, all kindergarten children are assessed for Kindergarten Readiness using the FLKRS (Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener.) This state-selected assessment contains a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System and the first *two* measures of the Florida Assessments in Reading (FAIR). The instruments used in the screening are based upon the Florida Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Education Standards. **Parents are provided with a letter from the Commissioner of Education, explaining the assessments.** Teachers will meet with parents after the assessments have been completed to review student performance. Data from the FAIR will be used to assist teachers in creating homogeneous groupings for small group reading instruction. Children entering Kindergarten may have benefited from the Hillsborough County Public Schools' Voluntary Prekindergarten Program. This program is offered at elementary schools in the summer and during the school year in selected Head Start classrooms **and as a blended program in several Early Exceptional Learning Program (EELP) classrooms. Starting in the 2012-2013 school year, students in the VPK program will be given the state-created VPK Assessment that looks at Print Knowledge, Phonological Awareness, Mathematics and Oral Language/Vocabulary.** This assessment **will be** administered at the start and end of the VPK program. A copy of these assessments **will be** mailed to the school in which the child will be registered for kindergarten, enabling the child's teacher to have a better understanding of the child's abilities **from the first day of school.** Parent Involvement events for Transitioning Children into Kindergarten include Kindergarten RoundUp. This event provides parents with an opportunity to meet the teachers and hear about the academic program. Parents are encouraged to complete the school registration procedure at this time to ensure that the child is able to start school on time.

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>			1.A.1 -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	1.A.1 <b>Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas</b> Common Core Questions of all types and levels are necessary to scaffold students' understanding of complex text. Teachers need to understand and use <b>higher-order, text-dependent questions</b> at the word/phrase.	1.A.1 <b>Who</b> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Resource Teachers  <b>How</b> -Reading PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach	1.A.1 <b>Teacher Level</b> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Keep electronic data walls to monitor student learning  <b>PLC Level</b> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the	1A.1. District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  <b>During the Grading Period</b> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
<b>Reading Goal #1A:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase from 35% to 38%.	<b>35%</b>	<b>38%</b>					

August 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised April 29, 2011

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

			<p>sentence, and paragraph/passage levels (Webb's, Bloom, Costas). Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Scaffolding of students' grappling with complex text through well-crafted text-dependent question assists students in discovering and achieving deeper understanding of the author's meaning. <b>All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.</b></p> <p><b>Action Steps</b> Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>	<p>after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.</p> <p><i>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period: Emerging: Higher Order Questions are being used consistently in 60% of the classrooms. Smart Goal for second nine weeks: Higher Order questions will be used consistently in 70% of the classrooms.</i></p>	<p>SMART goal data across all classes. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p> <p><i>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period: Emerging: Reading Form A test averages were 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade 43.22% 4<sup>th</sup> Grade 45.71% and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade 57.5%. Smart Goal: Each grade level will improve their average on Form B by 10%. 2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period: Emerging Reading Form B: 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade 46% 4<sup>th</sup> Grade 52% 5<sup>th</sup> Grade 55%  3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period: Emerging Reading Form C: 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade 58% 4<sup>th</sup> Grade 57% 5<sup>th</sup> Grade</i></p>	
		<p>1.A.2 Access to books from a variety of genres. Teacher's knowledge base of a variety of genres. Teacher's knowledge base of reader's responses.</p>	<p><b>3-5 Reading Incentive program- "Genre Genius"</b> Students will read and respond to text from a variety of genres. Teachers will monitor reading logs and graphs. Teachers will monitor, assess, and give feedback on reading response journals for each student. Students</p>	<p><b>Who:</b> Media specialist Reading Resource Reading Coach Classroom Teachers</p> <p><b>How:</b> Reading Response Logs Genre graphs Reading Logs</p>	<p>-Teachers reflect on reading responses and comprehension.  -Teachers use reading response journals and reading logs to plan instruction. -Media Specialist monitors and tracks reading logs and response</p>	<p>Reading Response Journals Reading Logs FAIR Formative Assessments FCAT</p>

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

			will be rewarded with lanyards and tags once they become a Genre Genius= 3 books in one specific genre.	1 <sup>st</sup> Grading Period: Emerging Genre Genius is being implemented in 35% of the classrooms. Smart Goal: Genre Genius will be implemented in 50% of the classrooms.	journals. 1 <sup>st</sup> Grading Period: <i>Emerging: Reading Form A test averages were</i> 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade 43.22% 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade 45.71% and 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade 57.5%.. <i>Smart Goal: Each grade level will improve their average on Form B by 10%.</i>  2 <sup>nd</sup> Grading Period: <i>Emerging</i> <i>Reading Form B:</i> 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade 46% 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade 52% 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade 55%  3 <sup>rd</sup> Grading Period: <i>Emerging</i> <i>Reading Form C:</i> 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade 58% 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade 57% 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b>		1.B.1.	1.B.1.	1.B.1.	1B.1.	1.B.1.
Reading Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
<b>NA</b>						
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b>			2A.1.	2A.1. <b>SEE 1.A.1 &amp; 1.A.2</b>	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
<b>Reading Goal #2A:</b> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase from 14% to 29%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <b>14%</b>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <b>17%</b>	2A.2.		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<b>Reading Goal #2B:</b> <b>NA</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	2B.2.		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			3.A.1. -Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.	3.A.1. <b>Strategy/Task</b> Students' reading achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to <b>differentiate instruction</b> .  <b>Actions/Details</b> <b>Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content</b> -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. <b>In the classroom</b> -During the lessons, <b>students</b> are involved in flexible grouping techniques <b>PLCs After Instruction</b> -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided.	3.A.1. <b>Who</b> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach Reading Resource Teacher -PLC facilitators  <b>How</b> -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)  <i>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</i> <i>Emerging: Differentiated Instruction began Week 6 of school. Implementation is consistent in 65% of the classrooms.</i> <i>Smart goal for the second nine weeks:</i> <i>Differentiated Instruction will be implemented consistently in 70% of the classrooms.</i>	3.A.1. <b>Teacher Level</b> -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. <b>PLC Level</b> -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. <b>Leadership Team Level</b> -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. <i>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</i> <i>Emerging: Reading Form A test averages were</i> <i>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade 43.22%</i> <i>4<sup>th</sup> Grade 45.71% and</i> <i>5<sup>th</sup> Grade 57.5%.</i> Smart Goal: Each grade level	3.A.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  <u>During the Grading Period</u> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
<b>Reading Goal #3A:</b> The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase from 67 points to 70 points	2012 Current Level of Performance: * <b>67 points</b>	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * <b>70 points</b>					

August 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

						<i>will improve their average on Form B by 10%.                  2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period:                  Emerging Reading Form B:                  3<sup>rd</sup> Grade 46%                  4<sup>th</sup> Grade 52%                  5<sup>th</sup> Grade 55%                   3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period:                  Emerging Reading Form C:                  3<sup>rd</sup> Grade 58%                  4<sup>th</sup> Grade 57%                  5<sup>th</sup> Grade</i>	
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B:  <b>NA</b>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>			4A.1.	SEE 1.A.1 & 1.A.2& 3.A.1	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
<b>Reading Goal #4:</b> The percentage of students in the bottom 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase from 72 points to 74 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <b>72 points</b>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <b>74 points</b>	4A.2.		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b> <u>Reading Goal #5A:</u>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.  <b>SEE 1.A.1 &amp; 1.A.2 &amp; 3.A.1</b>	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
<b>Reading Goal #5B:</b>  The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 37% to 43%.  The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 32% to 39%.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: NA Black:37% Hispanic: 32% Asian: NA American Indian: NA	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: NA Black:43% Hispanic: 39% Asian: NA American Indian: NA						
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	



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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<b>Target meet</b>	<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
				5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5D.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	5D.1. <b>Strategy</b> SWD student achievement improves through the effective and <b>consistent implementation of students' IEP</b> 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.	5D.1. <b>Who</b> Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal ESE Specialist  <b>How</b> IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC	5D.1. <b>Teacher Level</b> -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. <b>PLC Level</b> -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. <b>Leadership Team Level</b> -PLC facilitator/ Subject	5D.1. -FAIR  <b>During the Grading Period</b> -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance
<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 21% to 29%.	<b>21%</b>	<b>29%</b>					

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

						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.	
			5D.2.	5D.2. <b>SEE 1.A.1 &amp; 1.A.2&amp; 3.A.1</b>	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5E.1.	5E.1. <b>SEE 1.A.1 &amp; 1.A.2 &amp; 3.A.1.</b>	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
<b>Reading Goal #5E:</b>  The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 36% to 42%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<b>36%</b>	<b>42%</b>					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

### Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
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 (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Webb's Depth of Knowledge Higher Order Questioning	K-5	Reading Resource Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	-Resource Teachers -Course specific PLC Facilitators -Reading Coach	All teachers PLCs	-On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches
Using mini-lessons to re-teach and reinforcement essential skills in the core curriculum	K-5	- Resource Teachers -Grade Level PLCs -Reading Coach	School-wide	PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Resource Teachers

**August 2012**  
**Rule 6A-1.099811**  
**Revised April 29, 2011**

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

**Reading Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reading Incentive- Genre Genius	Reward lanyards, genre genius tags	SAC funds	1,382.58
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Supplemental Instruction	Teacher units to support supplemental instruction	ELP Funds	27,000
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:28,382.58</b>

*End of Reading Goals*

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

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

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

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>		1.1.	<b>See Reading Goals 1.A.1 &amp; 3.A.1</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #1:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
<i>The percentage of students scoring proficient in listening/speaking portion of CELLA will increase from 11% to 14%</i>	<b>11%</b>	1.2.		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>		2.1.	<b>See Reading Goals 1.A.1 &amp; 3.A.1</b>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #2:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
<i>The percentage of students scoring proficient in the reading portion of CELLA will increase from 15% to 17%</i>	<b>15%</b>	2.2.		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>		2.1.	2.1. <b>See reading goal 3.A.1 &amp; writing goal 1.A.1</b>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<b>CELLA Goal #3:</b>  <i>The percentage of students scoring proficient in the writing portion of CELLA will increase from 24% to 27%</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	<b>24%</b>	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

**CELLA Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of CELLA Goals*

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

**Elementary School Mathematics Goals**

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement										
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool						
<p><b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Mathematics Goal</th> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>#1A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 27% to 30%.</td> <td>27%</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Mathematics Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	#1A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 27% to 30%.	27%	30%	<p>1.A.1 -Lack of infrastructure to support technology -Lack of technology hardware -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS</p>	<p>1.A.1 <b>Strategy</b> Students' math achievement improves through the use of <b>technology and hands-on activities</b> to implement the Common Core State Standards. In addition, student practice taking on-line assessments to prepare students for on-line state testing. <b>Action Steps</b> -PLCs use their core curriculum information to learn more about hands-on and technology activities. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>	<p>1.A1 <b>Who</b> - Principal -AP -District Math Academic Coach -Technology Specialist -Math Resource Teacher <b>How Monitored</b> -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or Resource Teacher after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Administrator and resource teacher aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation <i>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</i> <i>Emerging: Hands on Activities and the use of technology began in week 5 of school. Full implementation is in 62% of the classrooms. Smart Goal for second nine weeks: Hands on Activities and use of technology will be implemented in 70% of the classrooms.</i></p>	<p>1.A.1 PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends. <i>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</i> <i>Emerging: Math Form 1 test averages were</i> <i>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade 51.7%</i> <i>4<sup>th</sup> Grade 44.68% and</i> <i>5<sup>th</sup> Grade 54.64%.</i> <i>Smart Goal: Each grade level will improve their average on Form 2 by 10%.</i> 2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period: Emerging: Form 2 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade 57% 4<sup>th</sup> Grade 54% 5<sup>th</sup> Grade 41% 3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period: Emerging Form 2 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade 57% 4<sup>th</sup> Grade 54%</p>	<p>1.A.1 <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.)</p>
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*											
#1A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 27% to 30%.	27%	30%											



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

						5 <sup>th</sup> Grade 41%	
		<p>1.A.2. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. -Finding time to conduct Webb's Depth of Knowledge walk-throughs is sometimes challenging.</p>	<p>1.A.2 <b>Strategy/Task</b> Students math achievement improves through frequent participation in <b>higher order questions/discussion activities</b> to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality questions/prompts and discussion techniques promotes thinking by students, assisting them to arrive at new understandings of complex material.</p> <p><b>Actions/Details</b> <b>Within PLCs</b> -Teachers work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively use higher order questions/activities. -Teachers plan higher order questions/activities for upcoming lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement. -Teachers plan for scaffolding questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students. -After the lessons, teachers examine student work samples and classroom questions using Webb's Depth of Knowledge to evaluate the sophistication/complexity of students' thinking. -Use student data to identify successful higher order questioning techniques for</p>	<p>1.A.2. <b>Who</b> -Principal -AP -District Math Academic Coach -Math Resource Teacher</p> <p><b>How Monitored</b> -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their Logs. -Classroom walk-throughs using Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel as a higher order walk-through form. They look for 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 -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</b> <i>Emerging: Higher Order Questions began in week 6 of school. Full implementation is in 62% of the classrooms. Smart Goal for second nine weeks:</i></p>	<p>1.A.2 PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction.  PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.</p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</b> <i>Emerging: Math Form 1 test averages were 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade 51.7% and 4<sup>th</sup> Grade 44.68% and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade 54.64% Smart Goal: Each grade level will improve their average on Form 2 by 10%.</i></p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period: Emerging: Form 2 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade 57% 4<sup>th</sup> Grade 54% 5<sup>th</sup> Grade 41%</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period: Emerging Form 2 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade 57% 4<sup>th</sup> Grade 54% 5<sup>th</sup> Grade 41%</p>	<p>1.A.2 <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.)</p>	

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

		<p>future implementation.</p> <p><b><i>In the classroom</i></b>  <u>During the lessons, teachers:</u>                      -Ask questions and/or provides activities that require students to engage in frequent higher order thinking as defined by Webb’s Depth of Knowledge.                      -Wait for full attention from the class before asking questions.                      -Provide students with wait time.                      -Use probing questions to encourage students to elaborate and support assertions and claims drawn from the text/content.                      -Allow students to “unpack their thinking” by describing how they arrive at an answer.                      -Encourage discussion by using open-ended questions.                      -Ask questions with multiple correct answers or multiple approaches.                      -Scaffold questions to help students with incorrect answers.                      -Engage all students in the discussion and ensure that all voices are heard.</p> <p><u>During the lessons, students:</u>                      -Have opportunities to formulate many of the high-level questions based on the text/content.                      -Have time to reflect on classroom discussion to increase their understanding (and without teacher mediation).</p> <p><u>School Leadership</u></p>	<p><i>Higher Order Questions will be implemented in 70% of the classrooms.</i></p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

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

			-The coach/resource teacher/PLC member/administrator collects higher order questioning walk-through data using Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel. -Monthly, school leaders conduct one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This teacher data/chats guides the leadership's team professional development plan (both individually and whole faculty).			
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
NA			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>			2A.1.	2A.1. See Math goal 1.A.1 and 1.A. 2	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 8% to 12%.	<b>8%</b>	<b>12%</b>					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<b>NA</b>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p><b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>			<p>3.A.1. -Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.</p>	<p>3.A.1. <b>Strategy/Task</b> Students' math achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to <b>differentiate instruction.</b></p> <p><b>Actions/Details</b> <b>Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content</b> -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. <b>In the classroom</b> -During the lessons, <b>students</b> are involved in flexible grouping techniques <b>PLCs After Instruction</b> -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided.</p>	<p>3.A.1. <b>Who</b> -Principal -AP Math Resource Teacher -PLC facilitators</p> <p><b>How</b> -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their Logs. -Classroom walk-through using Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel as a higher order walk-through form. They look for 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 -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p><i>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</i> <i>Emerging: Differentiated Instruction began in week 6 of school. Full implementation is in 50% of the classrooms. Smart Goal for second nine weeks:</i> <i>Differentiated Instruction will be implemented in 60% of the classrooms.</i></p>	<p>3.A.1. <b>Teacher Level</b> -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. <b>PLC Level</b> -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. <b>Leadership Team Level</b> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p> <p><i>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</i> <i>Emerging: Math Form 1 test averages were</i> <i>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade 51.7%</i> <i>4<sup>th</sup> Grade 44.68% and</i> <i>5<sup>th</sup> Grade 54.64% Smart Goal:</i></p>	<p>3.A.1. <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>
<p><b>Mathematics Goal</b> <b>#3A:</b></p> <p>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math will increase from 59 points to 62 points.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p><b>59 points</b></p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p><b>62 points</b></p>					

August 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised April 29, 2011

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

						Each grade level will improve their average on Form 2 by 10%. 2 <sup>nd</sup> Grading Period: Emerging: Form 2 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade 57% 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade 54% 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade 41%  3 <sup>rd</sup> Grading Period: Emerging Form 2 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade 57% 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade 54% 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade 41%	
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
NA			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			4A.1.	4A.1. See Math Goals 1.A.1, 1.A.2 and 3.A.1	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
Mathematics Goal #4:  Points earned from students in lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math will increase from 62 points to 64 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<b>62 points</b>	<b>64 points</b>					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b> <u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b> <u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 28% to 35%.  The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 35% to 43%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: NA Black: 28% Hispanic: 37% Asian: NA American Indian: NA	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: NA Black: 35% Hispanic: 43% Asian: NA American Indian: NA	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.  See Math Goals 1.A.1, 1.A.2 and 3.A.1	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	



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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5C.1 -Lack of understanding that math teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing. -Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing heritage language support. -Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on membership of ELLs. -Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL Program guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT and Bilingual paraprofessional.	5C.1 ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves through participation in the following <b>day-to-day accommodations on core content</b> and district assessments in math: -Extended time (lesson and assessments) -Small group testing -Para support (lesson and assessments) -Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)	5C.1 <u>Who</u> -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Para  <u>How</u> -Administrative and Resource Teacher walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RTI Handbook and ELL RTI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms	5C.1 Analyze math core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students.	5C.1 <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  Semester Exams  <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 37% to 43%.	<b>37%</b>	<b>43%</b>					
			5C.2.	5C.2. <b>See Math goals 1.A.1 and 3.A.1</b>	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5D.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	5D.1. <u>Strategy</u> SWD student achievement improves through the <b>effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals</b> , strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented	5D.1. <u>Who</u> Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal ESE specialist  <u>How</u> IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC and ESE specialist	5D.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal. <u>PLC Level</u>	5D.1 <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  <u>Semester Exams</u>  <u>During the Grading Period</u> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 17% to 25%.	<b>17%</b>	<b>25%</b>					

**August 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

			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.		-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD 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 SWD 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.	
		5D.2. -Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. -General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time.	5D.2. <u>Strategy/Task</u> SWD student achievement improves through teachers' implementation of the <u>Plan-Do-Check-Act model</u> in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications.  <u>Actions</u> <u>Plan</u> For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our SWD need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for	5D.2. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses  <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration/coaches. Administration/coaches provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team	5D.2. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period of SWD SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.	5D.2. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period of SWD SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.

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

		<p>this unit of instruction for our SWD?</p> <p><b><i>Plan for the “Do”</i></b>          What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal?          -What resources do we need?          -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD?          -What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our SWD?          -What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help SWD learn?          -Specifically how will we implement the _____strategy during the lesson?          -What are teachers going to do during the lesson for SWD?          -What are SWD student going to do during the lesson to maximize learning?</p> <p><b><i>Reflect on the “Do”/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work <u>during</u> the unit.</i></b>          For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers <b>reflect</b> and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD:          -What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful?          -What didn’t work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next?          -What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding?          And/or analysis of student performance?</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

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

			<p>-How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons?</p> <p><b>Reflect/Check – Analyze Data</b>                  Discuss one or more of the following:                  -What is the SWD data?                  -What is the data telling us as individual teachers?                  -What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/departement?                  -What are SWD not learning?                  Why is this occurring?                  -Which SWD are learning?</p> <p><b>Act on the Data</b>                  After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data.                  -What are we going to do about SWD not learning?                  -What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions (either to individual SWD or small groups)?                  -How are we going to re-teach the skill differently?                  -How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working?</p>			
		5D.3.	5D.3. See Math Goals 1.A.1, 1.A.2 & 3.A.1	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5E.1.	5E.1. See Math Goals 1.A.1, 1.A.2 & 3.A.1	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

August 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 28%% to 35%.	<b>28%</b>	<b>35%</b>					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

**Mathematics Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b>						
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 (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Higher Order Thinking	K-5	- Grade Level PLC Facilitators -District Math Academic Coach	School Wide	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team District Math Academic Coach
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	- Grade Level PLC Facilitators -District Math Academic Coach	School Wide	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team District Math Academic Coach

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

**Mathematics Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
See Reading	See Reading	See Reading	
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Mathematics Goals*

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

**Elementary and Middle School Science Goals**

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement										
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool						
<p><b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Science Goal #1A:</th> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 41% to 44%.</td> <td><b>41%</b></td> <td><b>44%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 41% to 44%.	<b>41%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<p>1.A.1. -Teachers are at varying levels of using collaborative structures</p>	<p>1.A.1. <u>Strategy</u> The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the science core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content/standards increase through appropriate engagement tools and activities based on skill need to ensure students are highly engaged in significant learning. The degree of <u>student engagement</u> is revealed through teacher analysis of students' level of engagement during a coherent well-designed lesson using the <i>Student Engagement Rubric (EET 3c)</i></p> <p>This strategy focuses on the following components in engagement:  <b>-Activities and assignments:</b>                      --are the centerpiece of learning and promote higher order thinking.                      --emphasize depth over breadth.                      --are highly intellectual and promote significant learning.  <b>-Grouping of students are:</b>                      -- productive and fully appropriate to the students or to the instructional purposes of the lesson.                      --influenced by the students</p>	<p>1.A.1. -Principal -AP -Science Resource -Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p><u>How</u> -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p><i>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</i> Emerging: student engagement is evident in 3 out of 5 classrooms. Smart Goal: student engagement will be evident in all classrooms.</p>	<p>1.A.1. <u>Teacher</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u> -PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to identify effective activities in future lessons.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> -Leadership Team determines what specific data will be reported to the Leadership Team. -Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress. -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for</p>	<p>1.A.1 <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>
Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*											
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 41% to 44%.	<b>41%</b>	<b>44%</b>											

August 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised April 29, 2011

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

			<p>information or adjustment.</p> <p><b>-Instructional Materials and resources are:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--suitable to the instructional purposes and engage students mentally.</li> <li>--initiated by student choice, adaptation, or creation of materials to enhance their learning.</li> <li>--supplemented when better suited to engaging students in deep learning.</li> </ul> <p><b>-Structure and pacing are:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--highly coherent and allows for reflection and closure.</li> <li>--ideal for keeping momentum.</li> <li>--organized with a structure or an agenda, but with flexible time frames, to ensure appropriate time for all facets of the lesson.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action Steps:</b></p> <p><b>Plan: Teachers meet with Academic support for Science to observe lessons and participate in a lesson study.</b></p> <p><u>PLCs Before the Lesson</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-PLCs discuss best practices for student engagement outlined in this strategy and on the rubric.</li> <li>-PLCs discuss how to use the student engagement rubric.</li> <li>-Within PLCs, teachers discuss resources to use for engaging students in learning. (e.g., manipulatives, technology, supplemental reading, speakers, real world connections)</li> </ul>		<p>targeted students and future professional development for teachers</p> <p><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check</u>  <i>Emerging: Science Form 1 test averages</i>  <i>Grade 5 36.88%</i>  <i>Smart Goal: Each grade level will improve their average on Form 2 by 10%.</i></p> <p><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period Check:</u>  <i>Emerging</i>  <i>Grade 5 43%</i></p> <p><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period:</u>  <i>Emerging</i>  <i>Grade 5 62%</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--



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

				<p>-PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, “How do we know if they have learned it?” (EET Rubric 1f, 4d)</p> <p><b>Do/Check</b>  <u>Teachers in the Classroom</u>                  - Teachers use engagement tools in the classroom to enhance deep learning.                  -Teachers recognize the critical distinction between a classroom in which students are compliant and busy.                  -Teachers ensure students are developing their understanding through what they do, and they are asked to think, to make connections, to formulate and test hypotheses, and draw conclusions.                  -Teachers provide students choices in a range of task from a large range, but the choices are designed to further understanding.                  -At the end of the unit, teachers administer the common assessment.                  -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p><b>Check/Act</b>  <u>PLCs After the Common Assessment</u>                  -Teachers bring their Engagement Rubrics back to the PLCs for discussion.                  -Teachers bring their common</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

			<p>assessment data back to the PLCs.          -Based on the data (Engagement Rubric and common assessment ), teachers reflect on their own teaching. <b>(EET Rubric 4a)</b>          -Using the data, effective <a href="#">student engagement</a> strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. <b>(EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e)</b></p> <p><u>Administrators/Leadership Team</u>          -Through walkthroughs teachers are identified that excel in <a href="#">student engagement</a> in order to set up demonstration classrooms. <b>(EET 4d, 4e)</b>          -Classroom coverage is provided for teachers to attend demonstration classrooms. <b>(EET 4e)</b>          -The <a href="#">student engagement</a> strategy is on the Leadership Team’s agenda in order to discuss strategy implementation, concentrating on barriers and how they can be overcome.</p> <p><u>Whole Faculty</u>          -Throughout the school year, teachers will participate in faculty SIP Reviews where teachers showcase <a href="#">student engagement</a> effective strategies.</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

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

			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Science Goal #1B:  NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p><b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b></p> <p><u>Science Goal #2A:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 6% to 9%.</p>			<p>2.A.1. - Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. - PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.</p>	<p>2.A.1. <u>Strategy:</u> <b>This strategy crosses all content areas.</b> Students’ comprehension of course content/standards increases through participation in <b>higher order thinking questioning techniques/Webb’s Depth of Knowledge</b> to promote critical thinking and problem-solving skills. This strategy will be implemented across all content areas. For this strategy, teachers implement a variety or series of questions/prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote meta-cognition. <b>(EET Rubric 1e, 3b)</b></p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u> <u>PLAN:</u> <u>Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson</u> -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question “How do we know if they have learned it?” <b>(EET Rubric 1f, 4d)</b> -Within PLCs, teachers discuss how to scaffold questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students for upcoming lessons. -Teachers design higher order questions to increase rigor in lesson plans and promote student accountable talk.</p>	<p>2.A.1 <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Instructional Coach(es) -Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p><u>How</u> -Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period Check</u> Emerging: Higher Order Questioning is evident in 60% of the classrooms. Smart Goal: Higher Order Questioning will be implemented in 70 % of the classrooms.</p>	<p>2.A.1. <u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers chart their students’ individual progress towards mastery.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u> -PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to identify effective <b>higher order</b> activities in future lessons.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> -Leadership Team determines what specific data will be reported to the Leadership Team. -Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress. -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers.</p> <p><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period Check:</u> <u>Emerging: Science Form 1 test</u></p>	<p>2.A.1.</p> <p><u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>. Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>

August 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised April 29, 2011

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

			<p>(EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1e, 1f, 3b, 4a, 4d)                  -Within PLCs, teachers plan and write for higher order questions in upcoming lessons. (EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 3b, 4d)</p> <p><b>Do/Check</b>  <i>Teachers in the Classroom</i>                  -During the lesson, teachers frequently ask higher order questions. The teacher responds to students' correct answers by probing for higher-level understanding in an effective manner. (EET Rubric 1b, 3b, 3e)                  -During the lesson, teachers successfully engage all students in the discussion. (EET Rubric 1b, 3b, 3e)                  -Students formulate many of the high-level questions and ensure that all voices are heard. (EET Rubric 3b)                  -Students are provided with opportunities to reflect on classroom discussion and discourse to increase understanding of learning objective. (EET Rubric 1c, 3a, 3b, 3c)                  -At the end of the unit, teachers administer the common assessment.</p> <p><b>Check/Act</b>  <i>PLCs After the Common Assessment</i>                  -Teachers bring their common assessment data back to the PLCs.                  -Based on the data, teachers</p>	<p>averages were                  Grade 5-36.88%.                  Smart Goal: Each grade level will improve their average on Form B by 10%.</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period Check:                  Emerging                  Grade 5 43%</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period:                  Emerging                  Grade 5 62%</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

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

			<p>reflect on their own teaching. <b>(EET Rubric 4a)</b></p> <p>-Using the data, effective <b>higher order</b> strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. <b>(EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e)</b></p> <p>-After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. <b>(EET Rubric 3d)</b></p> <p><u>Administrators/Leadership Team</u></p> <p>-Through walkthroughs teachers are identified that excel in <b>higher order thinking questioning techniques/Webb's Depth of Knowledge</b> in order to set up demonstration classrooms. <b>(EET 4d, 4e)</b></p> <p>-Classroom coverage is provided for teachers to attend demonstration classrooms. <b>(EET 4e)</b></p> <p>-PLC Facilitators/Subject Area Leaders put <b>higher order thinking questioning techniques/Webb's Depth of Knowledge</b> questions on every agenda, allowing teachers to share successes and challenges.</p> <p>-The <b>higher order</b> strategy is on the Leadership Team's agenda in order to discuss strategy implementation, concentrating on barriers and how they can be overcome.</p> <p><u>Whole Faculty</u></p> <p>-Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

				SIP Reviews where teachers showcase <b>higher order thinking</b> effective strategies.			
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
<b>NA</b>							
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

*End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals*

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

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Higher Order Thinking	K-5	- Science Resource Teachers -Grade Level PLCs	School-wide	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Resource Teacher

**Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
See Reading	See Reading	See Reading	Amount



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

			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Science Goals*

**Writing Goals**

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>							
<u>Writing Goal #1A:</u>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 64% to 67%.	<b>64%</b>	<b>67%</b>					
			<p><b>1.A.1</b> -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.</p>	<p><b>1.A.1 Strategy</b> Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing.</p> <p><b>Action Steps</b> -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.)</p> <p><b>Plan:</b> -Professional Development for 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</p>	<p><b>1.A.1 Who</b> Principal APC Writing Resource</p> <p>District (Writing Team, Supervisors, Writing Resources, Academic Coaches, and DRTs)</p> <p><b>How Monitored</b> -PLC logs -Classroom walk-throughs -Observation Form -Conferencing while writing walk-through tool (for coaches) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p><i>1st Grading Period Check</i> <i>Emerging: Writer's Workshop began in week 4 of school. Full implementation is in 70% of the classrooms. Smart Goal for second nine weeks:</i> <i>Writer's Workshop will be</i></p>	<p><b>1.A.1</b> See "Check" &amp; "Act" action steps in the strategies column</p> <p><b>1st Grading Period:</b> <i>Emerging:</i> <i>Grade 4 8% at a level 4 or higher</i> <i>Smart Goal: Grade 4 level 4s will increase by 30% or greater</i></p> <p><b>2nd Grading Period:</b> <i>Emerging</i> <i>Grade 4 7% at a level 4 or higher.</i></p> <p><b>3rd Grading Period:</b> <i>Emerging</i> <i>Grade 4 13% at a level 4 or higher.</i></p>	<p><b>1.A.1</b> -Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios</p>

August 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised April 29, 2011

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

				<p><b>Do:</b>                  -Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points                  -Daily/ongoing conferencing</p> <p><b>Check:</b>                  Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes                  -PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs</p> <p><b>Act:</b>                  -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)</p>	<p>implemented in over 75% of the classrooms.</p> <p><i>2<sup>nd</sup> Grading Period:</i>                  Writer's Workshop is in 70% of the classrooms.</p> <p><i>3<sup>rd</sup> Grading Period:</i>                  Writer's Workshop is in 75% of the classrooms.</p>		
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<p><b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b></p>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<p>Writing Goal #1B:</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					

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

		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

**Writing Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Gradual Release	4	Writing Resource -Grade Level PLC facilitator	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Writing Resource Teacher
Differentiated Instruction	4	Writing Resource -Grade Level PLC facilitator	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs EET- Informal and formal observations Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Writing Resource Teacher

**Writing Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Writing Goals*

**Attendance Goal(s)**

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Attendance</b>			1.1	<b>1.1</b>	1.1	1.1	1.1
1. The attendance rate will increase from 93.24% in 2011-2012 to 95% in 2012-2013.			No coordination exists within the school to ensure that student attendance monitoring exists and that duplication of services is not occurring.	The PSLT committee will review the schools Attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. The PSLT committee will also maintain a database of students with significant attendance problems and implement and monitor interventions to be documented on the attendance intervention form (SB 90710). The committee meets every two weeks.	PSLT committee will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the Principal and shared with faculty.	PSLT committed will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students.	Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data Parentlink contact reports
Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*	Students are absent and parents are not contacting the school.		Teachers will keep a log of all contacts made to parents.	Reports from EASI sign in system will be analyzed to determine if the problem is improving and which students should be targeted.	Reports on Demand excessive sign-in report.
	93.24%	95%	Parents are not aware that their student is absent.		Examination of Parentlink contact reports by attendance team/administration		
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	No system is utilized to easily identify students with significant number of tardies and how much instructional time is lost.		PSLT committee Will review the interventions implemented for students with excessive sign-ins and outs.		
2. The number of students who have 10 or more <b>unexcused</b> absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10%	232	209					
3. The number of students who have 10 or more <b>unexcused</b> tardies to school throughout the	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive		<b>Tier 1</b>			
				All teachers contact parents after the third unexcused			

**August 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

school year will decrease by 10%.	Tardies (10 or more)	Tardies (10 or more)		absence. Teacher’s record documentation of contact (to be used for an Attendance Referral if needed).  <b>Tier 1</b> School will use EASI online attendance to sign students in and out and will print the report of students with excessive sign-ins and sign-outs every week.  <b>Tier 1</b> On a daily basis, an Attendance Clerk contacts all parents whose students have an unexcused absence to school.			
	<b>99</b>	<b>89</b>					
			2.1 There is not a system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance.	2.1 <b>Tier 2</b> Every nine weeks, parents are entered into a drawing to receive a gift card incentive provided their children have only 1 absence.  <b>Tier 2</b> When a student reaches 5 days of unexcused absences, teachers will contact the parents via the phone and record documentation on the Attendance Intervention form (SB90717).	2.1 Guidance Counselor Social Worker PSLT  Teacher will initiate and document interventions on the Attendance Intervention Form. Teacher will also keep a log of interventions for their records.	2.1 PSLT will disaggregate attendance data for the “Tier 2” group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children  Data Processor will provide 5 day letters to teachers.	2.1 Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data
		3.1	3.1 <b>Tier 2/3</b> When a student reaches 6-10 days of unexcused absences and/or unexcused tardies to school, the teacher will investigate the reason for the absences and document the	3.1 Teacher will document all interventions on the Attendance Intervention Form. Teacher will also keep a log of interventions for their records.	3.1 Data Processor will provide 5 day letters to teachers. PSLT will disaggregate attendance data for the Tier 2/3 group.	3.1 Instructional Planning Tool	

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

		<p>intervention on the attendance intervention form. The administration may notify the parents and guardians via mail that future absences/tardies must have a doctor note or other reason outlined in the Student Handbook to receive an excused absence/tardy and must be approved through an administrator.</p> <p>A parent-administrator-student conference is scheduled and held regarding these procedures. The goal of the conference is to create a plan for assisting the students to improve his/her attendance/tardies.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

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

**Attendance Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance Improvement Training	K-5	Schools Social Worker	School Wide	September or when available	Monthly review of implementation of strategies such as attendance interventions and documentation on applicable forms by attendance team.	AP, Principal
IPT training	K-5	AP/Social Worker	School Wide	October 2012	Train the attendance committee to use the reports available to identify students with attendance concerns	AP

**Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Attendance Goals*



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

**Suspension Goal(s)**

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Suspension</b>			<p>1.1 There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.</p> <p>Our school does not have a clear school-wide system for reinforcing students specifically for following expectations and rules.</p> <p>Few opportunities exist for students to connect and establish mentoring relationships with adults at school.</p>	<p>1.1 <u>Tier 1</u></p> <p>- CHAMPS will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey, discipline data, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations.</p> <p>-Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and rules.</p> <p>-Leadership team conducts walkthroughs using CHAMPS walk-through form (generated by the district RtI facilitators).</p> <p>-The data is shared with faculty at a monthly meeting, tracking the overall improvement of the faculty.</p> <p>-Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats.</p>	<p>1.1 <u>Who</u></p> <p>-PSLT Behavior Committee</p> <p>-Leadership Team</p> <p>-Administration</p> <p>-Guidance</p> <p>-Social Worker</p> <p>-School Psychologist</p> <p>-Schools Behavior</p> <p>-Specialist</p>	<p>1.1 - PSLT /Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions data monthly.</p> <p>A subgroup of the Problem Solving Leadership Team will review suspension data and determine the percent of student with 10 or more suspensions. The Team will review suspension data biweekly and report progress to PSLT monthly.</p>	<p>EASI and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data</p> <p>Instructional Planning Tool and Education Connection Portal</p>
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%.	5	4					
2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.	5	4					
4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	31	28					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
	21	19					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CHAMPS	K-5	CHAMPS Trainer	New Teachers	Ongoing	Classroom walkthroughs looking for implementation of the strategies	Principal and Assistant Principal

**Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

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

*End of Suspension Goals*

**Parent Involvement Goal(s)**

**Upload Option-**For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.

**Online Template-** For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>  <b>See Title I PIP</b>	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**Parent Involvement Professional Development**

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

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

**Parent Involvement Budget**

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
<b>STEM Goal #1:</b> All classes grades K-5 will complete inquiry Monday Design Challenge lessons and science Olympics week.	1.1 First year of implementation of STEM lessons. This will be new to teachers. Access to technology.	1.1 Teachers will use district lesson plans to teach STEM design challenge lessons every Monday.	1.1 Administration Science Resource Math Resource	1.1 Classroom walkthroughs PLC discussions and planning	1.1 Science and Math mini assessments EOY assessments FCAT
	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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
STEM	K-5	Science Resource	All teachers	Ongoing	Classroom walkthroughs PLC discussion and planning	Administration Math and Science Resource

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

**STEM Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
<b>CTE Goal #1:</b> Students in grade five will participate in JBiz curriculum to increase their knowledge of various career opportunities to understand the preparatory knowledge for a future career.	1.1. Funding New teachers to grade level	1.1. Teachers will use JBiz manual to teach the content to the students	1.1. Grade 5 teachers	1.1 Student and teacher feedback	1.1. Student's performance on individual tasks and duties based on JBiz rubric JBiz post test
	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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
JBiz Town training	5 <sup>th</sup> grade	Biz Town trainers	5 <sup>th</sup> grade teachers	May 2013	JBiz Town feedback	5 <sup>th</sup> grade teachers Principal AP

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

**Additional 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)).

<b>Health and Fitness Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>					
			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:								
<b>1. Health and Fitness Goal</b>			1.1. Scheduling	1. 1. Elementary School students will engage in the equivalent of one 30 minute period per day of physical education for each year in grades 1-5	1.1.AP	1.1.Checking student schedules	1.1.	
<u>Goal #1:</u> During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 45% on the Pretest to 60% on the Posttest.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>  45%	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>  60%						
				1.2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the physical education teacher	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.	

**Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development**

<b>Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>					
			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:								
<b>1. Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development</b>			1.1 - Not enough time to meet	1.1 PLCs will meet on Tuesdays when there is not a faculty meeting.	1.1 Who Administration How - Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback.	1.1 PSLT will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process.	1.1 PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST team on progress of their PLC.	
<u>Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>						



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

The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that “the teachers that I work with deliver lessons that consistently include higher order thinking skills (under Teaching and Learning)” will increase from 65% in 2012 to 75% in 2013.	65%	75%					
			<p>1.2 - Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers</p>	<p>1.2 Teachers will use planning time and PLC’s to plan for higher order thinking/questioning.</p>	<p>1.2 Administration PLC facilitators Academic Resource/Coachaes</p>	<p>1.2 PSLT will examine the feedback from all PLC’s and determine next steps in the PLC process.</p>	<p>1.2 PLC facilitators will provide feedback to PSLT team on progress of their PLC.</p>
			<p>1.3 - PLCs do not always have a clear focus - PLCs not sure what they should be doing in the meetings.</p>	<p>1.3 PLC log templates will be created that include the SIP’s goals. PLCs will use the Action Steps of the Goals as a guide for PLC discussion and PLC planning</p>	<p>1.3 <u>Who</u> Administration Teachers who have received District training in PLCs and PLC Facilitation <u>How</u> - Administration will review PLCs logs.</p>	<p>1.3 PLST will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process.</p>	<p>1.3 PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST team on progress of their PLC.</p>

**Additional Goals Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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 (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

**Additional Goal(s) Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

**Final Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Civics Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>U.S. History Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>CTE Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total:</b>
	<b>Grand Total:</b>

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

### Differentiated Accountability

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

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

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

Are you reward school?  Yes  No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

#### 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 activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

- August/September – Assist in the SIP Development
  - Planning for a Family Informational Night in October
- October
  - Review baseline data
  - SAC sponsored Family Informational Night Oct. 30<sup>th</sup>
  - Begin planning for a SAC-sponsored Family Writing Night and Family Math Night
- November
  - Review Writing objectives
  - Carry out the SAC-sponsored Family Writing Night Event Nov. 7
  - Carry out the SAC-sponsored Family Math Night Event Nov. 13

**August 2012**  
**Rule 6A-1.099811**  
**Revised April 29, 2011**

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

- Review the first nine weeks student evaluation tool data and strategy fidelity check information.
- December – Review writing objectives
  - Plan for FCAT Writing Night in January
- January
  - Review math objectives
  - Carry out the SAC-sponsored FCAT Writing Night Jan. 29
  - Begin planning for a SAC-sponsored Family Reading Night in February
- February
  - Review mid-year data
  - Carry out the SAC-sponsored Family Reading Night Event Feb. 12
  - Review the second nine weeks student evaluation tool data and strategy fidelity check information.
- March
  - Review science objectives
- April
  - Plan for Science Family Night in May
- May
  - Carry out SAC-sponsored Family Science Night Event May 16

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.		Projected Amount	Final Amount
Reading Goal 4.1.A Genre Genius	Reading Incentive approved by SAC: 9 sets of Dog Tags (Poetry, Realistic Fiction, Science Fiction, Traditional Literature, Mystery, Fantasy, Historical Fiction, Informational Biography). These materials will be used to support the student reading books of various genre.	1,366.38	
Reading Goal 4.1.A Genre Genius	Reading Incentive approved by SAC: Black Lanyards for the student to put their Dog Tags on as they earn them	16.20	
	Total	1382.58	