FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Nelson Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Cindy Guy	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Martha France	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Highly Qualified Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Cindy Guy	Masters BS: 1-6 ESOL	9	9	11/12: B 10/11: A 97%AYP 09/10: A 90%AYP 08/09: A 95% AYP
Assistant Principal	Mary Slowey	Masters BS: 1-6 ESOL	5	5	11/12: B 10/11: A 97%AYP 09/10: A 90%AYP 08/09: A 95% AYP

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

List your school's highly qualified instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Angela Seiferd	Elementary Ed. (K-6)	2	2	11/12: B 10/11: A 97% AYP

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	District Staff	June	
2. Recruitment Fairs	District Staff	June	
3. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	ongoing	
4. District Peer Program	District Peers	ongoing	
5. School –based teacher recognition system	Principal	ongoing	
6. School-based teacher leadership	Principal	ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Teachers • 6 out of field	Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented **Administrators** Meets with teachers four times a year to discuss progress on completing courses taken to meet endorsement. **Academic Coach/Resource teacher** co-plans, models, observes and conferences with teachers on a regular basis. **PLC leader** meets with teachers twice monthly to discuss instructional strategies to promote student success.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
68	3% (2)	28% (19)	47% (32)	22% (15)	31% (21)	91% (62)	0%	4% (3)	72% (49)

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Tressa Jones	Jennifer Richmond	District assigned mentor, 15 years of experience in teaching both primary and intermediate.	Meets with mentee twice a month for 60 minutes to observe, coach and provide feedback.
Tressa Jones	Jessica Hawkins	District assigned mentor, 15 years of experience in teaching both primary and	Meets with mentee twice a month for 60 minutes to observe, coach and provide

		intermediate.	feedback.
Tressa Jones	Taylor Morris	District assigned mentor, 15 years of experience in teaching both primary and intermediate.	Meets with mentee once a week for 90 minutes to observe, coach and provide feedback.
Tressa Jones	Courtney Driggers	District assigned mentor, 15 years of experience in teaching both primary and intermediate.	Meets with mentee once a week for 90 minutes to observe, coach and provide feedback.

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only – N/A

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. The Leadership team includes: • Principal • Assistant Principal • Guidance Counselor • School Psychologist • Social Worker • Reading Coach • Representatives from the PLCs for each grade level, K-5 • Representatives from ELL, Attendance Committee and ESE • SAC Chair (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 MTSS 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 MTSS 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 MTSS is considered the main leadership team in our school. The MTSS 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:
  - Tutoring during the day in small groups in reading and math
  - Extended Learning Programs before and during school
- Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Determine scheduling needs, curriculum materials and intervention resources based on identified needs derived from data analysis
- 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 *Common Core Assessments* at the end of segments/chapters
  - Implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions (e.g., Differentiated Instruction)

Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) and progress monitoring.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? - The MTSS 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 2012-13 school year. - The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the MTSS. 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 MTSS 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. Each PLC will gather data from their team and note progress statements on their PLC log submitted electronically to administration and monitored by the MTSS.

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 Data Wall	MTSS, PLCs, individual teachers
District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	MTSS, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing and Science	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	MTSS, PLCs, individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting	Reading Coach/ Reading PLC

	Network Data Wall	Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL MTSS Representative
Common Assessments* *(see below)* of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources	School Generated Database	Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/MTSS Member
DRA-2	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher

*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 students need Differentiated Instruction within the classroom and which students might need Supplemental Services.

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP)* *(see below)*	School Generated Database in Excel	MTSS/ ELP Facilitator
Easy CBM	School Generated Database in Excel	MTSS/ Reading Coach/PLC

Students receiving pull-out tutoring during the school day or Extended Learning Program (ELP) at Saturday Academy 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 MTSS 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.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
Staff received overview training over the course of several faculty meetings during the 2009-2010 school year. Updated training was conducted in the fall of 2011 and 2012. MTSS members who attended the district level RtI trainings served as consultants to the PLCs to guide the process of data review and interpretation. The MTSS will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The MTSS will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District's RtI Committee (District RtI) 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 meetings.

Describe plan to support MTSS.
Response to intervention (RtI) has been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions. In order to support MTSS in our schools we will:
- Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (ie, PLC, PSLT, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plan).

- Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.
- Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
The Reading Leadership Team serves as the school's literacy Professional Learning Community. The team is comprised of:
  A.   **Principal**
  B.   **Assistant Principal**
  C.   **Reading Coach**
  D.   **Reading Teachers representing each grade level**
  E.   **Media Specialist**

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
The LLT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading strategies on the SIP.

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

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

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
- Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading strategies across the content areas.
- Professional Development
- Co-planning, modeling and observation of researched-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas
- Data analysis (on-going)
- Implement the K-12 Reading Plan.

NCLB Public School Choice
- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

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

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

*High Schools Only-N/A

Commented [S1]: Wow! Part 1 looks awesome! Great job! :)

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5). Reading Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 67% to 70%. **2012 Current Level of Performance:*** **67% (264)** **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** **70% (275)**	1.1. PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their learning. To address this barrier, PLC's will utilize the Plan-Do-Check-Act Plan of Instruction log.	1.1. Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Act-Check model and plan of instruction log to structure their way of work. Using the backward design model for plans of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they do not learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? **Action Details** -Grade level PLCs use a **Plan-Do-Act-Check** Plan of Instruction log to guide their discussion. The discussions are summarized on the log. -Additional action steps for the strategy are outlined on the grade level PLC logs.	1.1.Administrators -PLC facilitators How PLCs turn their logs into administration after a plan of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback from administration on their log. -Administration and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings. - Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team meetings.	1.1. **Teacher Level** Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning 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 the average unit assessment score for all their students per class/course. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery of the individual/PLC SMART goal. **PLC/Department Level** -PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Using individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes. -PLCs reflect on lesson and data outcomes used to drive future instruction. **Leadership Team Level** -PLC facilitator shares goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental and/or enrichment instruction	1.1.3x per year FAIR Form A, B, C During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.			2.1. See 1.1	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Reading Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 40% to 43%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **40% (158)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **43% (169)**					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.			3.1. See 1.1	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Reading Goal #3: Points earned for students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 65 points to 68 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **65 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **68 points**					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.

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

Reading Goal #4: Points earned from the students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 67 points to 70 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **67 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **70 points**	See 1.1				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016** | **2016-2017**
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Reading Goal #5:							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** Reading Goal #5A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Y	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	5A.1. see 1.1 White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring satisfactory of the 2013 FCAT will increase from 58% to 62%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **58%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **62%**	see 1.1				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**		**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. see 1.1		5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Reading Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **Y**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**		**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. see 1.1		5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of Student with Disabilities scoring satisfactory of the 2013 FCAT will increase from 34% to 41%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **34%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **41%**				

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Data Analysis	All	PLC facilitator Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	on-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administrators Reading Coach
Daily 5 Book Study	Reading	Reading Coach	Reading Teachers	Bimonthly until January	Classroom walkthroughs	Administrators Reading Coach
Reciprocal Teaching Book Study	Reading	Reading Leadership Team	Reading Teachers	Bimonthly beginning in January	Classroom walkthroughs	Administrators Reading Coach

End of Reading Goals

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

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5). Mathematics Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 65% to 68%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **65% (256)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **68% (268)**	1.1. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	1.1. **Strategy** Students' math achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act model** and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? **Actions/Details** -This year, the PLC members will administer common end-of-unit assessments. The assessments will be identified prior to the teaching of the unit. -Grade level/ PLCs use a **Plan-Do-Check-Act "Plan of Instruction" log** to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log.	1.1. Who -Administrators -PLC facilitators How PLCS turn their logs into administration after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a quarterly basis.	1.1. **Teacher Level** -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual goal. **PLC Level** -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the 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 goal. **Leadership Team Level** -PLC facilitator shares goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental and/or enrichment instruction.	1.1. <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing <u>3x per year</u> Form 1,2,3 EOY & FCAT exams <u>During the Grading Period</u> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

				-Additional planning for enrichment activities as necessary.			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.			2.1. See 1.1	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 35% to 38%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **35% (138)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **38% (150)**					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1. See 1.1	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 54 points to 57 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **54 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **57 points**					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.

Mathematics Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 45 points to 50 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **45 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **50 points**	See 1.1					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Math Goal #5:								
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics**			5A.1. see 1.1 White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	
Reading Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory of the 2013 FCAT will increase from 67% to 70%. The percentage of Black students scoring satisfactory of the 2013 FCAT will increase from 44% to 50%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring satisfactory of the 2013 FCAT will increase from 65% to 69%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:67% Black:44% Hispanic:65% Asian: NA American Indian:NA	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:70% Black:50% Hispanic:69% Asian:NA American Indian:NA						

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. see 1.1	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Mathematics Goal #5B: The percentage of the Economically Disadvantaged students scoring satisfactory of the 2013 FCAT will increase from 60% to 64%.	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** **60%** **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** **64%**				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. see 1.1	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C: The percentage of English Language Learner students scoring satisfactory of the 2013 FCAT will increase from 56% to 60%.	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** **56%** **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** **60%**				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. see 1.1	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D: . The percentage of Students with Disabilities scoring satisfactory of the 2013 FCAT will increase from 34% to 41%.	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** **34%** **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** **41%**				

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Analyzing first semester exams	K-5	PLC Leader	PLCs	After the administration of the tests	PLC logs	Administrator

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science. Science Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 55% to 58%. **2012 Current Level of Performance:*** 55% (79) **2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** 58% (83)	1.1 Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model. -Lack of common planning time.	1.1 **Strategy** Students' science skills will improve through participation in the **5E instructional model.** **Action Steps** -Teachers will attend District Science training and share 5 E Instructional Model information with their PLCs. -PLCs write goals based for units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively building 5E Instructional Model for upcoming lessons. -PLC teachers instruct students using the 5E Instructional Model. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans to drive future instruction.	1.1 **Who** Administrators PLC members **How Monitored** -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Data chats within PLC.	1.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their individual class goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the goal data across all classes. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares goal data with Administrators. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental and/or enrichment instruction.	1.1 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests, and EOY or FCAT exams. During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc.)
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**

2. **FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.			2.1. See 1.1	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 23% to 26%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **23% (33)**	2013Expected Level of Performance:* **26% (37)**					

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Inquiry and the 5E Instructional Model	K-5	Team Leaders	Appropriate county-level trainings	On-going in science PLCs three times per year	PLC facilitator notes discussions on PLC log	PLCs

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing. Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 90% to 93%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **90% (115)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **93% (119)**	1.1. Not all teachers are proficient at being able to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing. - Not all teachers know how to determine trends and student needs in order to focus instruction -All teachers need training in order to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using the information provided by the state.	1.1. Students use of mode-specific writing will improve through the use of the Writer's Workshop daily instructional model with a focus on mode-specific writing. **Action steps** **Plan:** -Using Data to identify trends to drive instruction - Lesson planning based on the needs of students **Do:** -Daily models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points -Daily conferencing **Check:** -Review of daily drafts and monthly demand writes -PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs **Act:** -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 cycle again, revise as needed, increase scale if possible, etc. -Plan ongoing monitoring of the solution.	1.1. Administration - Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs	1.1. PLCs – Monthly demand writes, daily drafts, and conferencing notes are reviewed to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency in writing through scoring data and benchmark attainment. District Writing Team-Monthly demand write scores provided through email to Writing Supervisor followed by fourth-grade writing review meetings and support pieces provided at monthly resource/contact meetings.	1.1. Student monthly demand writes, student daily drafts, and conferencing notes

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="7">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.</td></tr>
<tr><td>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</td><td>Grade Level/Subject</td><td>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</td><td>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</td><td>Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</td><td>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td></tr>
<tr><td>District Moodle Revised TIP</td><td>Writing grades 2-5</td><td>PLC facilitators</td><td>Writing Teachers Grades 2-5</td><td>On-going</td><td>Classroom Walkthroughs</td><td>Administrators Teachers</td></tr>
<tr><td>FCAT 2.0 Scoring Training</td><td>Writing grades 2-5</td><td>PLC facilitators</td><td>Writing Teachers Grades 2-5</td><td>On-going</td><td>Classroom Walkthroughs</td><td>Administrators Teachers</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

End of Writing Goals

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

Attendance Goal(s)

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: 1. The attendance rate will increase from 95.90% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013. 2. The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. 3. The number of students who have **unexcused** tardies throughout the school year decrease by 10%.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* **95.90%** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) **63** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) **95**	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* **96.0%** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) **56** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) **85**	1.1. Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance.	1.1. The Administration Team along with other appropriate staff will meet every 20 days to review the school's Attendance Plan to 1) ensure that all steps are being implemented with fidelity and 2) discuss targeted students. A data base will be maintained for students with excessive unexcused absences and tardies. This data base will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of attendance interventions and to identify students in need of support beyond school wide attendance initiatives	1.1. Social Worker Guidance Counselor Attendance Team	1.1. Attendance Team will disaggregate attendance data along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children	1.1. Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data

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

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: 1.The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. 2.The total number of students receiving In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10% 3.The total number of Out of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10% 4.The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions **6** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School **5** 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions **3** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School **2**	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions **5** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School **4** 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions **2** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School **1**	1.1. Our school does not have a clear school-wide system for reinforcing students specifically for following expectations and rules.	1.1. PSLT "Managing and Motivating" subgroup will develop a system for classroom teachers and other staff to reward students for following expectations and rules.	1.1 . PSLT "Managing and Motivating" subgroup PSLT – reviews subgroup proposal and allocates funds/resources as needed	1.1. PSLT "Managing and Motivating" subgroup with review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions monthly.	1.1. "UNTIE" ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data

Suspension Professional Development

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s) N/A

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s) – N/A

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

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Health and Fitness Goal Health and Fitness Goal #1: . During the 2011-2012 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 62% on the Pretest to 75% on the Posttest.	**65% (89)**	**75% (103)**	1.1	1.1 . Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5.	1.1. Principal	1.1. Student Schedules	1.1. Checking Schedules PACER Test
			1.2	1.2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the school's H.E.A.R.T. team.	1.2. H.E.A.R.T. team	1.2. School Calendar	1.2. Review Calendar PACER Test
			1.3	1.3. 3. Use of the playground or fitness course equipment; walk/jog/run activities in designated areas; and exercising to the outdoor activities such as the ones provided in the *150 Minutes of Elem. Physical Education* folder on IDEAS.	1.3. Physical Education Teacher	1.3. On-line Data Base	1.3. Check data base PACER test

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Continuous Improvement Goal Continuous Improvement Goal #1: The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicators under **Documenting and Using Results** on the *School Climate and Perception Survey for Instructional Staff* will increase from 43% in 2011 to 50% in 2012.	2012 Current Level :* **43%**	2013 Expected Level :* **50%**	1.1. - Difficult for administration to support all PLCs. - Difficult for support personnel to attend all PLC meetings. -Teachers are not comfortable using data to inform their future instruction.	1.1. -All PLCs will meet two Tuesdays a month after school. This will enable administration and support personnel to attend a greater number of PLC meetings. -A uniform plan will be kept at all PLC meetings to document discussion, goals, and plans for instruction.	1.1. Who Administration How Administration attends PLC meetings.	1.1. Administration will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process and if instructional changes are effective.	1.1. Data from AP1, AP2 and AP3

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals- N/A

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking. CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 49% to 52% 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: **49%**	1.1. . PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their learning. To address this barrier, PLC's will utilize the Plan-Do-Check-Act Plan of Instruction log.	1.1. Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Act-Check model and plan of instruction log to structure their way of work. Using the backward design model for plans of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they do not learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? **Action Details** -Grade level PLCs use a **Plan-Do-Act-Check** Plan of Instruction log to guide their discussion. The discussions are summarized on the log. -Additional action steps for the strategy are outlined on the grade level PLC logs.	1.1. Administrators -PLC facilitators How PLCs turn their logs into administration after a plan of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback from administration on their log. -Administration and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings. - Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team meetings.	1.1. Teacher Level Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning 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 the average unit assessment score for all their students per class/course. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery of the individual/PLC SMART goal. PLC/Department Level -PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Using individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes. -PLCs reflect on lesson and data outcomes used to drive future instruction. Leadership Team Level -Leadership Team determines what specific data will be reported to the Leadership Team.	1.1.<u>3x per year</u> FAIR Form A,B,C <u>During the Grading Period</u> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
					-Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress. -PLC facilitator/ Team 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.	
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
D. Students scoring proficient in Reading. CELLA Goal #D: . The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 23% to 26%	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : **23%**	2.1. See 1.1	2.1 . See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
E. Students scoring proficient in Writing. CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 24% to 27%	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : **24%**	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals N/A

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal N/A

NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals N/A

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

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal N/A

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

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

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

STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand inquiry based experiences for students in math and science through the 5E model	1.1. Need common planning time for math, science and other STEM teachers.	1.1. -Documentation of planning of units/ experimenting on PLC logs. -Increase effectiveness of school events that highlight STEM lessons.	1.1. PLC or Subject Area Leaders	1.1. Administrative Walkthoughs	1.1. Log the number of entries in Science Olympics and STEM Fair

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attend STEM Fair workshop	K-5	Science contact	Science Teachers	December 2012	Work with teachers to ensure student projects are progressing	Science Contact

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

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

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

CTE Goal #1:	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Increase student interest in career opportunities and program selection prior to middle school. The school will increase the frequency of exposure activities/events from 2 in 2011-2012 to 4 in 2012-2013		Implement special speakers to visit and share with students about CTE careers throughout the year and during the Great American Teach-In.	Guidance Counselor	Monitor the number of activities each classroom is scheduled	Speaker List for each event

CTE Professional Development

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

<u>Differentiated Accountability</u>

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

X☐ Yes   ☐ No

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

Describe the use of SAC funds.			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
Plan-Do-Act-Check Model used at PLC; Reading 1.1	National Geographic Magazine: Additional non-fiction reading material is needed to provide students with increased, rigorous text for effective lessons in text-based reading. Each classroom will receive a magazine every other month K-5. Each student subscription costs $4.15.	1545.00	
Increased Collaboration at PLC; Reading 1.1, Math1.1	Teacher Observation and feedback to improve best practice in instruction: Use substitute teachers to give release time for teachers to observe instructional strategies that increase student performance in reading and mathematics. Each substitute days costs approximately $75.00	$750.00	

Final Amount Spent	