

Florida Department of Education



School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| School Name: Frost Elementary | District Name: Hillsborough |
| Principal: Marlou Bates | Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia |
| SAC Chair: Lynn Hughes | 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 | MARLOU BATES | School Principal, Educational Leadership, Emotionally | 4 | 11 | 11-12 C Monitor Status 10-11 C DID NOT MEET AYP 09-10 B DID NOT MEET AYP 08-09 C Did not meet AYP Oak Park 07-08 D Did not meet AYP Oak Park |
| Assistant Principal | CARISA SPIRES | Educational Leadership, Elementary Education, ESOL | 8 | 8 | 11-12 C Monitor Status 10-11 C DID NOT MEET AYP 09-10 B DID NOT MEET AYP 08-09 B Did not meet AYP 07-08 C Did not meet AYP 06-07 C Did not meet AYP 05-06 B Did not meet 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.

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

| 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 | Smith, Lindsay | Elementary Education | 3 | 4 | 11-12 C Monitor Status 10-11 C DID NOT MEET AYP 09-10 B Did not meet 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 | General Directors | June | |
| 2. Recruitment Fairs | Quincy Bell | June | |
| 3. District Mentor Program | District Mentors | ongoing | |
| 4. | | | |

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 qualified. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|--|
| 2 Teachers are not highly qualified | Teachers are in the process of taking subject area test for ESE |

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 Highly Qualified Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 80 | 11% (9) | 33% (26) | 41% (33) | 15% (12) | 29% (23) | 98% (78) | 4% (3) | 1% (1) |

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 |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Caroline Copper | Keri McDaniel | Caroline Copper is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Obse rving, coaching, and mentoring |
| Kim VanBibber | Shelby Hagemann | Kim Van Bibber is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Obse rving, coaching, and mentoring |

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

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Kim VanBibber | Samantha Schwiegerath | Kim Van Bibber is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Observing, coaching, and mentoring |
| Kim VanBibber | Rebecca Fernandez | Kim Van Bibber is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Observing, coaching, and mentoring |

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Kim VanBibber | Jonathan McCormick | Kim Van Bibber is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Observing, coaching, and mentoring |
| Kim VanBibber | Jennifer Garrison | Kim Van Bibber is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Observing, coaching, and mentoring |

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Kim VanBibber | Sara Schell | Kim Van Bibber is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Observing, coaching, and mentoring |
| Kim VanBibber | Nicole Carta | Kim Van Bibber is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Observing, coaching, and mentoring |

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

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Kim VanBibber | Julia Smith | Kim Van Bibber is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Observing, coaching, and mentoring |
|---------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|

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 Migrant The migrant advocate provides services and support to students and parents. The advocate works with teachers and other programs to ensure that the migrant students' needs are being met. |

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

| |
|---|
| <p>Title I, Part D</p> <p>The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice.</p> |
| <p>Title II</p> <p>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.</p> |
| <p>Title III</p> <p>Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners</p> |
| <p>Title X- Homeless</p> <p>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</p> |
| <p>Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)</p> <p>SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs.</p> |
| <p>Violence Prevention Programs</p> <p>NA</p> |

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

| |
|--|
| Nutrition Programs NA |
| Housing Programs NA |
| Head Start We utilize information from students in Head Start to transition into Kindergarten. |
| Adult Education NA |
| Career and Technical Education The career and technical support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations |
| Job Training Job training support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations |
| Other NA |

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

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

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

- A. Principal
- B. Assistant Principal for Curriculum
- C. School Psychologist
- D. Guidance Counselor
- E. Elementary: PLC facilitators for grades K-5
- F. Instructional Coaches
- G. ESE Specialist
- H. School Advisory Council Chair

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 RtI team in our school is to provide high quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and using performance and learning rate over time to make important education decisions to guide instruction. The RtI team functions to address the progress of low performing students help meet AYP and help students stay in regular education setting and improve long term outcomes. The team uses a problem solving model and all decisions are made with data.

Our RtI Team will serve as the main leadership team of the school. The RtI Team will meet at least three times a month to:

- Use the RtI problem solving model to:
 - o Oversee a multi-tiered model of service delivery (Core/Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3)
 - o Determine scheduling needs, curriculum and intervention resources
 - o Review/interpret student data (Academic and Behavior)
 - o Organize and support systematic data collection.
 - o Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction:
 - * Through the implementation of PLCs
 - * Through the use of school-based Reinforcement Calendars, Mini Lessons and Mini Assessments

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

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

* Through the use of Common Assessments given every 6-9 weeks.

* Through the implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instruction/interventions. This year our RtI team will focus on Differentiated Instruction practices.

o Plan, implement and oversee the supplemental and intensive interventions for student progression in Tier 2 and Tier 3.

o Monitor interventions and data assessment in Tier 2 and Tier 3.

• Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model and progress monitoring

• Coordinate/collaborate with other working committees such as the Reading Leadership Team

• Assist in the implementation and monitoring of the Differentiated Accountability Model

• Identify professional development needs and resources

Describe the role of the school-based RtI Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan.

• The School Advisory Council (SAC) Chair is a member of the RtI Team.

• The School Improvement Plan is the document that guides the work of the RtI Team. The large part of the work of the RtI Team is outlined in the Action Steps, Evaluation Process, Evaluation Too, and Professional Development of the School Improvement Plan.

• Since one of the main tasks of the RtI Team is to monitor student data, it will monitor the effectiveness of the Action Steps and suggest modifications if needed.

MTSS Implementation

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

*Reviews of district and state assessments in the areas of math and science will be used for determining remediation students.

FAIR data will be used for sorting students for interventions with reading.

Daily and weekly reading records will be reviewed

EASI CBM

Writing monthly assessments

Math formative and informal assessments

Behavior logs

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

- The RtI Members will present during School Improvement Training will be shared with staff.

*Further trainings will be given during PLC's to teams by Team Facilitators as needed.

- As the District's Problem Solving Team develops resources and staff development courses on RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

*PSLT will continue to work with students to increase student achievement.

*PSLT will review tiers of student levels.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

- Principal
- Assistant Principal for Curriculum
- Reading Coach
- Reading Resource
- Media Specialist
- Academic Intervention Specialist

Reading Teachers

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

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

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

The principal/assistant principal are the LLT chairpersons. 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/assistant principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the Problem Solving Leadership team's support plan. Additionally the principal ensures

that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students.

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

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

NCLB Public School Choice

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

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

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

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

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 five 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 Dr. Eric. J. Smith, Florida 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. Students in the VPK program are given a district-created screening that looks at letter names, letter sounds phonemic awareness and number sense. This assessment is administered at the start and end of the VPK program. A copy of these assessments is 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. 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.

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

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

***High Schools Only**

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

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

| 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 | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).</p> | <p>1.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of understanding of how to use FCAT 2.0 stem questions during shared reading. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction | <p>1.1.</p> <p><u>Strategy:</u></p> <p>Tier 1 - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the problem-solving model.</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <p>1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.)</p> | <p>1.1.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Principal -AP <p><u>How</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. | <p>1.1.</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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 their students' progress towards the SMART Goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards the SMART Goal. <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. | <p>1.1.</p> <p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension -Reading Formative 3x/yr <p>Grades 2-5</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Common assessments DRAs, Running Records, EASI CBM, District Formatives | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>(both with the low performing and high performing students).</p> | <p>2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies.</p> <p>3. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.</p> <p>4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>6. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective.</p> <p>7. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to</p> | | <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-PLC facilitator/ Grade Area Leader/ Resource Teachers shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.</p> <p>—</p> | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | <p>the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.</p> <p>8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).</p> <p>9. PLCs record their work in logs.</p> | | | | | |
| <p><u>Reading Goal #1:</u></p> <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p> <p>In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 49% to 54%</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | 49% | 54% | | | | | |
| | | 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

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.</p> | <p>2.1.</p> <p>- Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques.</p> <p>- PLC meetings do not focus on higher order questioning strategies for upcoming lessons.</p> <p>- Administrators are at varying skill levels with identification.</p> | <p>2.1.</p> <p><u>Strategy:</u></p> <p>Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students’ reading comprehension will improve through participation in Higher Level Questioning (input, process, and output) in Reading, Language Arts, Science, and Social Studies.</p> <p>As a result, there will be increased use of higher level questions versus lower level questions for both teachers and students.</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <p>1. As a professional development activity, PLCs study questioning techniques.</p> <p>2. Teachers implement lessons</p> | <p>2.1.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>- Principal</p> <p>-AP</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool) <i>(which has HOTS as a strategy listed on the form.)</i></p> | <p>2.1.</p> <p><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.</p> <p>-Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system.</p> <p>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students per class/course.</p> <p>-Teachers chart their students’ individual progress towards mastery.</p> <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u></p> <p>PLCs examine student work and data from CIM.</p> <p>Data from review of skill assessments will be analyzed at PLC meetings.</p> <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> | <p>2.1.</p> <p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>- FAIR</p> <p>-formative data__</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u></p> <p>-Student work/projects</p> <p>-comprehension checks</p> <p>-Fluency Assessments</p> | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>using higher Level Questioning.</p> <p>3. Teachers assess students by having them identify and create different levels of questions.</p> <p>4. Teachers bring student work and/or assessments to PLCs.</p> <p>5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful.</p> <p>6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher level questioning techniques.</p> <p>7. PLCs record their work on the PLC logs.</p> | | <p>The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Literacy Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| <p><u>Reading Goal #2:</u></p> <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p> <p>In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 21% to 31%.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>21%</p> | <p>31%</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>2.2.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> | |
| | | <p>2.3</p> | <p>2.3</p> | <p>2.3</p> | <p>2.3</p> | <p>2.3</p> | |
| <p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p> | <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p> | <p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p> | <p>Student Evaluation Tool</p> | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|--|--|
| <p>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.</p> | <p>B.1. See 1.1</p> | <p>B.1. See 1.1</p> | <p>B.1. See 1.1</p> | <p>B.1. See 1.1</p> | <p>B.1.</p> | | |
| <p><u>Reading Goal #3:</u></p> <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p> <p>In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 56 points to 62 points.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>56 Pts</p> | <p>62 pts</p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|--------------------------------|------|--|
| | | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | |
| | | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | 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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p> | <p>4.1.</p> <p>- Teachers at varying skills levels with the FCIM model.</p> <p>- Teachers' implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across language arts and reading courses.</p> <p>- District mini lessons, mini assessments and District calendar do not always align with school student data.</p> <p>- Lack of common planning time to develop/ identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring.</p> | <p>4.1.</p> <p><u>Strategy:</u></p> <p>Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the FCIM strategy on identified tested benchmarks on District Formative tests, FAIR and Fluency checks in reading and Language Arts classes.</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <p>1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation.</p> <p>2. As a Professional Development activity in their</p> | <p>4.1.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Principal</p> <p>-AP</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs</p> <p>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (<i>EET tool. The F-CIM strategy will be added to the form under Instructional Practices.</i>)</p> <p>- Another fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/ logs of targeted skills reviewed by the AP.</p> | <p>4.1</p> <p><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.</p> <p>-Teachers maintain their assessments in their data binder .</p> <p>-Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery.</p> <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u></p> <p>-PLCs will review assessment data.</p> <p>-PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Tutors will share with homeroom teacher progress of students.</p> <p>-Students will be placed in ELP to provide additional support.</p> <p>-Do, check, check, act will be used.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> | <p>4.1.</p> <p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>-FAIR</p> <p>-Formative Tests__</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u></p> <p>-Fluency Assessment Data</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>- Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data.</p> <p>- Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide.</p> <p>- Finding appropriate text to develop the lessons and assessments.</p> | <p>PLCs, teachers identify (using District resources and curriculum resources) to plan review lessons for benchmarks.</p> <p>3. Teachers implement the review lessons and assessments.</p> <p>4. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>5. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/ calendar. Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule.</p> <p>6. PLCs record their work in logs.</p> | | <p>-With the Literacy Leadership Team, the Problem Solving Leadership Team 1) reviews FAIR data to determine the percentage of students scoring medium to high and 2) reviews course-generated nine week assessment that includes all skills covered during the nine week period.</p> <p>-The PSLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| <p><u>Reading Goal #4:</u></p> <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p> <p>In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 59 points to 66 points.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>59 pts</p> | <p>66 pts</p> | | | | | |
| | | <p>4.2.</p> | <p>4.2.</p> | <p>4.2.</p> | <p>4.2.</p> | <p>4.2.</p> | |
| | | <p>4.3</p> | <p>4.3.</p> | <p>4.3.</p> | <p>4.3.</p> | <p>4.3.</p> | |
| <p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p> | <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p> | <p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p> | <p>Student Evaluation Tool</p> | | |

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

| 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%. | | | | | | | |
| <u>Reading Goal #5:</u> | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> | <p>5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: -Lack of common planning time. -Teachers are at varying levels of understanding of the ELA vocabulary standards. - Teachers are at varying levels of understanding of the types of vocabulary items that complement content instruction. -PLC meetings do not include discussion of leveled vocabulary development and assessment</p> | <p>5A.1. <u>Strategy:</u> Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students’ vocabulary acquisition will improve through the implementation of appropriately leveled, <u>vocabulary development</u> lessons across all content areas. <u>Action Steps:</u> 1. PLC schedule will provide common planning time. 2. PLCs will familiarize themselves with the content standards. 3. PLCs will recognize vocabulary needs within each content area. 4. PLCs come to consensus on the use of common assessments: 1) vocabulary items included in end of</p> | <p>5A.1. <u>Who</u> Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Subject Area Leaders and Grade Level Subject PLC Facilitators -Reading Leadership Team <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (<i>EET tool - Vocabulary strategy will be added to the form under Instructional Practices.</i>) -Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.</p> | <p>5A.1. <u>PLC/Department Level</u> PLCs-Teachers assess students using mini-assessments. PLCs will review assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> | <p>5A.1. <u>Bx Per Year</u> - FAIR Formative Tests <u>During Grading Period</u> Running Records, comprehension checks, Fluency checks, conferencing</p> | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>for content instruction.</p> <p>-PLC meetings do not include the development of vocabulary instructional activities for upcoming lessons.</p> <p>-Administrators and support staff are at varying skill levels with identifying appropriate levels of vocabulary development.</p> | <p>the unit/segment assessment 2) LA- embedded vocabulary development activities and/or 3) any program assessment provided in curriculum resources and materials.</p> <p>5. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs come to consensus on the vocabulary standards/ benchmark to be addressed within each content area.</p> <p>6. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs study the process of scaffolding lessons to move students to perform more complex vocabulary acquisition tasks.</p> <p>7. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs design specific scaffolded lessons essential in creating appropriate vocabulary</p> | <p>-Classroom walk-through form for Grades K-12 Reading Intervention classes <i>(available from Reading Department)</i></p> <p>-PSLT will review student data and fidelity data every nine weeks.</p> | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>acquisition</p> <p>8. Teachers implement the scaffolded lessons.</p> <p>9. Teachers implement the common assessments.</p> <p>10. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. PLCs study students' responses to the scaffolded lessons.</p> <p>11. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs use data with the problem-solving process to determine next steps in their vocabulary acquisition implementation.</p> <p>12. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.</p> | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| <u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>The percentage of White_ students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 60% to 70%.</p> | | | | | | | |
| <p>The percentage of Black_ students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 38% to 50%.</p> | | | | | | | |
| <p>The percentage of Hispanic_ students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 46% to 60%.</p> | | | | | | | |
| | <p>White: 60% Black:38% Hispanic 46%: Asian: American Indian:</p> | <p>White:70% Black:50% Hispanic:60% Asian: American Indian:</p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>5A.2.</p> <p>Teacher support for planning remediation and enrichment activities</p> <p>-Teacher support for the strategy</p> | <p>5A.2.</p> <p>Tier 2/3 - Students' reading comprehension will improve through the implementation of a 30 minute supplemental instruction period per day for re-teaching and enrichment.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will determine the reading skills targeted for the weekly sessions based on student performance during the previous week. Students will either have a re-teach or enrichment activity. Re-teach sessions will be assessed with a mini-assessment to demonstrate mastery. PLCs record their work in logs. | <p>5A.2.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>AP</p> <p>Principal</p> <p>Team Leaders</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Teacher re-grouping of students and topic/lesson turned in.</p> <p>-Classroom walk-through observing this strategy.</p> | <p>5A.2.</p> <p><u>Teachers</u></p> <p>Teachers analyze mini assessment data on skills taught/reviewed in supplemental instructional period.</p> <p>Teachers review data at PLC meetings.</p> <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u></p> <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> | <p>5A.2.</p> <p><u>3x per year (Reading)</u></p> <p>- FAIR</p> <p><u>During Nine Weeks</u></p> <p>-Running Records, Comprehension checks</p> | |
| | | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.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 | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|-------------------------|--|--|
| 5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. | 5B.1. See 5A.1 | 5B.1. See 5A.1 | 5B.1. See 5A.1 | 5B.1. See 5A.1 | 5B.1. See 5A.1 | | |
| <p><u>Reading Goal #5B:</u></p> <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p> <p>In grades 3-5, 55% Economically Disadvantaged students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | 43% | 55% | | | | | |

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

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> | <p>5C.1</p> <p>-Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority.</p> <p>-Some teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. The ERT will work with teachers on to work with ELL teachers.</p> <p>-ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses.</p> | <p>5C.1</p> <p>ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension will increase by use of ELL strategies within the regular classroom.</p> <p>Action Steps</p> <p>-ERT models lessons</p> <p>-Core content teachers set SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming core curriculum assessments.</p> <p>-Core content teachers administer and analyze ELLs performance on assessments.</p> <p>-Teachers aggregate data to determine the performance of ELLs compared to the whole group.</p> <p>-Based on data core content teachers will differentiate instruction to remediate/enhance instruction.</p> | <p>5C.1</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-School based Administrators</p> <p>-ESOL Resource Teachers</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs</p> | <p>5C.1</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses.</p> <p>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-ERTs meet with grade level PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data.</p> <p>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p> <p>-ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)</p> | <p>5C.1.</p> <p>See 5A.1</p> | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|------------------------------|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <p><u>Reading Goal #5C:</u></p> <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p> <p>In grades 3-5, ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the FCAT reading will increase from 12% to 15%</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>12%</p> | <p>15%</p> | | | | | |
| | <p>—</p> | <p>5C.2.</p> | <p>5C.2.</p> | <p>5C.2.</p> | <p>5C.2.</p> | <p>5C.2.</p> | |
| | | <p>5C.3.</p> | <p>5C.3.</p> | <p>5C.3.</p> | <p>5C.3.</p> | <p>5C.3.</p> | |
| <p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p> | <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p> | <p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p> | <p>Student Evaluation Tool</p> | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> | <p>5D.1. - No electronic accessibility to FAA data (instructional planning tool, mainframe, etc.) -Collecting data with fidelity -Understanding data and the students' disability to make instructional decisions -For general education teachers, understanding the IEP and instructional accommodations -Teachers at varying skill levels (ACP, content knowledge, certification) -Multiple preparations -Lack of common planning time</p> | <p>5D.1. <u>Strategy:</u> SWDs reading comprehension will improve by <u>connecting individual needs to instruction as outlined in the IEP.</u> <u>Action Steps:</u> 1. General ed. and/or SWD teachers will familiarize themselves with each student's IEP goals, strategies and accommodations. 2. Every nine weeks the General Ed and/or SWD teacher reviews students' IEPs to ensure that all students' IEP goals, strategies and accommodations are being implemented with fidelity. 3. Using student data, every nine weeks (along with the report card) SWD students</p> | <p>5D.1. <u>Who</u> Principal, Site Administrator, Assistant Principal <u>How</u> -IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC.</p> | <p>5D.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their mini assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards 80% mastery of skills. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress. <u>PLC/Department Level</u> PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of SWD students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> The Problem Solving</p> | <p>5D.1. <u>Bx Per Year</u> - FAIR <u>During Grading Period</u> -Fluency Assessments - Nine weeks grades for SWD students SRA records</p> | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>-Lack of understanding of the IEP and instructional accommodations</p> | <p>will receive an Individual Education Plan Progress Report to inform parents of the students' progress toward mastering their IEP goals and strategies.</p> <p>4. Across all content areas, PLCs write SWD SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the SWD students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.</p> <p>5. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discussing implementation of IEP strategies and modifications.</p> <p>6. PLC teachers instruct students implementing IEP strategies and accommodations.</p> <p>7. Teachers give a common assessment identified from the</p> | | <p>Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>core curriculum material.</p> <p>8. Teachers bring SWD assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>9. Based on the data, teachers discuss techniques that were effective for SWD students.</p> <p>10. Based on the data, teachers decide what skills need to be re-taught to targeted students using DI techniques.</p> <p>11. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).</p> <p>12. PLCs record their work in logs.</p> | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| <u>Reading Goal #5D:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| In grades 3-5, 30% SWD students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test or the percentage of non-proficient students will increase by more than 10% in 2012. | 13% | 30% | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
| | | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | |

Reading Professional Development

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Core Curriculum for Reading | All | Reading Coach, Focus coach, Reading Resource | School-wide | September | Walkthroughs to ensure fidelity of instruction | Coaches, Administration |
| DRA Review | All | Reading Coach | Grade levels | February | Spot checking of DRA's | Coaches, administration |
| Data Chats | All | Reading Coach, Focus Coach, Reading Resource | All Grade Levels | September | PLC Logs | Administration, Team Leaders |
| Easy CBM | All | Reading Coach, Reading resource, Psychologist | All Grade Levels | October | Easy CBM data | |
| PLC's | All | Teachers, PSLT facilitators | All Grade Levels | On-going | Data Wall, PLC logs | |

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).</p> | <p>1.1. - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.</p> | <p>1.1. <u>Strategy:</u> Tier 1 - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM) with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the problem-solving model. <u>Action Steps:</u> 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an</p> | <p>1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -APC -Math Resource Teacher -Math Academic Coach <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration and</p> | <p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> - 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 their students' progress towards the SMART Goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards the SMART Goal. <u>PLC/Department Level</u> PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet) that will be maintained in the assessment binder. PLCs will review chapter and district formative assessments and chart the</p> | <p>1.1.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> - District Form 1 and Form 2 Assessment and District EOY Test <u>During Grading Period</u> -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments -Anecdotal records from informal observations__</p> | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>-Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.</p> <p>- Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.</p> <p>- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).</p> <p>-Lack of teacher content knowledge to teach the NGSSS to intended rigor</p> | <p>80% or above on each unit of instruction.)</p> <p>2. Teachers will attend district Math trainings and share their gained information at PLCs. More trainings will be offered at Frost to promote increased attendance.</p> <p>3. Math Committee member from each grade level will share knowledge gained at content committee meetings with team at PLCs.</p> <p>4. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based DI best-practice</p> | <p>Academic Coach walk-throughs.</p> <p>Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks</p> <p>Morning and lunchtime remediation groups will be facilitated by the Math Resource Teacher.</p> | <p>increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.</p> <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>Leadership Team Level</p> <p>The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>strategies. In addition, math teachers visit math demonstration classrooms where DI is emphasized.</p> <p>5. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.</p> <p>6. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>7. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>8. Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective.</p> <p>9. Based on the data, teachers a) decide what</p> | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students.</p> <p>10. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).</p> <p>11. PLCs record their work in logs.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 42% to 50%.</p> | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|--------------------------------|------|--|
| | 42% | 50% | | | | | |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.</p> | <p>2.1 Teachers are at varying skill levels with (higher order questioning techniques). - PLC meetings do not focus on higher order questioning strategies for upcoming lessons. - Administrators are at varying skill levels with identification of higher order thinking/level questioning.</p> | <p>2.1. <u>Strategy:</u> Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students’ math skills will improve through participation in Higher Level Questioning. As a result, there will be increased use of higher level questions versus lower level questions for both teachers and students. <u>Action Steps:</u> 1. As a professional development activity, PLCs study Higher Level Questioning techniques and ways to plan Higher Order questions within their lessons.</p> | <p>2.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -Assistant Principal -Math Resource Teacher -Math Academic Coach <u>How</u> PLC logs turned into administration for review -Administration <i>This form demonstrates students’ use of vocabulary and higher levels of learning</i> -Use the forms to compute percentage of higher level vs. lower level and monitor improvement/growth -HCPS Informal Observation Pop-</p> | <p>2.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -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. - <u>PLC/Department Level</u> PLCs examine student work and data from the data boards. Data from review of unit assessments and interactive notebooks will be analyzed at PLC meetings.</p> | <p>2.1. <u>Bx Per Year</u> - District Form 1 and Form 2 Assessment and District EOY Test <u>During Grading Period</u> -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments -Anecdotal records from informal observations</p> | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | <p>2. Teachers implement lessons using Higher Level Questioning.</p> <p>3. Teachers assess students by having them identify and create different levels of questions.</p> <p>4. Teachers bring student work and/or assessments to PLCs.</p> <p>5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful.</p> <p>6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques.</p> <p>7. PLCs record</p> | <p>In Form (EET tool) <i>(which has HOTS as a strategy listed on the form.)</i></p> <p>Math Resource Teacher and Academic coach will conduct informal walk-throughs checking for higher order questioning and provide feedback to administration after walk-throughs</p> | <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>Leadership Team Level</p> <p>The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | their work on the PLC logs. | | | | | |
| In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 18% to 23% | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>20123Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | (18%) | (23%) | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|-------------|--|
| | | <p>2.2. Teachers are at varying skill levels with problem solving based instruction</p> <p>-PLC's do not focus on implementing problem solving based instruction</p> | <p>2.2. Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through participation in Higher Level Questioning. As a result, there will be increased use of higher level questions versus lower level questions for both teachers and students.</p> <p>—</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <p>1. As a professional development activity, PLCs study Higher Level Questioning techniques and ways to plan Higher Order questions within their lessons.</p> <p>2. Teachers implement lessons using Higher Level</p> | <p>2.2. <u>Who</u></p> <p>-Administration Team</p> <p>-Math Resource Teacher</p> <p>-Math Academic Coach</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Classroom walk-throughs observing problem solving based lessons</p> <p>Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool).</p> | <p>2.2. <u>Teachers</u></p> <p>—</p> <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u></p> <p>PLCs examine student work and data from the data boards.</p> <p>Data from review of unit assessments and anecdotal records will be analyzed at PLC meetings.</p> <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team</u></p> <p>The Problem Solving Leadership Team/ Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|-------------|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----|--|-----|-----|-----|--|
| | | | <p>Questioning.</p> <p>3. Teachers assess students by having them identify and create different levels of questions.</p> <p>4. Teachers bring student work and/or assessments to PLCs.</p> <p>5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful.</p> <p>6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques.</p> <p>7. PLCs record their work on the PLC logs.</p> | | | | |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | |

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 | 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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.</p> | <p>3.1. -Lack of infrastructure to support technology -Lack of technology hardware -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the NGSSS -Lack of teacher knowledge best practices for implementing available technology -Lack of teacher knowledge on the available technology resources</p> | <p>3.1. Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students’ math skills will improve through the use of <u>technology and hands-on activities</u> to implement the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards <u>Action Steps:</u> Action Steps 1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. 2. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling technology and hands-on strategies.</p> | <p>3.1. <u>Who</u> - Principal -Assistant Principal - Technology Specialist - Math Resource Teacher -Math Academic Coach <u>How</u> - -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing technology and hands-on lessons. -Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.</p> | <p>3.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -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. - <u>PLC/Department Level</u> PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. - <u>Leadership Team Level</u> The Problem Solving</p> | <p>3.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> District Form 1 and Form 2 Assessment and District EOY Test <u>During Grading Period</u> -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments -Anecdotal records from informal observations_</p> | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | <p>3. Math resource teacher will meet with Math Committee members to share available technology resources and best practices for utilizing them. Members will then share with grade level PLC members.</p> <p>4. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating strategies from their PLC discussions.</p> <p>5. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>7. As a Professional</p> | <p>Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.</p> <p>-HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool).__</p> | <p>Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | <p>Development activity, teachers use data to discuss strategies that were effective.</p> <p>8. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning technology and hands-on strategies.</p> <p>9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.</p> | | | | | |
| In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 59 pts. to 64 pts. | <u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | (59Pts) | (64pts) | | | | | |
| | | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|--------------------------------|------|--|
| | | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | 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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p> | <p>4.1. - Teachers at varying skill levels with the FCIM model. - Teachers' implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across math classes. - Lack of common planning time to develop/identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum bas materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring. - Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson</p> | <p>4.1 Tier 1- The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the FCIM strategy on identified tested benchmarks. <u>Action Steps:</u> 1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. 2. Based on the data, PLCs develop a 10</p> | <p>4.1.____ <u>Who</u> Teacher Principal AP Math Resource <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into Administration. --Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. -Another fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/timeline/logs of targeted skills reviewed by</p> | <p>4.1.____ <u>Teachers</u> ____ <u>PLC/Department Level</u> ____ -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in a course specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet). ____ -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on each mini-assessment. ____ PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. <u>Leadership Team</u> ____ The Problem Solving Leadership Team reviews</p> | <p>4.1. <u>3x Per Yea</u> ____ District Form 1 and Form 2 Assessment and District EOY Test ____ <u>During Grading Period</u> ____ -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments -Anecdotal records from informal observations__</p> | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>data.</p> <p>- Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide.</p> | <p>day projected timeline/calendar for re-teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum.</p> <p>3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons/assessments.</p> <p>4. Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments.</p> <p>5. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>6. As a Professional Development activity in their</p> | <p>the administration and/or Math Coach.</p> <p>- PSLT will review the calendars/logs and make progress statements at the end of each nine weeks.</p> <p>-Morning and lunchtime remediation groups will be facilitated by the Math Resource Teacher.</p> | <p>data that includes all skills covered during the nine week period.</p> | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the timeline/ calendar. Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a maintenance or re-teaching schedule.</p> <p>7. As a PLC, teachers develop a school-based assessment that covers all mini lesson skills taught within the nine week period.</p> <p>8. PLCs record their work in logs</p> | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| <u>Mathematics Goal #4:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|--|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p> <p>In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 53% to 60%.</p> | | | | | | | |
| | (53%) | (60%) | | | | | |
| | | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | |

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

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics</p> | <p>5A.1. - Students not receiving academic support outside of math classroom instruction.</p> | <p>5A.1. <u>Strategy:</u> Tier 2/3 - Students' math skills will improve through providing a supplemental math class.</p> | <p>5A.1. <u>Who</u> - Administration Team -Math Resource Teacher</p> <p><u>How</u> -Math Resource teacher will monitor progress through benchmark mini assessments and performance on online tutorial and practice exercises.</p> | <p>5A.1. <u>5A.1. Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their mini assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards 80% mastery of skills. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress.</p> <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the 80% mastery data across all classes/ courses for each mini assessment.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> AP reviews district formative assessments and Instructional Planning Tool Data</p> | <p>5A.1. <u>Bx Per Year</u> District Form 1 and Form 2 Assessment and District EOY Test</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u> -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments -Anecdotal records from informal observations_ -Online resource reports</p> | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>In grades 3-5, 60% of the following All Curriculum student subgroups will score a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%.</p> | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | <p>5A.2.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>AP Principal Team Leaders Math Resource Teacher Classroom teachers</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Team re-grouping of students by teacher and topic/lesson turned into APC weekly.</p> <p>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.</p> | <p>5A.2.</p> <p><u>Teachers</u></p> <p>Teachers analyze mini assessment data on skills taught/reviewed in supplemental instructional period. Mini-assessment data recorded in team data base (excel spread sheet)</p> <p>Teachers review data at PLC meetings.</p> <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u></p> <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p><u>Leadership Level</u></p> <p>The Problem Solving Leadership Team/ Reading Leadership Team will review</p> | <p>5A.2.</p> <p><u>3x per year</u></p> <p>District Form 1 and Form 2 Assessment and District EOY Test</p> <p><u>During Nine Weeks</u></p> <p>-Chapter Tests</p> <p>-Benchmark mini assessments</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|------------------|--|
| | | | | | assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | | |
| | | | | 5A.3. See 4.1 | 5A.3. See 4.1 | 5A.3. See 4.1 | |
| 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 | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> | <p>5B.1. See 5A.1</p> | <p>5B.1. <u>Strategy:</u> See 5A.1 <u>Action Steps:</u></p> | <p>5B.1. <u>Who</u> See 5A.1 <u>How</u></p> | <p>5B.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> See 5A.1 - <u>PLC/Department Level</u> - <u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> | <p>5B.1. See 5A.1 <u>During Grading Period</u></p> | | |
| <p>In grades 3-5, 46% Economically Disadvantaged All Curriculum students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10%.</p> | | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|-------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | (47%) | | | | | | |
| | | (57%) | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. See 5A.2 | 5B.1. See 5A.2 | 5B.1. See 5A.2 | 5B.1. See 5A.2 | 5B.1. See 5A.2 | |
| | | 5B.3. See 4.1 | 5B.3. See 4.1 | 5B.3. See 4.1 | 5B.3. See 4.1 | 5B.3. See 4.1 | |
| 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 | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|
| <p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> | <p>5C.1.</p> | <p>5C.1.</p> | <p>5C.1.</p> | <p>5C.1.</p> | <p>5C.1.</p> | | |
| <p><u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>(n/a)</p> | <p>(n/a)</p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|--------------------------------|-------|--|
| | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | 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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> | <p>5D.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No electronic accessibility to FAA data (instructional planning tool, mainframe, etc.) -Collecting data with fidelity -Understanding data and the students' disability to make instructional decisions -For general education teachers, understanding the IEP and instructional accommodations -Teachers at varying skill levels (ACP, content knowledge, certification) -Multiple Preps. -Lack of common planning time | <p>5D.1.</p> <p><u>Strategy:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SWDs math skills will improve by <u>connecting individual needs to instruction as outlined in the IEP.</u> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Math General ed. and/or SWD teachers will familiarizing themselves with each student's IEP goals, strategies and accommodations. 2. Every nine weeks the Math General Ed and/or SWD teacher reviews students' IEPs to ensure that all students' IEP goals, strategies and accommodations are being implemented with fidelity. 3. Using student data, every nine weeks (along with the report card) SWD students will receive an Individual Education Plan Progress Report to inform parents of the students' progress toward mastering their IEP goals and strategies. 4. Math PLCs write | <p>5D.1. __</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>Principal, Site Administrator, Assistant Principal ESE Specialist</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC. -PSLT will identify and/or create a fidelity monitoring tool designed to check implementation of this specific strategy. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. | <p>5D.1.</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>—</p> <p><u>PLC/Department Level</u></p> <p>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of SWD students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. —</p> <p>The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> | <p>5D.1</p> <p><u>3x Per Year</u></p> <p>District Form 1 and Form 2 Assessment and District EOY Test</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments -Anecdotal records from informal observations__ | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>SWD SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the SWD students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.)</p> <p>5. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discussing implementation of IEP strategies and modifications.</p> <p>6. PLC teachers instruct students implementing IEP strategies and accommodations.</p> <p>4. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>5. Teachers bring SWD assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>6. Based on the data, teachers discuss techniques that were effective for SWD students.</p> <p>7. Based on the data, teachers decide what skills need to be re-taught to targeted students using DI techniques.</p> <p>8. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted</p> | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| | | students (remediation and enrichment). 9. PLCs record their work in logs. | | | | | |
| In grades 3-5, 64% SWD All Curriculum students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2013 FCAT Math Test or the percentage of non-proficient students will decrease by 10% in 2013 | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | (30%) | (40%) | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. See 5A.1 See 5A.2 | 5D.2. See 5A.1 See 5A.2 | 5D.2. See 5A.1 See 5A.2 | 5D.2 See 5A.1 See 5A.2 | 5D.2 See 5A.1 See 5A.2 | |
| | | 5D.3 See 4.1 | 5D.3 See4.1 | 5D.3 See4.1 | 5D.3 See4.1 | 5D.3 See4.1 | |

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

**Mathematics Professional Development
Professional
Development
(PD) aligned with**

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

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 Reviews | All Levels | Math Resource Teacher | Math Teachers | Ongoing monthly | PLC logs | Team Leaders |
| Math Instruction Misconceptions | All Levels | Math Resource Teacher | Math Teachers | November | Walkthroughs | Administration |
| Planning for Effective Math Lesson | 3, 4, 5 | Math Resouce | Math Teacher | October | Walkthroughs, lesson plans | Math Resource, administration |

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 | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.</p> | <p>1.1. Not all teachers know how to identify misconceptions and depth of student knowledge of science concepts. -Not all teachers are able to attend available science trainings on dates available by the district. -Not all teachers are knowledgeable of the strategies of inquiry based instruction such as engaging the students, allowing explore time, encouraging accountable talk, higher order</p> | <p>1.1. Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge. To achieve this goal, science teachers will increase the number of <u>inquiry based activities</u> (such as student engagement, explore time, accountable talk and higher order questioning) per unit of instruction.</p> | <p>1.1. <u>Who</u> Principal AP Science Resource Teacher District Academic Coach Science Teachers <u>How</u> - -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administrative walk-throughs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing inquiry based instruction. -The district walk-through checklist will be used to monitor fidelity of best</p> | <p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -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 their students' progress towards the SMART Goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards the SMART Goal. <u>PLC/Department Level</u> Science PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Science Resource Teacher and</p> | <p>1.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> - District-level baseline and mid-year tests - <u>During Grading Period</u> - District-level baseline and Big Idea Chapter tests. Midyear mini assessments</p> | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>questioning, etc.</p> <p>-Not all PLC meetings include regular discussion of student data and/or the implementation of the inquiry model.</p> <p>-Teachers are at varying skill levels with the use of achievement series to accurately analyze student data.</p> <p>-Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model.</p> <p>- Administrators are at varying skill levels with understanding</p> | <p>questioning, etc.</p> <p>-</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <p>1. Teachers attend District Science training and share information with their PLCs.</p> <p>2. District trainings be offered at Frost to encourage teacher attendance.</p> <p>3. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.)</p> <p>4. As a Professional</p> | <p>practices outlined in the SIP across the entire faculty.</p> <p>-Children needing remediation will be invited to Lunch Breakfast with Science Resource Teacher.</p> <p>Science Resource will work with small groups in the room to provide extra assistance with students</p> | <p>the Academic Coach.</p> <p>Assessment data will be reviewed for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> <p>-</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.</p> <p>-</p> | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>inquiry and the 5E lesson model</p> <p>-PLC are not being implemented at all grade levels with fidelity</p> <p>-Lack of common planning time to facilitate and hold PLC</p> <p>- Students do not have access to National Geographic login account</p> <p>-2/3 science teachers are new to 5th grade science instruction</p> | <p>Development activity in their PLCs, teachers will spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling inquiry based instruction strategies with the resource teacher.</p> <p>5.Science teachers will instruct students using the core curriculum and inquiry based instruction strategies.</p> <p>6.At the end of the unit, teachers will give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>7.Teachers will bring</p> | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>8. Based on the data, teachers discuss inquiry based instruction strategies that were effective.</p> <p>9. Based on data, PLCs will use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning inquiry based instruction strategies.</p> <p>10. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.</p> | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| <u>Science Goal #1:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p> <p>In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 33%-43%.</p> | (33%) | (43%) | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|-------------|--|
| | | <p>1.2. Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students’ science skills will improve through participation in the 5E lesson plan model.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>1. Teachers will attend District Science training and share 5 E Lesson Plan Model information with their PLCs.</p> <p>2. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 70% or above on each unit of instruction.)</p> <p>3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively building 5E Lesson Plans.</p> <p>4. PLC teachers instruct students using the 5 E</p> | <p>1.2. <u>Who</u></p> <p>Principal AP Science Resource Teacher District Academic Coach Science Teachers</p> <p><u>How Monitored</u></p> <p>- PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. - Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. - Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. - The district walk-through checklist will be used to monitor fidelity of best practices outlined in the SIP across the entire faculty</p> | <p>1.2. PLCs will review evaluation data.</p> <p>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 70% mastery on units of instruction.</p> <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Administration, Science Resource Teacher and District Science Academic Coach. The Science Resource Teacher and District Science Academic Coach will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | |
|--|--|---|---|--|-------------|--|

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Lesson Plans.</p> <p>5. At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>7. Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans.</p> <p>8. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of 5 E Lesson planning.</p> <p>9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.</p> | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|-------------|--|--|
| | | <p>1.3.</p> <p>- Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data.</p> <p>- Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> <p>Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students’ science skills will improve through teachers using the active thinking strategy on identified tested benchmarks (<i>this can be bell work</i>)</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, PLCs identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation.</p> <p>2. Based on the data, PLCs develop a 10 day projected timeline/ calendar for re-teaching the essential skills and/ or standards covered in the core curriculum.</p> <p>3. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>Teachers Principal AP Science Resource Teacher District Academic Coach</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Evidence of strategies in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.</p> <p>-Classroom walk-throughs show evidence of this strategy.</p> <p>-The district walk-through checklist will be used to monitor fidelity of best practices outlined in the SIP across the entire faculty</p> <p>-Monitored data will be reviewed every nine weeks.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> | <p>1.3.</p> <p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>-</p> <p>District-level baseline and mid-year tests</p> <p>-</p> <p><u>During Grading Period</u></p> <p>District-level baseline and Big Idea Chapter tests.</p> <p>Midyear mini assessments</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|-------------|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------|---|---|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>4.As a PLC, teachers develop a school-based assessment that covers all mini lesson skills taught within the nine week period.</p> <p>5.PLCs record their work in logs.</p> | <p>-Another fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/ timeline/ logs of targeted</p> <p>- Administration and Science Resource Teacher will review the calendars/ logs and make progress statements at the end of each nine weeks</p> | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | | | |
| | | | Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.</p> | <p>2.1.</p> <p>- Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques.</p> <p>- PLC meetings do not focus on higher order questioning strategies for upcoming lessons.</p> <p>- Administrators are at varying skill levels with identification of HOT/questioning.</p> | <p>2.1. <u>Strategy:</u></p> <p>Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students’ science skills will improve through participation in Higher Level Questioning training. As a result, there will be increased use of higher level questions versus lower level questions for both teachers and students.</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <p>1. Science teachers attend on-going training</p> | <p>2.1. <u>Who</u></p> <p>-Administration -Science Resource Teacher -District Academic Coach -Reading Coach</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. specific strategy. -The district walk-through checklist will be used to monitor fidelity of best practices outlined in the SIP across the entire faculty.</p> | <p>2.1.</p> <p>PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet).</p> <p>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.</p> <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Administration</p> | <p>2.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>- District-level baseline and mid-year tests</p> <p>- <u>During Grading Period</u></p> <p>District-level baseline and Big Idea Chapter tests. Midyear mini assessments</p> | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>provided by the Reading Coach and Science Resource Teacher.</p> <p>2. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 70% or above on each unit of instruction.)</p> <p>3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss strategies and their implementation in the upcoming lessons.</p> <p>4. Teachers implement</p> | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>the targeted higher order questioning strategies in their lessons.</p> <p>5. Teachers implement the common assessments.</p> <p>6. Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>7. PLCs study students' responses to the higher order questions to assess students' higher order thinking processes.</p> <p>8. Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher order strategy implementati</p> | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | on. 9.PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. | | | | | |
| In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 2% to 15% | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | (2%) | (15%) | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | <p>2.2.</p> <p>- Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.</p> <p>-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.</p> <p>-Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.</p> <p>- Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> <p>Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students’ science comprehension will improve through teachers using the Continuous Improvement Model with core curriculum and providing Differentiated Instruction as a result of the problem-solving model.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>1. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.)</p> <p>2. As a Professional Development activity, teachers use district textbook adopted materials and resources within their PLCs to plan and deliver lessons.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-Principal</p> <p>-AP</p> <p>-Science Resource Teacher</p> <p>-District Academic Coach</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration classroom walk-throughs.</p> <p>-The district walk-through checklist will be used to monitor fidelity of best practices outlined in the SIP across the entire faculty.</p> | <p>2.2.</p> <p>PLC unit assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet).</p> <p>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.</p> <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Administration and Science Resource Teacher. They will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> | <p>2.2.2.2.</p> <p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>-</p> <p>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During Nine Weeks</u></p> <p>Big Idea Chapter Tests</p> <p>Unit assessments</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>3.As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling researched-based best-practice strategies.</p> <p>4.PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating DI strategies from their PLC discussions.</p> <p>5.At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>6.Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>7.Based on the data, teachers discuss strategies that were effective.</p> <p>8.Based on the data, teachers: 1) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, 2) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons or re-teach for</p> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>the whole class 3) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students (remediation and enrichment).</p> <p>9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.</p> | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | <p>2.3</p> <p>-Teacher support for planning remediation and enrichment activities</p> <p>-Teacher support for the DI strategy</p> | <p>2.3</p> <p>Tier 1 – Students’ science skills will advance through participation in enrichment activities during a <u>30 minute supplemental instruction period per week.</u> Students who are not assigned to re-teaching lessons in reading, math or writing for the week, will participate instead in a science enrichment lesson.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>1. Weekly, teams will collaborate and regroup students across the four teachers based on student need. The science teachers will determine science enrichment activity.</p> <p>2. Students who are eligible attend the enrichment session.</p> <p>3. In the enrichment sessions, students will engage in project-type activities.</p> | <p>2.3</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>Science teachers</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Team re-grouping of students by teacher and topic/lesson turned into APC weekly.</p> <p>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.</p> | <p>2.3</p> <p>Evaluation of project using a rubric.</p> <p>Teachers review data at PLC meetings. PLC facilitator will share data with the Administration and Science Resource Teacher. They will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p> | <p><u>2.3 During Nine Weeks</u></p> <p>Student projects</p> | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | 4. PLCs record their work in logs. | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|

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 |
|---|-------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Long Term Investigations | All Levels | Science Coach, Science Resource Teacher | All grade levels | September | Walkthroughs, observation | Administration |
| Science Content | All levels | Science coach Science Resource Teacher | All grade levels | November-March | Walkthroughs, observation | Administration |

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

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

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.</p> | <p>1.1. - Teachers lack skill and understanding regarding the FCAT Writing Assessment and Scoring Rubric. - Teachers new to Language Arts may not have FCAT Writing training - Teachers do not have confidence using holistic scoring methods - Teachers lack sufficient time to score student papers - Teachers lack common planning time to meet in PLCs to discuss common deficiencies in writing</p> | <p>1.1. <u>Strategy:</u> Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students’ writing skills will improve through participation of best practices for teaching writing. Best practices include <u>PLC instructional calendars. Differentiated Instruction and effective holistic scoring methods.</u></p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u> 1. As a Professional Development activity, teachers new to the profession and/or content area are required to attend district level trainings. 2. As a Professional Development activity, teachers participate in</p> | <p>1.1. <u>Who</u> Principal AP Writing Resource Teacher PLCs <u>How</u> - PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. - Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. - Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.</p> | <p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> _____ <u>PLC/Department Level</u> PLCs will identify trends (deficiencies and growth) in student writing performance and collaborate to modify the instructional calendar to provide differentiated instruction as appropriate. PLCs - Review of monthly formative writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric. PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching 4.0 or above on the monthly writing prompt. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team_____ <u>Leadership Team Level</u> The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends. PLCs will participate in rubric Norming sessions to identify teacher barriers impeding effective holistic scoring.</p> | <p>1.1. _____ _____ <u>During Grading Period</u> Writing Prompts STAR conference</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>assessment and rubric refresher courses and practice scoring within PLCs.</p> <p>3. As a Professional Development activity, Language Arts SAL/DH and grade level (PLC) chairs will facilitate advanced scoring sessions.</p> <p>4. Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each nine weeks. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the monthly formative writing prompt.)</p> <p>5. As a Professional Development activity PLC discussions draw teachers to a consensus regarding student trends, needs, and scores based on connecting student writing</p> | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>with state anchors.</p> <p>6. Based on student writing reviews and PLC discussions regarding trends and needs, teachers create monthly writing menus for craft, elaboration, and genres as a list of essential teaching points for the month ahead.</p> <p>7. Teachers implement the ideas based on specific student needs.</p> <p>8. As a Professional Development activity PLCs examine student conference notes, daily drafts, and monthly demand writes and adjust the monthly writing menu of teaching points and share ideas to grow students.</p> <p>9. PLCs review nine week data, set a new goal for the following nine weeks.</p> | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------|------------------|------|------|--|
| | | 10. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. | | | | | |
| In grades 3-5, the percentage of AYP All Curriculum (AC) students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Writing will increase from 81% to 85%. | <u>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| | (81%) | (85%) | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Evaluation Tools | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

riting/Language Arts Professional Development

Professional

Hillsborough 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised July, 2012

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

**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 Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>1. Attendance</p> | <p>1.1. Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance. -Lack of time to focus on attendance -Lack of staff to focus on attendance</p> | <p>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</p> | <p>1.1 Social Worker will run Attendance/Tardy meetings every 20 days with appropriate reports Social Worker will maintain data base</p> | <p>1.1. Administration Team and subset of PSLT will examine data monthly</p> | <p>1.1. Attendance Report Tardy Report Attendance Plan</p> | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|

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

| Attendance Goal #1: | <u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u> | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>-The attendance rate will increase from 94.8% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012\-\-2013.</p> <p>-The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease from 176 in 2011-2012 to 130 in 2012-2013.</p> | | | | | | | |
| | 94.8 | 96 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u> | | | | | |
| | 176 | 130 | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| | <u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u> | | | | | |
| | 207 | 175 | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader Social Worker | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| Attendance Plan | | Administrators Social Worker | At Administrator staff meeting | August/October/Jan | Review plan and student data every 20 days | Social Worker |

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 | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>1. Suspension</p> | <p>1.1. There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.</p> | <p>1.1. Positive Behavior Support (PBS) monitors the school-wide expectations and rules while also providing training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations New behavior plan implemented school wide. Staff trained during pre-planning. Love and Logic behavior training for all staff.</p> | <p>1.1. PSLT “behavior” subgroup</p> | <p>1.1. PSLT and Administration with review data on Office Discipline Referrals and out of school suspensions monthly</p> | <p>1.1. Crystal Report ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data</p> | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|

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

| Suspension Goal #1: | 2012 Total Number of | 2013 Expected Number of | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | In-School Suspensions | In-School Suspensions | | | | | |
| <p>The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease from 2 in 2010-2011 to 1 in 2011- 2012</p> | | | | | | | |
| <p>-The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension will decrease from 5 in 2011-2012 to 4 in 2012-2013</p> | | | | | | | |
| <p>-The total number of Out-of-Suspensions will decrease from 8 in 2011-2012 to 7 in 2012-2013.</p> | | | | | | | |
| <p>- The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10% for the 2012-2013</p> | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| school year. | | | | | | | |
| | 5 | 4 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended</u> <u>In-School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended</u> <u>In-School</u> | | | | | |
| | 5 | 4 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | | | | | |
| | 8 | 7 | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended</u> <u>Out- of- School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended</u> <u>Out- of-School</u> | | | | | |
| | 8 | 7 | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. Data indicates that there is wide variation in the number of discipline referrals generated across classrooms. | 1.2. PSLT “Managing and Motivating” subgroup will review data and make recommendations to the PSLT for additional training in classroom management for teachers in need (CHAMPS) | 1.2. “Managing and Motivating” subgroup PSLT | 1.2. Administration and PSLT will review data on Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) and out of school suspensions monthly in targeted classrooms | 1.2. “UNTIE” ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|---------------------------------|--|
| | | 1.3. Few opportunities exist for students to connect and establish mentoring relationships with adults at school. | 1.3. Tier 2: “Check In” program will be implemented to support students who accrue more than 3 suspension days in one semester. | 1.3 Guidance Social Worker School Psychologist. | 1.3. A subgroup of the Problem Solving Leadership Team will review suspension data and determine the percent of student with 10 or more suspensions per semester. The Team will review suspension data biweekly and report progress to PSLT monthly | 1.3. Monthly Suspension Data | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|---------------------------------|--|

Suspension Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|--|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Additional Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | 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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p>1. Health and Fitness Goal</p> | <p>1.</p> | <p>1. Elementary School students will engage 150 minutes of p.e. per week in grades Kindergarten through 5.</p> | <p>1. Principal Assistant Principal</p> | <p>1. Classroom walkthroughs Class schedules</p> | <p>1. Classroom teachers document in their lesson plans 90 min. Teacher Directed pe per week Physical Ed. Teachers schedules will reflect 60 minutes</p> | | |
| <p>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 75% on the Pretest to 85% on the Posttest</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level :*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level :*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>75%</p> | <p>85%</p> | | | | | |
| | | | <p>2.Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by PE teacher</p> | <p>2.PE teacher</p> | <p>2.Data on the number of students scoring in the Health Fitness Zone (HFZ)</p> | <p>2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health</p> | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----|---|--------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| | | 3. | 3.Use of fitness course equipment:walking/jogging/running in designated areas. Exercising to outdoor activities from 150 Minutes of Elem PE | 3.PE Teacher | 3.Lesson plans of PE teacher | 3.PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM Pacer for assessing cardiovascular health | |
|--|--|----|---|--------------|------------------------------|---|--|

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

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

| | Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
| <p>1. Continuous Improvement Goal</p> | <p>1.1. - Not enough time to meet</p> | <p>1.1. PLCs will meet after faculty meetings and when possible for additional time. An additional hour one Monday a month will be dedicated to reviewing data for alignment.</p> | <p>1.1. <u>Who</u> Administration <u>How</u> - Administration will review PLCs logs and provide feedback as needed.</p> | <p>1.1. PLST will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process.</p> | <p>1.1. PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST team on progress of their PLC.</p> | | |

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

| Continuous Improvement Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p> <p>The articulation and alignment will increase between the grade levels from 64% to 70%</p> | | | | | | | |
| | 64% | 70% | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|-------------|--|
| | <p>1.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not all staff is trained in PLCs. - PLC Facilitators/ Team Leaders are not all trained to lead PLCs. - Difficulty making the transition for keeping meetings focused. <p>1.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PLCs do not always have a clear focus - PLCs not sure what they should be doing in the meetings. | <p>1.2.</p> <p>Vertical PLC's during Staff PLC's</p> | <p>1.2.</p> <p>Principal and trained staff members</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administration monitor | <p>1.2.</p> <p>PSLT will review data.</p> | <p>1.2.</p> <p>PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST team on progress of their PLC..</p> | <p>1.2.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|-------------|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------|---|------|--|
| | | 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 work. | 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. | 1.3. PSLT will review data | 1.3. PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST team on progress of their PLC. | 1.3. | |
|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------|---|------|--|

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------|--|------|------|------|--|--|
| A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9). | A.1. | A.1. See Reading Goal 5d | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | | |
|---|------|--|------|------|------|--|--|

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

| <u>Reading Goal A:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.</p> | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | |
| | | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------|--|------|------|------|--|--|
| <p>B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</p> | B.1. | B.1. See Reading Goal 5d | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. | | |
|---|------|--|------|------|------|--|--|

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

| Reading Goal B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.</p> | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | |
| | | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | |

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

| | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| CELLA Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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

| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | |
|--|--|--|----------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--|
| C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking. | 1.1. | 1.1. See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2,5C.3 and 5C.4 | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
| <p><u>CELLA Goal #C:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/ Speaking section of CELLA will increase from 44% to 49%</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u></p> | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|------|
| | 49% | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | |
| | | | Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | | |
| D. Students scoring proficient in Reading. | 2.1. | 2.1. See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4 | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|------|
| <p><u>CELLA Goal #D:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 30% to 35%.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p>35%</p> | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| <p>Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</p> | <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Fidelity Check</p> <p>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p> | <p>Strategy Data Check</p> <p>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p> | <p>Student Evaluation Tool</p> | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| <p>E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.</p> | <p>2.1.</p> | <p>2.1. See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4</p> | <p>2.1.</p> | <p>2.1.</p> | <p>2.1.</p> | |
| <p><u>CELLA Goal #E:</u> The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 28% to 33%..</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u></p> | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 28% | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|---------------------|---|---|--|-------------------------|--|--|
| F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9). | F.1. | F.1. See Math Goal 5d | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | | |

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

| Mathematics Goal F: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|--|------|------|------|------|--|
| <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.</p> | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | |
| | | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|--|
| <p>G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</p> | <p>G.1.</p> | <p>G.1. See Math Goal 5d</p> | <p>G.1.</p> | <p>G.1.</p> | <p>G.1.</p> | | |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|--|

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

| <u>Mathematics Goal</u> G: | <u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|--|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | |
| | | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | |

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

Hillsborough 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised July, 2012

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

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).</p> | <p>J.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs To address this barrier as needed</p> | <p>J.1. <u>Strategy</u> SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement</p> | <p>J.1. <u>Who</u> Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Specialist <u>How</u> IEP Progress Reports Academic Reviews</p> | <p>J.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC Level</u> -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p> | <p>Teacher made Assessments District Assessments as Appropriate</p> | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons. | | | | | |
| <p><u>Science Goal J:</u></p> <p>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.</p> | <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> | <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> | | | | | |
| | <p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p> | <p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p> | | | | | |
| | | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | |
| | | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | |

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|-------------|--|--|
| <p>M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).</p> | <p>M.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs To address this barrier.</p> | <p>M.1. <u>Strategy</u> SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/ SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.</p> | <p>M.1. <u>Who</u> Principal, ESE specialist, Assistant Principal <u>How</u> IEP Progress Reports Academic Reviews</p> | <p>M.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <u>PLC Level</u> -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.</p> | <p>M.1.</p> | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|-------------|--|--|

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

| <u>Writing Goal M:</u> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
|--|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. | |
| | | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | |

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

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

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

| 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 |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| <u>STEM Goal #1:</u> Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science | 1.1 Need common planning time for math, science, and resource teachers | 1.1 -Team planning -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc. -Fifth grade teachers will implement robotics into math and science. | 1.1 PLC or grade level lead | 1.1 Administrative/resource teacher walk-throughs | 1.1 Formative assessments Chapter tests |
| | 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

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

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

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

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| <p><u>CTE Goal #1:</u></p> <p>Increase student interest in career opportunities and program selection</p> <p>Prior to middle school. The school will increase frequency of career exposure activities/events from 25% in 2011-2012 to 35% in 2012-2013.</p> | <p>1.</p> | <p>1. Provide field trips to local businesses or CTE student competitions</p> | <p>1.</p> | <p>1.</p> | <p>1. Log of CTE field</p> |
| | <p>2.</p> | <p>2. Implement guidance and APC Middle School presentations/ visits from feeder patterns and magner) regarding CTE coursework options</p> | <p>2.</p> | <p>2.</p> | <p>2. Log of middle school presentations regarding CTE course options</p> |
| | <p>3.</p> | <p>3.</p> | <p>3.</p> | <p>3.</p> | <p>3.</p> |

CTE Professional Development

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

Hillsborough 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised July, 2012

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

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)

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

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

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

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

| Describe the use of SAC funds. | | | |
|--|--|------------------|--------------|
| Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan | Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement | Projected Amount | Final Amount |
| Reading Goal #1 | Reading Materials for classroom use. Reading Materials for Parent Resource room | \$2196.24 | |
| FCAT-2.0:Students scoring proficient | | | |

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

| | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--|
| In reading (level 3-5) | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Final Amount Spent | | | |