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

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

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)/ | Number of | Number of | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ | |
|------------------------|---------------|--|----------------|---------------|---|--|
| | | | Years at | Years as an | Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest | |
| | | Certification(s) | Current School | Administrator | 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) | |
| Principal | MARLOU BATES | School Principal, Educational Leadership, | 4 | 11 | 11-12 C Monitor Status | |
| | | Emotionally | | | 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, | 8 | 8 | 11-12 C Monitor Status | |
| | | ESOL | | | 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.

| Subject | Name | Degree(s)/ | Number of | Number of Years as | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ |
|---------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------|--|
| | | | Years at | an | Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, |
| Area | | Certification(s) | Current School | | Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated |
| | | | | Instructional Coach | 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- | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| of-field/ and who are not highly qualified. | |
| 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)).

| To tal Nu m ber | % of Fir st-Ye | % of Te ach ers | % of Te ach ers | % of Te ach ers | % of Te ach ers | % Hi gh ly Qu | % Re ad ing En | % Na tio nal Bo | % ES OL End |
|--|------------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| of In str uc tio nal Sta ff | ar Te ach ers | with 1-5 Yea rs of Exp erie nce | with 6- 14 Yea rs of Exp erie nce | with 15+ Yea rs of Exp erie nce | th Ad van ced De gre es | alif ied Te ac her s | dor sed Te ach ers | ard Ce rtif ied Te ac her s | orse d Tea cher s |
| 80 | 11 % (9) | 33 % (26) | 41 % (33) | 15 % (12) | 29 % (23) | 98 % (78) | 4% (3) | 1% (1) | 8 |

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 | Comontho | 17. 17 | 01 |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------|
| | Samantha | Kim Van | Obse |
| VanBibber | Schwiegerat | Bibber is | rving, |
| | h | a Mentor | coaching, |
| | | with EET | and |
| | | initiative. | mentoring |
| | | She has | |
| | | strengths in | |
| | | the areas of | |
| | | leadership, | |
| | | mentoring, | |
| | | and | |
| | | increasing | |
| | | student | |
| | | achievement. | |
| Kim | Rebecca | Kim Van | Obse |
| VanBibber | Fernandez | Bibber is | rving, |
| | | a Mentor | coaching, |
| | | with EET | and |
| | | initiative. | mentoring |
| | | She has | 8 |
| | | strengths in | |
| | | the areas of | |
| | | leadership, | |
| | | mentoring, | |
| | | and | |
| | | increasing | |
| | | student | |
| | | achievement. | |

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

| 17. | 7 ,1 | 77. 77 | 01 |
|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| Kim | Jonathan | Kim Van | Obse |
| VanBibber | McCormick | Bibber is | rving, |
| | | a Mentor | coaching, |
| | | with EET | and |
| | | initiative. | mentoring |
| | | She has | |
| | | strengths in | |
| | | the areas of | |
| | | leadership, | |
| | | mentoring, | |
| | | and | |
| | | increasing | |
| | | student | |
| | | achievement. | |
| Kim | Jennifer | Kim Van | Obse |
| VanBibber | Garrison | Bibber is | rving, |
| | | a Mentor | coaching, |
| | | with EET | and |
| | | initiative. | mentoring |
| | | She has | C |
| | | strengths in | |
| | | the areas of | |
| | | leadership, | |
| | | mentoring, | |
| | | and | |
| | | increasing | |
| | | student | |
| | | achievement. | |

| Kim | Sara Schell | Kim Van | Obse |
|-----------|--------------|---|------------------|
| VanBibber | | Bibber is | rving, |
| | | a Mentor | coaching, |
| | | with EET | and |
| | | initiative. | mentoring |
| | | She has | |
| | | strengths in | |
| | | the areas of | |
| | | leadership, | |
| | | mentoring, | |
| | | and . | |
| | | increasing | |
| | | student | |
| 77. | N. 1 G | achievement. | 0.1 |
| Kim | Nicole Carta | Kim Van | Obse |
| VanBibber | | Bibber is | rving, |
| | | a Mentor | coaching, |
| | | | |
| | | with EET | and |
| | | initiative. | and mentoring |
| | | initiative. She has | |
| | | initiative. She has strengths in | |
| | | initiative. She has strengths in the areas of | |
| | | initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, | |
| | | initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, | |
| | | initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and | |
| | | initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing | |
| | | initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and | |

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

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.

| Title I, Part D |
|---|
| The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice. |
| |
| |
| Title II |
| The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training. In addition, the funds are utilized in the Salary Differential Program at Renaissance schools. |
| Title III |
| Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners |
| |
| Title X- Homeless |
| The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education |
| |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) |
| SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs. |
| |
| |
| Violence Prevention Programs |
| NA |
| |
| |

| Nutrition Programs |
|--|
| NA |
| Housing Programs |
| Housing Frograms |
| 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

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

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

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

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

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

• 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. | 1003.4 | 13 | (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 <u>High School Feedback Report</u> . |
| |
| |

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

| Reading Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme nt | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|--|--|-------------------------|--|
| 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

| 1. FCAT 2.0: Students | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
| scoring proficient in | | G | **** | n , , , | 2 D W | |
| reading (Level 3-5). | - Lack of | Strategy: | Who_ | Teacher Level | 2-3x Per Year | |
| | understanding | Tier 1 - The | -Principal | -Teachers reflect on lessons | - FAIR On-going | |
| | of how to use | purpose of this | ri ililçipai | | Progress Monitoring in | |
| | FCAT 2.0 | | -AP | specific evidence of learning | | |
| | ptem questions | strengthen the | | and use this knowledge to | comprehension | |
| | a arring brian e a | core curriculum. | | drive future instruction. | -Reading Formative 3x/yr | |
| | reading. | Students' reading | | drive ruture mstruction. | riceauling i offiliative 3x/yi | |
| | T1 C | comprehension will | | Teachers maintain their | Grades 2-5 | |
| | -Lack of | improve through | | assessments in the on-line | Grades 2-5 | |
| | common | teachers using the | | grading system. | | |
| | | a a | | grading system. | F | |
| | practices before | | -PLC logs turned | -Teachers use the on-line | | |
| | the unit of | Model | into administration. | grading system data to | | |
| | instruction. | | Administration | calculate their students' | | |
| | instruction. | (C-CIM) with | provides feedback. | progress towards the | | |
| | -Lack of | core curriculum | | SMART Goal developed in | | |
| | common | 1 | Classicolli walk- | their PLC. | | |
| | planning time | D. 00 | throughs observing | | | |
| | to identify and | | this strategy. Administrators will | -Teachers chart their | During Grading Period | |
| | analyze core | 1. 0.1 | use the HCPS Informal | students' individual progress | | |
| | | 11 1 . | use the free 5 informat | towards the SMART Goal. | | |
| | | model. | Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool) | | G | |
| | dssessificites. | | Evidence of strategy | L | - Common assessments | |
| | -Lack of | L | in teachers' lesson | | DRAs, Running Records, | |
| | planning time | | plans seen during | PLC/Department Level | EASI CBM, District Formatives | |
| | to analyze data | | r | | Formatives | |
| | to identify best | | l | PLC unit assessment data | | |
| | practices. | - | _ | will be recorded in a course- | | |
| | praetices. | A -4: C4 | | specific PLC data base | | |
| | - Need | Action Steps: | | (excel spread sheet). | | |
| | | 1. PLCs write | -Monitoring data will | | | |
| | | | be reviewed every nine | | | |
| | _ | based on each nine | | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | | weeks of material. | | assessments and chart the | | |
| | | (For example, | | increase in the number of | | |
| | - Teachers | during the first nine | | students reaching at least | | |
| | | weeks, 75% of the | | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | | students will score | | instruction. | | |
| | | an 80% or above | | msu ucuon. | | |
| | of | on each unit of | | | | |
| | Differentiated | instruction.) | | | | |
| | Instruction | <u> </u> | | | | |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

| | | <u> </u> |
|----------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| (both with the | | PLC facilitator will share |
| low performing | Professional | data with the Problem |
| and high | Development | Solving Leadership Team. |
| performing | activity in | The Problem Solving |
| students). | their PLCs, | Leadership Team/Reading |
| | teachers spend | Leadership Team will |
| | time sharing, | review assessment data |
| | researching, | for positive trends at a |
| | teaching, and | minimum of once per nine |
| | modeling | weeks. |
| | researched-based | weeks. |
| | | |
| | best-practice | F 1 1 1 |
| | strategies. | Leadership Team Level |
| | h mr a | Cadersing ream Level |
| | 3. PLC teachers | -PLC facilitator/ Grade Area |
| | instruct students | Leader/ Resource Teachers |
| | using the core | shares data with the Problem |
| | curriculum, | Solving Leadership Team. |
| | incorporating | Solving Ecuacismp Team. |
| | DI strategies | -Data will be used to plan |
| | from their PLC | for future supplemental |
| | discussions. | |
| | | instruction. |
| | 4. At the end of | |
| | the unit, teachers | F |
| | give a common | |
| | assessment | |
| | identified from the | |
| | core curriculum | |
| | material. | |
| | | |
|] | 5. Teachers bring | |
| | assessment data | |
| | back to the PLCs. | |
| | odek to the Les. | |
|] | 6. Based on the | |
| | data, teachers | |
| | | |
|] | discuss strategies | |
| | that were effective. | |
| | 7. Deced on the | |
|] | 7. Based on the | |
|] | data, teachers a) | |
| | decide what skills | |
| | need to be re-taught | |
| | in a whole lesson to | |

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

| | 1 | the entire class, b) | | I | 1 | | |
|---|---------------|----------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | decide what skills | | | | | |
| | | need to be moved | | | | | |
| | | to mini-lessons or | | | | | |
| | | re-teach for the | | | | | |
| | | whole class and c) | | | | | |
| | | decide what skills | | | | | |
| | | need to re-taught to | | | | | |
| | | targeted students. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 8. Teachers provide | | | | | |
| | | Differentiated | | | | | |
| | | Instruction to | | | | | |
| | | targeted students | | | | | |
| | | (remediation and | | | | | |
| | | enrichment). | | | | | |
| | | em iemnemi). | | | | | |
| | | 0 77 0 | | | | | |
| | | 9. PLCs record | | | | | |
| | | their work in logs. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #1: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected Level | | | | | |
| Treating Goal #1. | Level of | of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Performance:* | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Enter reserving for the condition this | | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| 004. | | | | | | | |
| 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% | | | | | | | |
| | 1001 | - 40 / | | | | | |
| | 49% | 54% | | | | | |
| | • / / 0 | ~ ' ' ' | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 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 | Anticipated | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | |
|---|-------------|----------|----------------|---|-------------------------|--|
| achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | , | How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | | |

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

| 2. FCAT 2.0: Students | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | F.11. | |
| scoring Achievement | | | | | | |
| Levels 4 or 5 in reading. | | Strategy: | <u>Who</u> | Teacher Level | 2-3x Per Year | |
| | T1 | Tier 1 – The | Duin ain al | Tanahana naflast an lasaana | EAID | |
| | | | - Principal | | - FAIR | |
| | | purpose of this | | during the unit citing/using | | |
| | levels with | | | specific evidence of learning | -formative data_ | |
| | higher order | strengthen the | | and use this knowledge to | | |
| | questioning | core curriculum. | | drive future instruction. | | |
| | techniques. | Students' reading | | | | |
| | | comprehension will | <u>How</u> | -Teachers maintain their | | |
| | PLC meetings | improve through | | assessments in the on-line | | |
| | do not focus | participation in | HCPS Informal | grading system. | | |
| | on higher order | | Observation Pop- | [| | |
| | questioning | Ouestioning | In Form (EET tool) | -Teachers use the on-line | | |
| | strategies for | (input, process, | (which has HOTS as a | grading system data to | During Grading Period | |
| | upcoming | and output) in | strategy listed on the | calculate the average unit | During Ordanig i Oriou | |
| | lessons. | Reading, Language | form.) | assessment score for all their | | |
| | 10550115. | Arts, Science, and | | students per class/course. | | |
| | | Social Studies. | | students per class/course. | -Student work/projects | |
| | | | | To a disconsistent discin | l i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i | |
| | | As a result, there | | -Teachers chart their | -comprehension checks | |
| | | will be increased | | students' individual progress | Comprehension encons | |
| | skill levels with | | | towards mastery. | -Fluency Assessments | |
| | identification. | level questions | | | 1 raciney 7 (35e35inents | |
| | | versus lower level | | H- | | |
| | | questions for | | DI C/Dtt I1 | | |
| | | both teachers and | | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | | students. | | PLCs examine student work | | |
| | | | | and data from CIM. | | |
| | | | | and data from Chvi. | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | Data from review of skill | | |
| | | F | | | | |
| | | A -4: C4 | | assessments will be analyzed | | |
| | | Action Steps: | | at PLC meetings. | | |
| | | 1. As a | | | | |
| | | professional | | | | |
| | | development | | DI C C : 11: 4 : 11 1 | | |
| | | activity, PLCs | | PLC facilitator will share | | |
| | | study questioning | | data with the Problem | | |
| | | techniques. | | Solving Leadership Team. | | |
| | | techniques. | | | | |
| | | 2. Teachers | | | | |
| | | | | l | | |
| | | implement lessons | | Leadership Team Level | | |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

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

| Reading Goal #2: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| 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%. | | | | | | | |
| | 21% | 31% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | | 2.2. | 2.2. | |

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

| 3. FCAT 2.0: Points for | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|------|--|
| students making Learning | | [· · · | | | | |
| Gains in reading. | See 1.1 | See 1.1 | See 1.1 | See 1.1 | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #3: | 2012 Current Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | <u>Level of</u> Performance:* | of Performance:* | | | | |
| | r criormance. | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this | | | | | | |
| box. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | |
| r- rome. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 56 Pts | 62 nts | | | | |
| | DO 1 13 | խ∠ բւծ | | | | |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

| | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | |
|--|------------------------|----------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 33. | 3.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | A 41 1 1 | G4 4 | ETTE CL | St. 4. D.4. Cl. 1 | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
| to "Guiding Questions", identify | | | Who and how will the | How will the evaluation tool | | | |
| and define areas in need of improvement for the following | | | fidelity be monitored? | data be used to determine the | | | |
| group: | | | | effectiveness of strategy? | | | |

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Points for | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1 | 4.1. | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|
| • | H.1. | 4.1. | H.1. | H. I | H.1. | |
| students in Lowest 25% | | | | L | L I | |
| making learning gains in | | Strategy: | Who_ | Teacher Level | 2-3x Per Year | |
| reading. | T1 | Tier 1 – The | -Principal | Teachers reflect on lessons | EAID | |
| | - Teachers at | purpose of this | | during the unit citing/using | Fraik | |
| | varying skills | strategy is to | -AP | charific avidence of learning | l l | |
| | | strengthen the | Al | specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to | -Formative Tests | |
| | FCIM model. | core curriculum. | | drive future instruction. | | |
| | m 1 , | Students' reading | | drive ruture mstruction. | ⊢ I | |
| | - Teachers' | comprehension will | | Teachers maintain their | | |
| | implementation | improve through | | assessments in their data | | |
| | of the FCIM | teachers using the | | binder. | | |
| | model is not | TOTAL TOTAL | | omder . | | |
| | consistent | identified tested | -PLC logs turned | -Teachers chart their | | |
| | across | benchmarks on | into administration. | students' individual progress | | |
| | language arts | District Formative | Administration | towards mastery. | 1 | |
| | and reading | tests, FAIR and | provides feedback. | to wards musicity. | | |
| | courses. | Fluency checks | D :1 | | During Grading Period | |
| | - District mini | in reading and | Evidence of strategy | | -Fluency Assessment | |
| | lessons, mini | Language Arts | in teachers' lesson | PLC/Department Level | Data | |
| | assessments | classes. | plans seen during | | Data | |
| | and District | | administration walk- | -PLCs will review | | |
| | calendar do not | | throughs | assessment data. | | |
| | always align | | -Classroom walk- | | | |
| | with school | Action Steps: | l | -PLC facilitator will share | | |
| | student data. | | l | data with the Problem | | |
| | Student data. | 1. Through | Administrators will | Solving Leadership Team. | | |
| | - Lack of | data analysis of | | <u></u> | | |
| | common | FCAT, baseline | Observation Pop-In | -Tutors will share with | | |
| | planning time | data, classroom | L : | homeroom teacher progress | | |
| | to develop/ | assessments | F-CIM strategy will | of students. | | |
| | identify | and student | be added to the form | -Students will be placed in | | |
| | PLC based | performance, PLCs identify | · | | | |
| | mini lessons | essential tested | D \ | ELP to provide additional | | |
| | and mini | benchmarks for | | support. | | |
| | assessments | their students that | - Another fidelity | -Do, check, check, act will | | |
| | (using | need reinforcement | | be used. | | |
| | curriculum | and/or remediation. | calendars/timeline/ | oc used. | | |
| | based | and/of femediation. | logs of targeted skills | | | |
| | materials) | 2. As a | reviewed by the AP. | | | |
| | geared toward | Professional | | | | |
| | on-going | Development | | Γ | | |
| | progress | activity in their | | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | monitoring. | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| | PLCs, teachers | -With the Literacy | | |
| - Lack of | identify (using | Leadership Team, the | | |
| common | District resources | Problem Solving Leadership | | |
| planning time | and curriculum | Team 1) reviews FAIR data | | |
| to analyze mini | i resources) to plan | to determine the percentage | | |
| lesson data. | review lessons for | of students scoring medium | | |
| | benchmarks. | to high and 2) reviews | | |
| - Lack of | | course-generated nine week | | |
| | 3. Teachers | assessment that includes all | | |
| of when | implement the | skills covered during the | | |
| and how to | review lessons and | nine week period. | | |
| implement the | | r | | |
| mini lessons | | | | |
| within the | 4. Teachers bring | | | |
| | assessment data | The PSLT will review | | |
| guide. | back to the PLCs. | assessment data for positive | | |
| | | trends at a minimum of once | | |
| - Finding | 5. As a | per nine weeks. | | |
| appropriate tex | tProfessional | por mine woons. | | |
| to develop the | Development | | | |
| lessons and | activity in their | | | |
| assessments. | PLCs, teachers | | | |
| 3555551151165 | 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. | | | |
| | cacining schedule. | | | |
| | 6. PLCs record | | | |
| | their work in logs. | | | |
| | mon work in 10gs. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 1 | | | |

| Reading Goal #4: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|---|---|------------------------|--|-------------------------|------|--|
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | | |
| | 59 pts | 66 pts | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 4.2. | |
| | | 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 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 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|
| Achievable Annual Measurable | | | | | | | |
| Objectives (AMOs), Reading and | | | | | | | |
| Math Performance Target | | | | | | | |
| 5. Ambitious but | | | | | | | |
| Achievable Annual | | | | | | | |
| Measurable Objectives | | | | | | | |
| (AMOs). In six year | | | | | | | |
| school will reduce their | | | | | | | |
| achievement gap by 50%. | | | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #5: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| 5A. Student subgroups by | 5A 1 | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| ethnicity (White, Black, | 571.11. | 571.11 | 071.1. | 571.1. | D71.11. | |
| | XX71-:4 | C44 | XX71 | DI C/D-markus ant I assal | 2 D V | |
| | White: | Strategy: | Who_ | PLC/Department Level | 3x Per Year | |
| Indian) not making | Black: | Tier 1 – The | Principal | PLCs-Teachers assess | - FAIR | |
| satisfactory progress in | Diack. | purpose of this | i inicipai | students using mini- | 17th | |
| reading. | Hispanic: | | -AP | assessments. PLCs will | Formative Tests | |
| | | strengthen the | 111 | review assessments and | | |
| | Asian: | core curriculum. | -Reading Coach | chart the increase in the | During Grading Period | |
| | American Indian: | Students' | Trouumg courn | number of students reaching | | |
| | American maian. | vocabulary | -Subject Area | at least 80% mastery on | Running Records, | |
| | | acquisition will | Leaders and Grade | units of instruction. | comprehension checks, | |
| | | improve through | Level Subject PLC | | Fluency checks, | |
| | | the implementation | | | conferencing | |
| | | of appropriately | | | | |
| | -Lack of | leveled, | -Reading Leadership | PLCs will review evaluation | | |
| | common | vocabulary_ | Team | data. PLC facilitator will | | |
| | planning time. | development | | share data with the Problem | | |
| | | lessons across all | | Solving Leadership Team. | | |
| | -Teachers are | content areas. | | The Problem Solving | | |
| | at varying | | <u>How</u> | Leadership Team/Reading | | |
| | levels of | Action Steps: | -PLC logs turned | Leadership Team will | | |
| | understanding of the ELA | 1 DIG 1 11 | into administration. | review assessment data | | |
| | | 1. PLC schedule | Administration | for positive trends at a | | |
| | vocabulary | will provide | provides feedback. | minimum of once per nine | | |
| | standards. | common planning | provides recuback. | weeks. | | |
| | - Teachers | time. | -Classroom walk- | | | |
| | are at varying | 2. PLCs will | throughs observing | | | |
| | levels of | familiarize | this strategy. | | | |
| | | themselves with the | Administrators | | | |
| | of the types | | will use the HCPS | | | |
| | of vocabulary | content standards. | Informal Observation | | | |
| | items that | 3. PLCs will | Pop-In Form (EET | | | |
| | complement | recognize | tool - Vocabulary | | | |
| | content | vocabulary needs | strategy will be | | | |
| | instruction. | | added to the form | | | |
| | | area. | under Instructional | | | |
| | -PLC meetings | | Practices.) | | | |
| | _ | 4. PLCs come to | | | | |
| | discussion | consensus on the | -Evidence of strategy | | | |
| | of leveled | use of common | in teachers' lesson | | | |
| | vocabulary | assessments: 1) | plans seen during | | | |
| | development | vocabulary items | administration walk- | | | |
| | and assessment | included in end of | throughs. | | | |

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

| for content | the unit/segment | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| instruction. | assessment 2) | -Classroom walk- | | | |
| | LA- embedded | through form for | | | |
| -PLC meetings | | Grades K-12 Reading | | | |
| | development | Intervention classes | | | |
| include the | activities and/or | (available from | | | |
| | | | | | |
| development | | Reading Department) | | | |
| | assessment | | | | |
| instructional | provided in | -PSLT will review | | | |
| activities for | curriculum | student data and | | | |
| upcoming | resources and | fidelity data every nine | | | |
| lessons. | materials. | weeks. | | | |
| ecsons. | inatoriais. | W CORS. | | | |
| -Administrators | 5 Δς a | | | | |
| | Professional | 1 | | | |
| | | | [| | |
| | Development | | [| | |
| | activity, PLCs | | | | |
| | come to consensus | | | | |
| | on the vocabulary | | | | |
| appropriate | standards/ | | | | |
| | benchmark to be | | | | |
| | addressed within | | | | |
| | each content area. | | | | |
| de velopment. | cacii content area. | | | | |
| | 6. As a | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Professional | | | | |
| | Development | | | | |
| | activity, PLCs | | | | |
| | study the process | | | | |
| | of scaffolding | | | | |
| | lessons to move | | | | |
| | students to perform | | | | |
| | more complex | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | vocabulary | | | | |
| | acquisition tasks. | | | | |
| | L . | | | | |
| | 7. As a | | | | |
| | Professional | | | | |
| | Development | | [| | |
| | activity, PLCs | | [| | |
| | design specific | | | | |
| | scaffolded lessons | | | | |
| | essential in creating | , | [| | |
| | | | | | |
| | appropriate | | | | |
| | vocabulary | | | | |

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

| Reading Goal #5A: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected Level | | | |
|--|------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| _ | Level of | of Performance:* | | | |
| | Performance:* | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| The percentage of White | | | | | |
| students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ | l | | | | |
| FAA Reading will increase | | | | | |
| from 60% to 70%. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| The percentage of Black_ | | | | | |
| students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ | | | | | |
| FAA Reading will increase | | | | | |
| from 38% to 50%. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| The percentage of Hispanic_ | | | | | |
| students scoring proficient/ | | | | | |
| satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ | 1 | | | | |
| FAA Reading will increase | | | | | |
| from 46% to 60%. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | White: 60% | White:70% | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Black:38% | Black:50% | | | |
| | Ilianonia | Hignoria:600/ | | | |
| | Hispanic 46%: | Hispanic:60% | | | |
| | | Asian: | | | |
| | Asian: | | | | |
| | | American Indian: | | | |
| | American | | | | |
| | Indian: | | | | |

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

| 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teacher support for planning remediation and enrichment activities -Teacher support for the strategy | reading comprehension will improve through the implementation | AP Principal Team Leaders | Teachers Teachers analyze mini assessment data on skills taught/reviewed in supplemental instructional period. | 3x per year (Reading) - FAIR During Nine Weeks -Running Records, |
| | during the previous week. 2. Students will either have a re-teach or enrichment activity. 3. Re-teach sessions will be assessd with a mini-assessment to demonstrate mastery. 4. PLCs record their work in logs. | -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedbackTeacher re-grouping of students and topic/lesson turned inClassroom walk-through observing this strategy. | Teachers review data at PLC meetings. PLC/Department Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. Leadership Team Level The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | |
| 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|--|
| 5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. See 5A.1 | ^{5B.1.} See 5A.1 | | See 5A.1 | |
| | See 5A.1 | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #5B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | | | | |
| 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%. | | | | | | |
| | 43% | 55% | | | | |

| | | 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 | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
| achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | 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

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

| Reading Goal #5C: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------|--|
| In grades 3-5, ELL students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the FCAT reading will increase from 12% to 15% | | | | | | | |
| | 12% | 15% 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 | | 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

| 5D. Students with | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | \neg |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--------|
| | DD.11. | DD.11. | DD.11. | JB.11. | | |
| Disabilities (SWD) not | | G | **** | n , , , | | |
| making satisfactory | - No electronic | Strategy: | Who_ | Teacher Level | 3x Per Year | |
| progress in reading. | accessibility | SWDs reading | Principal, | -Teachers reflect on lessons | - FAIR | |
| | to FAA data | comprehension | | during the unit citing/using | | |
| | (instructional | will improve | | specific evidence of learning | | |
| | planning tool, | by connecting | | and use this knowledge to | F | |
| | mainframe, | individual needs | Assistant i inicipai | drive future instruction. | | |
| | etc.) | to instruction as | | drive ruture mstruction. | | |
| | G 11 .: | outlined in the | | Teachers maintain their | | |
| | -Collecting | IEP. | | | | |
| | data with | <u>1151</u> . | | line grading system. | During Grading Period | |
| | fidelity | | <u>How</u> | inic grading system. | | |
| | Tin danatan din . | | HED D. D. | -Teachers use the on-line | | |
| | -Understanding | L | -IEP Progress Reports | grading system data to | -Fluency Assessments | |
| | data and the | | | calculate their students' | | |
| | students' | Action Steps: | | progress towards 80% | Nine weeks grades for | |
| | disability | | | mastery of skills. | SWD students | |
| | to make | 1. General ed. and/ | | mastery of skins. | | |
| | instructional | or SWD teachers | | Teachers chart their | SRA records | |
| | decisions | will familiarize | | students' individual | | |
| | For conoral | themselves with | | progress. | | |
| | -For general | each student's | | progress. | | |
| | education teachers, | IEP goals, | | | | |
| | understanding | strategies and | | Γ | | |
| | the IEP and | accommodations. | | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | instructional | ο Γi | | | | |
| | | 2. Every nine | | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | ns | weeks the General | | assessments and chart the | | |
| | 115 | Ed and/or SWD | | increase in the number of | | |
| | -Teachers | teacher reviews students' IEPs | | SWD students reaching at | | |
| | at varying | to ensure that all | | least 80% mastery on units | | |
| | skill levels | students' IEP goals. | | of instruction. | | |
| | | strategies and | | | | |
| | knowledge, | accommodations | | | | |
| | certification) | are being | | | | |
| | Continuation) | implemented with | | PLC facilitator will share | | |
| | -Multiple | fidelity. | | data with the Problem | | |
| | preparations | indenty. | | Solving Leadership Team. | | |
| | propulations | 3. Using student | | | | |
| | -Lack of | data, every nine | | | | |
| | common | weeks (along with | | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | planning time | the report card) | | Denderonip Team Devel | | |
| | | SWD students | | The Problem Solving | | |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

| -Lack of | will receive | Leadership Team will | | i |
|----------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| Lack of | will receive | Leadership Team win | | |
| understanding | | review assessment data | | |
| of the IEP and | Education Plan | for positive trends at a | | |
| instructional | Progress Report | minimum of once per nine | | |
| | | weeks. | | |
| ns | of the students' | | | |
| | progress toward | | | |
| | mastering their | | | |
| | IEP goals and | | | |
| | strategies. | | | |
| | Strategies. | | | |
| | 4 4 11 | | | |
| | 4. Across all | | | |
| | content areas, | | | |
| | PLCs write SWD | | | |
| | SMART goals | 1 | | |
| | based on each nine | | | |
| | weeks of material. | | | |
| | (For example, | | | |
| | during the first nine | | | |
| | weeks, 75% of the | | | |
| | SWD students will | | | |
| | SWD students will | | | |
| | score an 80% or | | | |
| | above on each unit | | | |
| | of instruction. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 5. As a | | | |
| | Professional | | | |
| | Development | | | |
| | activity in their | | | |
| | PLCs, teachers | | | |
| | discussing | | | |
| | implementation of | | | |
| | IEP strategies and | | | |
| | ner sualegies and | | | |
| | modifications. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 6. PLC teachers | | | |
| | instruct students | | | |
| | implementing | | | |
| | IEP strategies and | 1 | | |
| | accommodations. | | | |
| | | 1 | | |
| | 7. Teachers | 1 | | |
| | give a common | | | |
| | assessment | | | |
| | | | | |
| | identified from the | J | | |

| | <u> </u> | | | |
|-----|---------------------|---|---|------|
| | core curriculum | | | |
| I I | material. | I | 1 | |
| | material. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 8. Teachers bring | | | |
| | SWD assessment | | | |
| | data back to the | | | |
| | | | | |
| | PLCs. | | | |
| l | | | | |
| | 9. Based on the | | | |
| l | data, teachers | | | |
| | diagona tochniques | | | |
| l | discuss techniques | | | |
| l | that were effective | | | |
| | for SWD students. | | | |
| l | | | | |
| l | 10. Based on | | | |
| | 10. Dased oil | | | |
| l | the data, teachers | | | |
| | decide what | | | |
| | skills need to re- | | | |
| l | taught to targeted | | | |
| | at death of a DI | | | |
| | students using DI | | | |
| l | techniques. | | | |
| l | | | | |
| I I | 11. Teachers | I | 1 | |
| l | provide | I | | |
| l | | I | | |
| I I | Differentiated | I | 1 | |
| l | Instruction to | I | | |
| I I | targeted students | I | 1 | |
| 1 | (remediation and | | | |
| I I | | I | 1 | |
| I I | enrichment). | I | 1 | |
| l | 1 | I | | |
| l | 12. PLCs record | I | | |
| l | their work in logs. | I | | |
| I I | men work in logs. | I | 1 | |
| I I | 1 | I | 1 | |
| | 1 1 | | | |

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

| In grades 3-5, 30% SWD students will score a Level | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| 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.

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

| 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 | (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of | | |
| | | PLC Leader | | meetings) | | |
| Core Curriculum for | All | Reading | School-wide | September | Walkthroughs to ensure fidelity of | Coaches, |
| Reading | | Coach, | | | instruction | |
| | | Focus coach, | | | | Administration |
| | | Reading | | | | |
| | | Resource | | | | |
| DRA Review | All | Reading | Grade levels | February | Spot checking of DRA's | Coaches, administration |
| | | Coach | | 3 | | , |
| Data Chats | All | Reading | All Grade Levels | September | PLC Logs | Administration, Team Leaders |
| | | Coach, Focus | | • | 3 | , |
| | | Coach, | | | | |
| | | Reading | | | | |
| | | Resource | | | | |
| Easy CBM | All | Reading | All Grade Levels | October | Easy CBM data | |
| Lady ODIII | , | Coach, | 7 6.000 2010.0 | 00.000 | Lasy SDIII data | |
| | | Reading | | | | |
| | | resource, | | | | |
| | | Psychologist | | | | |
| DL C'a | A II | | All Crade Levels | On main m | Data Wall DLC lago | |
| PLC's | All | Teachers, | All Grade Levels | On-going | Data Wall, PLC logs | |
| | | PSLT | | | | |
| | | facilitators | | | | |

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 Achieveme nt | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|-------------------------|--|
| 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 | 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

| 1. FCAT 2.0: Students | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.11. | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| scoring proficient in | | | | | 1.1 | |
| mathematics (Level 3-5). | - Lack of | Strategy: | Who | <u> Teacher Level</u> | 2-3x Per Year | |
| | understanding of how to | m· 1 m | D | - Teachers reflect on lessons | D SK TOT TOUT | |
| | of how to | lier I - Ine | -Principal | during the unit citing/using | _ | |
| | implement | purpose of this | | 1 | District Form 1 and | |
| | the Core | strategy is to | | and use this knowledge to | Form 2 Assessment | |
| | Continuous | strengthen the core curriculum. | | drive future instruction. | and District EOY Test | |
| | Improvement | Students' | Teacher | | and District EO1 Test | |
| | Model (C- | math skills | | -Teachers maintain their | | |
| | CIM with | will improve | | assessments in the on-line | | |
| | the core | 1 | Coach | grading system. | During Grading Period | |
| | curriculum), | using the <u>Core</u> | Coach | -Teachers use the on-line | C1 | |
| | as the | Continuous | | grading system data to | -Chapter Tests | |
| | emphasis has | Improvement | | calculate their students' | -Benchmark mini | |
| | been placed | Model (C- | | progress towards the SMART | assessments | |
| | on F-CIM | CIM) with | How_ | Goal developed in their PLC. | assessments | |
| | for targeted | core curriculum | niow_ | -Teachers chart their students' | Anecdotal records | |
| | mini lessons | and providing | -PLC logs turned | individual progress towards | from informal | |
| | and NOT | Differentiated | into administration. | the SMART Goal. | observations_ | |
| | on the core curriculum. | Instruction (DI) | Administration | | ooser vacrons_ | |
| | curriculum. | as a result of the | provides feedback. | | | |
| | -Lack of | problem-solving | | | | |
| | common | model. | -Classroom walk- | - | | |
| | planning time | | throughs observing | | | |
| | to discuss | | this strategy. | ┝ | | |
| | best practices | | Administrators | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | before the | Γ | will use the | | | |
| | unit of | Action Steps: | | PLC unit assessment | | |
| | instruction. | 1 DI Carreita | | data will be recorded in a | | |
| | | 1. PLCs write SMART goals | | course-specific PLC data | | |
| | -Lack of | based on each | | base (excel spread sheet) | | |
| | common | nine weeks of | 1 | that will be maintained in | | |
| | planning | material. (For | added to the form. | the assessment binder. | | |
| | time to | | -Evidence of | | | |
| | identify and | the first nine | strategy in | | | |
| | analyze core | weeks, 75% | | PLCs will review chapter | | |
| | curriculum | of the students | | and district formative | | |
| | assessments. | will score an | r | assessments and chart the | | |
| | | | und | assessments and chart the | | |

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

| | 000/ 1 | A 1 ' C 1 | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| | | | increase in the number of | | |
| | | | students reaching at least | | |
| planning time | | | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| to analyze | | | instruction. | | |
| | | will be reviewed | | | |
| | | every nine weeks | | | |
| practices. | district Math | | | | |
| | | | PLC facilitator will share | | |
| - Need | share their gained | lunchtime | data with the Problem | | |
| additional | information at | remediation groups | Solving Leadership Team. | - | |
| training to | PLCs. More | will be facilitated | | | |
| implement | trainings will | by the Math | L | | |
| | | Resource Teacher | Leadership Team Level | | |
| PLCs. | Frost to promote | | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | increased | _ | | | |
| - Teachers | attendance. | | | | |
| at varying | | | The Problem Solving | | |
| | 3. Math | | Leadership Team/Reading | | |
| impleme | Committee | | Leadership Team will | | |
| | member from | | review assessment data | | |
| Differentiated | | | for positive trends at a | | |
| Instruction | level will share | | minimum of once per nine | | |
| (both with | knowledge | | weeks. | | |
| | gained at content | | | | |
| | committee | | | | |
| | meetings with | | | | |
| | team at PLCs. | | | | |
| students). | tourn at 1 Ecs. | | | | |
| | 4. As a | | | | |
| | Professional | | | | |
| | Development | | | | |
| | activity in | | | | |
| | their PLCs, | | | | |
| | teachers spend | | | | |
| | time sharing, | | | | |
| intended rigor | | | | | |
| intended rigor | teaching, and | | | | |
|] | modeling | | | | |
| | researched-based | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | DI best-practice | | | | |

| | skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to minilessons or re-teach for the whole class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. 10. Teachers provide Differentiated Instruction to targeted students (remediation and enrichment). 11. PLCs record their work in | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| 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%. | their work in logs. | | | |

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 | | 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

| 2. FCAT 2.0: Students | 2.1 | 2.1. Strategy: | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| scoring Achievement | | | | | | |
| Levels 4 or 5 in | Teachers | Tier 1 – The | Who | Teacher Level | 3x Per Year | |
| mathematics. | are at | purpose of this | | | | |
| | varying skill | F F | -Principal | -Teachers reflect on lessons | - | |
| | | strategy is to | | during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning | District Form 1 and | |
| | | strengthen the | | and use this knowledge to | Form 2 Assessment | |
| | questioning | core curriculum. | | · E | and District EOY Test | |
| | techniques). | Students' math | -Main Resource | differential instruction. | and District LOT Test | |
| | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | skills will | Teacher | -Teachers maintain their | | |
| | - PLC | improve through | | assessments in the on-line | | |
| | meetings do | participation in | -Math Academic | grading system. | | |
| | | Higher Level | Coach | m 1 1 1 | | |
| | higher order | Ouestioning As | | -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to | | |
| | questioning | a result, there | | calculate the average unit | | |
| | strategies for | will be increased | | | During Grading Period | |
| | upcoming | use of higher | | students per class/course. | During Grading Period | |
| | lessons. | level questions | How_ | - | -Chapter Tests | |
| | | versus lower | PLC logs turned | -Teachers chart their students' | | |
| | - | level questions | into administration | individual progress towards | -Benchmark mini | |
| | Administr | for both teachers | for review | mastery. | assessments | |
| | ators are at | and students. | | | | |
| | varying skill | | -Administration | Γ | -Anecdotal records | |
| | levels with | | This form | | from informal | |
| | identification | | 1 | PLC/Department Level | observations | |
| | of higher | Γ | students' use of | r Eerbepartment Eever | | |
| | order | Action Steps: | vocabulary and | PLCs examine student | | |
| | thinking/ | 1. As a | higher levels of | work and data from the | | |
| | level | professional | learning | data boards. | | |
| | questioning. | development | | | | |
| | | activity, | -Use the forms to | | | |
| | | PLCs study | compute percentage | | | |
| | | Higher Level | | Data from review of | | |
| | | Questioning | | unit assessments and | | |
| | | techniques and | | interactive notebooks | | |
| | | ways to plan | | will be analyzed at PLC | | |
| | | Higher Order | growth | meetings. | | |
| | | questions within | Hana La | | | |
| | | their lessons. | -HCPS Informal | | | |
| | | | Observation Pop- | | | |

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

| 2. Teachers | In Form (EET tool) | PLC facilitator will share | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| implement | (which has HOTS | data with the Problem | | |
| lessons using | as a strategy listed | Solving Leadership Team. | | |
| Higher Level | on the form.) | | | |
| Questioning. | | L | | |
| | -Math Resource | | | |
| 3. Teachers | Teacher and | - | | |
| assess students | Academic coach | Leadership Team Level | | |
| by having | will conduct | Dean Sever | | |
| them identify | informal walk- | The Problem Solving | | |
| and create | | Leadership Team/Reading | | |
| different levels of | 5 | Leadership Team will | | |
| questions. | | review assessment data | | |
| questions. | provide feedback to | for positive trends at a | | |
| 4. Teachers | administration after | minimum of once per nine | | |
| bring student | walk-throughs | weeks. | | |
| work and/or | waik-unoughs | | | |
| assessments to | | | | |
| PLCs. | <u> </u> | | | |
| PLCS. | | | | |
| F A | | | | |
| 5. As a | | | | |
| professional | | Γ | | |
| development | | | | |
| activity, PLCs | | | | |
| use the data | | F 1 | | |
| to discuss | | | | |
| techniques that | | | | |
| were successful. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 6. Based on the | | | | |
| data, PLCs use | | | | |
| the problem- | | | | |
| solving process | | | | |
| to determine | | | | |
| next steps of | | | | |
| higher Level | | | | |
| Questioning | | | | |
| techniques. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 7. PLCs record | | | | |

| | their work on the PLC logs. | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | 20123Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
| (18%) | (23%) | | | |

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

| 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2 | 2.2. | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|------|--|
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 2.2. | 2.2. | <u> </u> | 2.2. | |
| Teachers are | Tier 1 – The | . <u>Who</u> | Teachers | | |
| at varying skill | purpose of this | . <u>vv110</u> | reactions | | |
| levels with | | -Administration Team | _ _ | | |
| | strategy is to | | PLC/Department Level | | |
| based instruction | strangthan the | -Math Resource Teacher | PLC/Department Level | | |
| based filstruction | core curriculum. | -Main Resource Teacher | PLCs examine student | | |
| -PLC's do | | | work and data from the | | |
| not focus on | skills will | | data boards. | | |
| implementing | improve through | | | | |
| | participation in | | | | |
| based instruction | | How_ | | | |
| Dased Histraction | Ouestioning As | 110 W | Data from review of | | |
| | | -PLC logs turned | unit assessments and | | |
| | | into administration. | anecdotal records will | | |
| | | into administration. | be analyzed at PLC | | |
| | | | meetings. | | |
| | versus lower level | reedback. | gs. | | |
| | | -Classroom walk-throughs | | | |
| | | observing problem solving | | | |
| | students. | based lessons | PLC facilitator will | | |
| | Students. | | share data with the | | |
| | | | Problem Solving | | |
| | | use the HCPS Informal | Leadership Team. | | |
| | L | Observation Pop-In Form | Louderomp 1 com. | | |
| | A .: | (EET tool). | | | |
| | Action Steps: | (EE1 1001). | | | |
| | 1. As a professional | | Leadership Team | | |
| | development | | | | |
| | activity, PLCs | | The Problem Solving | | |
| | study Higher | | Leadership Team/ | | |
| | Level Questioning | | Reading Leadership | | |
| | techniques and | | Team will review | | |
| | ways to plan Higher | | assessment data for | | |
| | Order questions | | positive trends at a | | |
| | within their lessons. | | minimum of once per | | |
| | | | nine weeks. | | |
| | 2. Teachers | | | | |
| | implement lessons | | | | |
| | using Higher Level | | | | |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

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

| 3. Teachers assess students by having them identify and create different levels of questions. 4. Teachers bring student work and/ or assessments to PLCs. 5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | Questioning. | | | | |
|--|---------------------|------|-----|-----|--|
| students by having them identify and create different levels of questions. 4. Teachers bring student work and/ or assessments to PLCs. 5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | Questioning. | | | | |
| students by having them identify and create different levels of questions. 4. Teachers bring student work and/ or assessments to PLCs. 5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | 3. Teachers assess | | | | |
| them identify and create different levels of questions. 4. Teachers bring student work and/ or assessments to PLCs. 5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | students by having | | | | |
| levels of questions. 4. Teachers bring student work and/ or assessments to PLCs. 5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | them identify and | | | | |
| 4. Teachers bring student work and/ or assessments to PLCs. 5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problemsolving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | | | | | |
| student work and/ or assessments to PLCs. 5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem- solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | levels of questions | 6. · | | | |
| student work and/ or assessments to PLCs. 5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem- solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | 4 T11-in | | | | |
| or assessments to PLCs. 5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problemsolving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | 4. Teachers bring | | | | |
| PLCs. 5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problemsolving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | or assessments to | | | | |
| 5. As a professional development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problemsolving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | | | | | |
| development activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem- solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | | | | | |
| activity, PLCs use the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem- solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | 5. As a profession | al | | | |
| the data to discuss techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem- solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | development | | | | |
| techniques that were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problem- solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | activity, PLCs use | | | | |
| were successful. 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problemsolving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | the data to discuss | | | | |
| 6. Based on the data, PLCs use the problemsolving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | techniques that | | | | |
| data, PLCs use the problem- solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | were successiui. | | | | |
| data, PLCs use the problem- solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | 6. Based on the | | | | |
| the problem- solving process to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | data, PLCs use | | | | |
| to determine next steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | the problem- | | | | |
| steps of higher Level Questioning techniques. | solving process | | | | |
| Level Questioning techniques. | to determine next | | | | |
| techniques. | steps of higher | | | | |
| | Level Questioning | | | | |
| | techniques. | | | | |
| 7. PLCs record their | 7. PLCs record the | eir | | | |
| work on the PLC | work on the PLC | | | | |
| logs. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 2.2 | h 2 | h 2 | 2.2 | |
| 2.3 2.3 2.3 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.5 | |
| | i 1 | | i e | | |

| Based on the analysis of student | Anticipated | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | |
|---|-------------|----------|------------------------|---|-------------------------|--|
| achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | 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

| 3. FCAT 2.0: Points for | 3.1. | 3.1. Tier 1 – | 3.1. | 3.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> | 3.1. | |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| students making learning | | The purpose of | J.1. | J. I. I Cacilei Level | | |
| gains in mathematics. | -Lack of | | Who | -Teachers reflect on lessons | 2-3x Per Year | |
| | infrastructure | to strengthen the | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | during the unit citing/using | 2 3.11 01 1 001 | |
| | to support | core curriculum. | - Principal | specific evidence of learning | District Form 1 and | |
| | technology | Students' | | and use this knowledge to | Form 2 Assessment | |
| | | math skills | -Assistant Principal | drive future instruction. | and District EOY Test | |
| | -Lack of | will improve | | To all our maintain that | | |
| | technology | through the use | - Technology | -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line | | |
| | hardware | of technology | Specialist | grading system. | | |
| | l | and hands- | | grading system. | | |
| | -Teachers | on activities to | - Math Resource | -Teachers use the on-line | | |
| | at varying | implement the | Teacher | grading system data to | During Grading Period | |
| | understanding | Next Generation |] | calculate the average unit | During Grading 1 criod | |
| | of the intent | Sunshine State | | assessment score for all their | | |
| | of the NGSSS | Standards | Coach | students per class/course. | Chantan Taata | |
| | -Lack of | | | Teachers chart their students' | -Chapter Tests | |
| | teacher | Action Steps: | | individual progress towards | -Benchmark mini | |
| • | knowledge | Action Steps | | mastery. | assessments | |
| I | best | Action Steps | Цом | | assessments | |
| | | 1. PLCs write | How_ | - | -Anecdotal records | |
| | | SMART goals | L | PLC/Department Level | from informal | |
| | available | based on each | DI C.1 4 1 | _ | observations_ | |
| | technology | nine weeks of | | PLCs will review unit | _ | |
| | | material. | into administration. Administration | assessments and chart the | | |
| | -Lack of | | | increase in the number of | | |
| | | 2. As a | P . | students reaching at least | | |
| | knowledge on | | -Classroom walk- | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | | Development | throughs observing | instruction. | | |
| | technology | activity in | technology and | | | |
| | resources | their PLCs, | hands-on lessons. | | | |
| | | teachers spend | | PLC facilitator will share | | |
| | | time sharing, | | data with the Problem | | |
| | | researching, | strategy in | Solving Leadership Team. | | |
| | | teaching, and | teachers' lesson | Dorving Leadership Team. | † | |
| | | modeling | plans seen during | L | | |
| | | technology | administration | | | |
| | | and hands-on | walk-throughs. | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | | strategies. | | The Problem Solving | | |

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

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

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

| | | Development activity, teachers use data to discuss strategies that were effective. 8. Based on data, PLCs use the problemsolving process to determine next steps of planning technology and hands-on strategies. 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. | | | | | |
|--|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| 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. | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | (59Pts) | (64pts) | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | |

| | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 33. | 3.3. | |
|--|---------|----------|------|--|-------------------------|------|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Barrier | Strategy | | 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

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

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

| data. | | | data that includes all skills | | |
|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| - Lack of | for re-teaching | | covered during the nine week period. | | |
| understanding | | - PSLT will review | week period. | | |
| | | the calendars/logs | | | |
| | | and make progress | | | |
| | | statements at the | | | |
| | | end of each nine | | | |
| lessons within | | weeks. | | | |
| | 3. As a | | | | |
| pacing guide. | Professional | -Morning and | | | |
| | Development | lunchtime | | | |
| | | remediation groups | | | |
| | | will be facilitated | | | |
| | | by the Math | | | |
| | | Resource Teacher | | | |
| | lessons and mini | | | | |
| | assessments for | | | | |
| | benchmarks. | | | | |
| | PLCs use a | | | | |
| | combination | | | | |
| | of District and | | | | |
| | school-generated | | | | |
| | mini lessons/ | | | | |
| | assessments. | | | | |
| | 4. Teachers | | | | |
| | implement the | | | | |
| | mini lessons | | | | |
| | and mini | | | | |
| | assessments. | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 5. Teachers bring | | | | |
| | assessment data | | | | |
| | back to the PLCs. | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 6. As a | | | | |
| | Professional | | | | |
| | Development | | | | |
| | activity in their | | | | |

| E 1 | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| 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. | | |
| | | |
| 7. As a PLC, | | |
| teachers develop | | |
| a school-based | | |
| assessment that | | |
| covers all mini | | |
| lesson skills | | |
| taught within the | | |
| nine week period. | | |
| | | |
| 8. PLCs record | | |
| their work in logs | | |

| Mathematics Goal #4: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | Level of Performance:* | of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this | | | | | | | |
| box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| To anodos 2.5 dbs | | | | | | | |
| 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%. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | (53%) | (60%) | | | | | |
| | (, -) | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | |
|---|------------------------|-----------|--|--|-------------------------|-----------|--|
| | | 4.3 | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | | 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

| 5A. Student subgroups by | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|---|
| ethnicity (White, Black, | | | | 5.4.1 | 2 D W | |
| Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making | | Strategy: | Who_ | 5A.1. | 3x Per Year | |
| satisfactory progress in | | Tier 2/3 - | 1 rammistration | | District Form 1 and | |
| mathematics | | Students' math skills will | | -Teachers reflect on lessons | Form 2 Assessment and District EOY Test | |
| | | | | during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and | | |
| | outside | providing a | Teacher | use this knowledge to drive future | | |
| | | <u>supplemental</u> | | instruction. | During Grading Period | |
| | classroom instruction. | <u>math class</u> . | | -Teachers maintain their mini | | |
| | msu uchon. | | | assessments in the on-line grading system. | -Chapter Tests | |
| | - Lack pre- | Γ | | -Teachers use the on-line grading | -Benchmark mini | |
| | requisite | | M-41. D | system data to calculate their | assessments | |
| | skills | L | teacher will monitor | students' progress towards 80% mastery of skills | A 1.4.11. | |
| | | Action Steps: | progress through | | -Anecdotal records from informal | |
| | | • | benchinark mini | Ficachers chart their students | observations_ | |
| | | 1. Identify students in | assessments and performance on | | | |
| | | lowest quartile | online tutorial and | | -Online resource reports | |
| | | and/or Level 1 | practice exercises | PLC/Department Level | reports | |
| | | 2. Schedule | | -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the 80% | | |
| | | students into | | mastery data across all classes/ | | |
| | | appropriate | | courses for each mini assessment. | | |
| | | remediation | | L | | |
| | | lunch or breakfast group. | | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | | | | AP reviews district formative | | |
| | | 3. Utilize online | | assessments and Instructional | | |
| | | tutorials and practice within | | Planning Tool Data | | |
| | | these classes | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 1 |

| In grades 3-5, 60% of the following All Curriculum student subgroups will see a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math or the percentage of non-proficie students will decrease by 10%. | re | | | |
|---|----|--|--|--|
| | | | | |

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

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

| | | | | assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks. | | |
|---|------------------------|----------|--|--|------------------|--|
| | | | | | 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 | 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

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

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 | |
| | | | Sec4.1 | | | 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 be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | | |

| FC English Longue | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| 5C. English Language | DC.1. | DC.1. | DC.1. | DC.1. | DC.1. | |
| Learners (ELL) not | | | | | | |
| making satisfactory | | | | | | |
| progress in mathematics. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5C: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected Level | | | | |
| iviationaties Goal 1130. | 2012 Current Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this | | | | | | |
| box. | | | | | | |
| JOA. | | | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | (n/a) | (n/a) | | | | |

| | | 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 | Anticipated Barrier | | | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the | Student Evaluation Tool | | |
| improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | effectiveness of strategy? | | | |

| 5 D 0: 1 : : : | KD 1 | KD 1 | ED 1 | en i | en i | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------|
| 5D. Student with | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. <u> </u> | 5D.1. | 5D.1 | |
| Disabilities (SWD) not | | | | | | |
| making satisfactory | No electronic | Strategy: | Who_ | Teacher Level | .3x Per Year | |
| progress in mathematics. | accessibility | | L | | L | |
| F - 5 | to FAA data | - SWDs math | Principal, | - | District Form 1 and Form 2 | |
| | | skills will improve | 0 | N C/D | Assessment and District EOY | |
| | planning tool, | by <u>connecting</u> individual needs | Site Administrator, | PLC/Department Level | Test | |
| | mainframe, etc.) | to instruction as | Assistant Principal | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | -Collecting data | outlined in the IEP. | | assessments and chart the | | |
| | with fidelity | butilited in the IEI. | | increase in the number of SWD | During Grading Period | |
| | with fidelity | | | students reaching at least 80% | During Grading Feriod | |
| | -Understanding | | | mastery on units of instruction. | -Chapter Tests | |
| | data and the | L | | | | |
| | students' | | | | -Benchmark mini | |
| | disability to make | Action Steps: | | | assessments | |
| | instructional | | | PLC facilitator will share data | | |
| | decisions | Math General ed. | | with the Problem Solving | -Anecdotal records from | |
| | <u>_</u> | | -IEP Progress Reports | Leadership Team | informal observations_ | |
| | | will familiarizing | reviewed by APC. | | | |
| | education | themselves with | DOLE HILL CO | F | | |
| | teachers, | each student's IEP | -PSLT will identify | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | understanding the IEP and | goals, strategies and accommodations. | and/or create a fidelity monitoring tool designed | | | |
| | instructional | accommodations. | to check implementation | The Problem Solving Leadership | | |
| | | 2. Every nine weeks | | Team/Reading Leadership Team | | |
| | accommodations | | | will review assessment data for | | |
| | -Teachers | and/or SWD teacher | | positive trends at a minimum of | | |
| | at varying | reviews students' | | once per nine weeks. | | |
| | skill levels | IEPs to ensure that | | • | | |
| | | all students' IEP | | | | |
| | | goals, strategies and | | | | |
| | | accommodations are | L | L | | |
| | | being implemented | | | | |
| | -Multiple Preps. | with fidelity. | F | | | |
| | Lack of common | 3. Using student data, | | | | |
| | planning time | every nine weeks | | | | |
| | planning time | (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 | | | | |

| | SWD SMART goals | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|--|
| | based on each nine | | |
| | weeks of material. | | |
| | (For example, during | | |
| | the first nine weeks, | | |
| | TEO/ CAL CAND | | |
| | 75% of the <u>SWD</u> | | |
| | students will score an | | |
| | 80% or above on each | | |
| | unit of instruction.) | | |
| | 1 | | |
| | 5. As a Professional | | |
| | Development activity | | |
| | in their PLCs, | | |
| | teachers discussing | | |
| | implementation of | | |
| | Implementation of | | |
| | IEP strategies and | | |
| | modifications. | | |
| | L | | |
| | 6. PLC teachers | | |
| | instruct students | | |
| | implementing | | |
| | IEP strategies and | | |
| | accommodations. | | |
| | 1 | | |
| | 4. At the end of the | | |
| | unit, teachers give a | | |
| | common assessment | | |
| | identified from the | | |
| | core curriculum | | |
| | core curriculum | | |
| | material. | | |
| | L | | |
| | 5. Teachers bring | | |
| | SWD assessment data | | |
| | back to the PLCs. | | |
| | 1 | | |
| | 6. Based on the data, | | |
| 1 | teachers discuss | | |
| | techniques that were | | |
| 1 | effective for SWD | | |
| | students. | | |
| 1 | | | |
| | 7. Based on the data, | | |
| | teachers decide what | | |
| | akilla mood to ro | | |
| 1 | skills need to re- | | |
| | taught to targeted | | |
| | students using DI | | |
| | techniques. | | |
| | | | |
| | 8. Teachers provide | | |
| | Differentiated | | |
| | Instruction to targeted | | |
| | | | |

| | | 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>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | (40%) | | | | | |
| | | See 5A.1 See 5A.2 | See 5A.1 See 5A.2 | See 5A.1 See 5A.2 | . See 5A.1 See 5A.2 | 5D.2 . See 5A.1 See 5A.2 | |
| | | | | | | 5D.3 See4.1 | |

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with

Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic | 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 | (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of | | |
| | | PLC Leader | | meetings) | | |
| 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 3 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 Achieveme nt | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|----------------------------|--|
| 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 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

| 1. FCAT 2.0: Students | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| scoring proficient (Level | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
| 3-5) in science. | | l | | | 2 2 2 Y | |
| 5 3) in science. | | Tier 1 – | | | 2-3x Per Year | |
| | Not all | The purpose | Who | Teacher Level | | |
| | teachers | of this | | | | |
| | 11110 11 110 11 | strategy is to | Principal | | District-level | |
| | to raciitiry | strengthen | | during the unit citing/using | baseline and mid- | |
| | | the core | | specific evidence of learning | year tests | |
| | | curriculum. | | and use this knowledge to | | |
| | | Students | Science Resource | drive future instruction. | _ | |
| | knowledge | will develop | Teacher | Teachers maintain their | | |
| | of science | problem- | | assessments in the on-line | During Grading Period | |
| | concepts. | solving and | | grading system. | | |
| | | creative | Coach | | | |
| | -Not all | thinking | | -Teachers use the on-line | District-level | |
| | icaciicis aic | skills while | | grading system data to | baseline and Big | |
| | able to attend | constructing | | calculate their students' | Idea Chapter tests. | |
| | available | new | | progress towards the SMART | 1 | |
| | science | knowledge. | How_ | Goal developed in their PLC. | Midyear mini | |
| | trainings | To achieve | 110W | | assessmsnts | |
| | on dates | this goal, | | students' individual progress | | |
| | available by | science | | towards the SMART Goal. | | |
| | the district. | teachers | -PLC logs turned | | | |
| | | will increase | into administration. | L | | |
| | -Not all | the number | Administration provides | | | |
| | teachers are | of <u>inquiry</u> | feedback. | F | | |
| | knowledge | <u>based</u> | | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | able of the | <u>activities</u> | - Evidence of strategy | | | |
| | strategies of | (such as | | Science PLCs will review | | |
| | inquity oused | student | μ <i>Θ</i> | unit assessments and chart | | |
| | instruction | | | the increase in the number | | |
| | such as | | throughs. | of students reaching at | | |
| | C115451115 | accountable | | least 80% mastery on units | | |
| | the students, | talk and | | of instruction. | | |
| | allowing | higher order | throughs observing | | | |
| | explore time, | | inquiry based | | | |
| | encouraging | | instructionThe | DI C C 1111 1 11 1 | | |
| | accountable | instruction. | | PLC facilitator will share | | |
| | talk, higher | | checklist will be used to | | | |
| | order | | monitor fidelity of best | kesource Teacher and | | |

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

| questioning, | practices outlined in the | the Academic Coach | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| etc. | | Assessment data will be | | |
| l I | C 1, | reviewed for positive | | |
| -Not all PLC Action Ste | | trends at a minimum of | | |
| | | once per nine weeks. | | |
| meetings 1.Teach | | once per fille weeks. | | |
| | istrictremediation will be | | | |
| regular Science | invited to Lunch | | | |
| discussion of training | Breakfast with Science | Leadership Team Level | | |
| student data and shar | | - | | |
| and/or the information | | -PLC facilitator/ Subject | | |
| impleme with the | | Area Leader/ Department | | |
| ntation of PLCs. | | Heads shares data with the | | |
| the inquiry | with small groups in the room | Problem Solving Leadership | | |
| model. 2.Distric | t to provide extra assistance | Team. | | |
| trainings | with students | Detail 11 to and to at | | |
| -Teachers are be offere | | -Data will be used to plan | | |
| at varying at Frost | | for future supplemental instruction. | | |
| skill levels encoura | | instruction. | | |
| with the teacher | , | | | |
| use of attendan | ce | _ | | |
| achievement | | | | |
| series to 3. PLCs | write | | | |
| accurately SMART | | | | |
| analyze goals ba | | | | |
| student data. on each | | | | |
| weeks o | | | | |
| | | | | |
| -Teachers are material | | | | |
| at varying (For exa | | | | |
| skill levels during the | | | | |
| in the use of first nine | · | | | |
| inquiry and weeks, | . | | | |
| the 5E lesson 75% of | | | | |
| plan model. students | | | | |
| score an | | | | |
| - or above | | | | |
| Administr each uni | t of | | | |
| ators are at instructi | on.) | | | |
| varying skill | | | | |
| levels with 4.As a | | | | |
| understanding Professi | onal | | | |

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

| <u> </u> | | | 1 |
|------------------------|----------------|--|-------|
| inquiry and | Development | | |
| the 5E lesson | | | |
| | their PLCs, | | |
| | teachers | | |
| -PLC are | will spend | | |
| not being | time sharing, | | |
| | researching, | | |
| at all grade | teaching, and | | |
| levels with | modeling | | |
| | inquiry based | | |
| | instruction | | |
| | strategies | | |
| common | with the | | |
| planning time | | | |
| to facilitate | teacher. | | |
| and hold PLC | | | |
| and note i Ec | 5.Science | | |
| | teachers | | |
| | will instruct | | |
| | students | | |
| | using the core | | |
| | curriculum | | |
| login account | | | |
| | based | | |
| | instruction | | |
| | strategies. | | |
| new to 5 th | | | |
| grade science | 6 At the end | | |
| instruction | of the unit, | | |
| | teachers | | |
| | will give | | |
| | a common | | |
| | assessment | | |
| | identified | | |
| | from the core | | |
| | curriculum | | |
| | material. | | |
| | inacorar. | | |
| | 7.Teachers | | |
| | will bring | | |
| | Will Offing | | |
| | | | |

| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | , | | 1 | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | assessment | | | |
| | data back to | | | |
| | the PLCs. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 8.Based on | | | |
| | the data, | | | |
| | teachers | | | |
| | discuss | | | |
| | inquiry based | | | |
| | instruction | | | |
| | stratagies | | | |
| | strategies | | | |
| | that were | | | |
| | effective. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 9.Based on | | | |
| | data, PLCs | | | |
| | will use the | | | |
| | problem- | | | |
| | solving | | | |
| | process to | | | |
| | determine | | | |
| | next steps | | | |
| | of planning | | | |
| | inquiry based | | | |
| | instruction | | | |
| | strategies. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 10.PLCs | | | |
| | record their | | | |
| | work in the | | | |
| | DI C leas | | | |
| | PLC logs. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Science Goal #1: | | 2013 Expected | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Level of | Level of | | | |
| | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this | | | | | |
| box. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 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%. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | (220/) | (420/) | | | |
| | (33%) | [(43 70 <i>)</i> | | | |
| | , | | | | |

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

| 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------|--|
| | 1 . 2 . | 1.4. | | |
| Tier 1 – The purpose | W/h a | | | |
| of this strategy is to | <u>Who</u> | PLCs will review | | |
| | . , | evaluation data. | | |
| curriculum. Students' | Principal | | | |
| | l | | | |
| | AP | | | |
| improve through | | PLCs will review | | |
| participation in the <u>5E</u> | Science Resource Teacher | unit assessments and | | |
| lesson plan model. | | chart the increase | | |
| | District Academic Coach | in the number of | | |
| - | | students reaching | | |
| | | at least 70% | | |
| Action Steps | | mastery on units of | | |
| | ĺ | instruction. | | |
| 1.Teachers will attend | | | | |
| District Science training | How Monitored | | | |
| and share 5 E Lesson | | | | |
| Plan Model information | -PLC logs turned | PLC facilitator will | | |
| with their PLCs. | | share data with the | | |
| | Administration provides | Administration, | | |
| | feedback. | Science Resource | | |
| goals based on each | | Teacher and District | | |
| P | -Evidence of strategy in | | | |
| 1 | teachers' lesson plans | Science Academic | | |
| 1 | seen during administration | Coach. The Science | | |
| L | walk-throughs. | | | |
| will score an 70% or | waik-unoughs. | and District | | |
| above on each unit of | - Classroom walk- | Science Academic | | |
| | l | Coach will review | | |
| · — | | assessment data for | | |
| 3.As a Professional | strategy. | positive trends at a | | |
| • | | minimum of once | | |
| L | The district walk-through | per nine weeks. | | |
| | checklist will be used to | | | |
| teachers spend time | monitor fidelity of best | | | |
| | practices outlined in the | | | |
| • | SIP across the entire | | | |
| A DI Co | faculty | | | |
| 4.PLC teachers instruct | ĺ | | | |
| students using the 5 E | | | | |

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

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

| 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
|----------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------|-----------------------------|--|
| | | | | | |
| - Lack of | Tier 1 – The purpose | Who | | 2-3x Per Year | |
| common | of this strategy is to | | | | |
| planning time | strengthen the core | Teachers | | | |
| to analyze | curriculum. Students' | | | District-level baseline and | |
| mini lesson | science skills will | Principal | | mid-year tests | |
| data. | improve through | | | | |
| | | AP | | | |
| - Lack of | active thinking strategy | | | | |
| | | Science Resource Teacher | | During Grading Period | |
| of when | benchmarks (this can be | | | | |
| and how to | bell work) | District Academic Coach | | | |
| implement | | | | District-level baseline and | |
| the mini | | <u>How</u> | | Big Idea Chapter tests. | |
| lessons within | • | | | | |
| the District | | -PLC logs turned | | Midyear mini assessments | |
| pacing guide. | | into administration. | | | |
| | | Administration provides | | | |
| | • | feedback. | | | |
| | data, classroom | | | | |
| | assessments and student | | | | |
| | | in teachers' lesson plans | | | |
| | | seen during administration | | | |
| | | walk-throughs. | | | |
| | students that need | C1 | | | |
| | | -Classroom walk-throughs | | | |
| | | show evidence of this | | | |
| | 2.Based on the data, | strategy. | | | |
| | PLCs develop a 10 | The district walk-through | | | |
| | | checklist will be used to | | | |
| | calendar for re-teaching | | | | |
| | | practices outlined in the | | | |
| | or standards covered in | | | | |
| | | faculty | | | |
| | die core curriculum. | rucuity | | | |
| | 3.Teachers bring | -Monitored data will | | | |
| | assessment data back to | | | | |
| | | weeks. | | | |

| | | | develop a school-based assessment that covers all mini lesson skills taught within the nine week period. 5.PLCs record their work in logs. | -Another fidelity tool will be the PLC calendars/ timeline/ logs of targeted - Administration and Science Resource Teacher will review the calendars/ logs and make progress statements at the end of each nine weeks | | |
|--|------------------------|----------|---|---|----------------------------|--|
| 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 | | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |

| 2. FCAT 2.0: Students | 2.1. | 2.1 | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |
|---------------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| scoring Achievement | | ∠ .1.— | ۲.1. | | | |
| Levels 4 or 5 in science. | | | | PLC unit assessment | 2-3x Per Year | |
| Levels 4 of 5 m science. | | Strategy: | | data will be recorded in a | 5 3.1 T 61 T 641 | |
| | - Teachers | Tier 1 – | | course-specific PLC data | _ | |
| | are at | The purpose | | | | |
| | varying skill | of this | -Science Resource | base (excel splead sheet). | District-level | |
| | levels with | | Teacher | | baseline and mid- | |
| | higher order | strengthen | i eacher | | year tests | |
| | questioning | the core | -District Academic | PLCs will review unit | | |
| | techniques. | curriculum. | | assessments and chart the | L | |
| | 1 | Students' | | | | |
| | - PLC | | | | During Grading Period | |
| | meetings do | | | students reaching at least | | |
| | not focus on | will improve | | 80% mastery on units of | | |
| | higher order | through | | instruction. | District-level | |
| | questioning | participation | How_ | | baseline and Big | |
| | strategies for | in <u>Higher</u> | | | Idea Chapter tests. | |
| | upcoming | <u>Level</u> | -PLC logs turned | DI C C 114 4 111 | | |
| | lessons. | Questioning | | PLC facilitator will | Midyear mini | |
| | | training. | Administration provides | share data with the | assessments | |
| | L | As a result, | feedback. | Administration | | |
| | Administr | there will | | | | |
| | ators are at | be increased | -Evidence of strategy | | | |
| | varying skill | use of | in teachers' lesson | | | |
| | levels with | higher level | plans seen during | | | |
| | identification | questions | administration walk- | | | |
| | of HOT/ | versus | throughs. | | | |
| | questioning. | lower level | | | | |
| | 1 | questions for | -Classroom walk- | | | |
| | | both teachers | throughs observing | | | |
| | | and students. | this strategy. specific | | | |
| | | | strategy. | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | L | -The district walk- | | | |
| | | | through checklist will | | | |
| | | Action Steps: | be used to monitor | | | |
| | | 1. Science | fidelity of best practices | | | |
| | | teachers | outlined in the SIP | | | |
| | | attend on- | across the entire faculty. | - | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | going training | 5 | | | |

| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | |
|---|--|--|
| provided by | | |
| the Reading | | |
| Coach and | | |
| Science | | |
| Resource | | |
| Teacher. | | |
| reacher. | | |
| | | |
| 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.) | | |
| | | |
| 3.As a | | |
| Professional | | |
| Development | | |
| notivity in | | |
| activity in | | |
| their PLCs, | | |
| teachers | | |
| discuss | | |
| strategies and their | | |
| and their | | |
| implement | | |
| ation in the | | |
| upcoming | | |
| lessons. | | |
| | | |
| 4.Teachers | | |
| | | |
| implement | | |

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

| | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | on. 9.PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | (2%) | (15%) | | | |

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

| 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2.2.2. | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| | | . | | 4.4. 4.4. | |
| - Lack of | Tier 1 – The purpose | Who | DI C unit aggaggmant | L | |
| common | of this strategy is to | <u>vv 110</u> | PLC unit assessment data will be | 2-3x Per Year | |
| | ne strengthen the core | | recorded in a | | |
| to discuss | curriculum. Students' | -Principal | | ⊢ | |
| | es science comprehension | l A D | course-specific PLC | | |
| before the | will improve through | FAP | | District Baseline and Mid- | |
| unit of | teachers using | -Science Resource | spread sheet). | Year Testing | |
| instruction. | the Continuous | Teacher | | | |
| instruction. | Improvement Model | reacher | | | |
| -Lack of | with core curriculum | D: | DI C '11 ' | | |
| common | and providing | -District Academic Coach | | | |
| planning | Differentiated | | unit assessments and | † I | |
| time to | Instruction as a result | | chart the increase | | |
| identify and | | | in the number of | | |
| analyze cor | | | students reaching | | |
| curriculum | inodei. | | at least 80% | | |
| assessment | | | mastery on units of | During Nine Weeks | |
| assessment | · - | | instruction. | | |
| -Lack of | Action Steps | Administration provides | | Big Idea Chapter Tests | |
| | | feedback. | | | |
| planning ti | 1.PLCs write SMART | l | | Unit assessments | |
| to analyze data to | goals based on each | | PLC facilitator will | | |
| identify bes | | | share data with the | | |
| I I I | - I | seen during administration | | | |
| practices. | (For example, during | classroom walk-throughs. | | | |
| X71 | the first nine weeks, | | Teacher. They will | | |
| - Need | 75% of the students | -The district walk-through | | | |
| additional | will score an 80% or | | data for positive | | |
| training to | above on each unit of | monitor fidelity of best | trends at a minimum | | |
| implement | instruction.) | | of once per nine | | |
| effective | l a . | | weeks. | | |
| PLCs. | 2.As a Professional | faculty. | | | |
| | Development activity, | | | | |
| | teachers use district | | | | |
| | textbook adopted | | | | |
| | materials and resources | | | | |
| | within their PLCs | | | | |
| | to plan and deliver | | | | |
| | lessons. | | | | |

| i i | | · |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | |
| 3.As a Professional | | |
| Development activity | | |
| in their PLCs, | | |
| teachers spend time | | |
| sharing, researching, | | |
| teaching, and modeling | | |
| researched-based best- | | |
| practice strategies. | | |
| 4.PLC teachers instruct | | |
| students using the | | |
| core curriculum, | | |
| incorporating DI | | |
| strategies from their | | |
| PLC discussions. | | |
| | | |
| 5.At the end of the | | |
| unit, teachers give a | | |
| common assessment | | |
| identified from the core | | |
| curriculum material. | | |
| | | |
| 6.Teachers bring | | |
| assessment data back to | | |
| the PLCs. | | |
| | | |
| 7.Based on the data, | | |
| teachers discuss | | |
| strategies that were | | |
| effective. | | |
| 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 | | |

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

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

| | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 During Nine Weeks |
|---|-------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| | | _ | T | T | 2.3 During Mile Weeks |
| | -Teacher | Tier 1 – Students' | Who | Evaluation of | Stadent noviceta |
|] | _ | science skills will | W IIO | project using a | Student projects |
| | l | | Science teachers | rubric. | |
| | remediation | participation in | Science teachers | ruoric. | |
| | and | enrichment activities | | | |
| | enrichment | during a 30 minute | | | |
| | activities | | How | | |
| | | instruction period | 110 110 | | |
| | -Teacher | | -PLC logs turned | Teachers review | |
| | support | | | data at PLC | |
| | for the DI | | | meetings. PLC | |
| | strategy | | | facilitator will | |
| | | writing for the week, | | share data with the | |
| | | | | Administration and | |
| | | in a science enrichment | | Science Resource | |
| | | | | Teacher. They will | |
| | | | APC weekly. | review assessment | |
| | | | | data for positive | |
| | | | -Classroom walk-throughs | | |
| | | Action Steps | observing this strategy. | of once per nine | |
| | | - | | weeks. | |
| | | 1. Weekly, teams will | | | |
| | | collaborate and regroup | | | |
| | | students across the | | | |
| | | four teachers based | | | |
| | | on student need. The | | | |
| | | science teachers will | | | |
| | | determine science | | | |
| | | enrichment activity. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | 2. Students who are | | | |
| | | eligible attend the | | | |
| | | enrichment session. | | | |
| | | D. In the employment | | | |
| | | 3. In the enrichment | | | |
| | | sessions, students will | | | |
| | | engage in project-type | | | |
| | | activities. | | | |

| | 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 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)

Long Term Investigations All Levels

Science Coach, All grade levels Science

September

Walkthroughs, observation

Administration

Science Content

All levels

Science coach

Science Resource Teacher

Resource Teacher

All grade levels

November-March

Walkthroughs, observation

Administration

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

| Writing/ Language Arts Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|----------------------------|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | • | | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |

| | l | 1 | I | l | l | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| 1. Students scoring | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
| at Achievement | | | | | | |
| Level 3.0 or higher | | Strategy: | Who | <u> Teacher Level</u> | L | |
| in writing. | | L | L | | | |
| | - Teachers | Tier 1 – The | Principal | F | F | |
| | lack skill and | purpose of this | | N C/D | | |
| | understanding | strategy is to | AP | PLC/Department Level | | |
| | regarding the | strengthen the | | DI Ca:11 : dantifa tuan da | | |
| | FCAT Writing | core curriculum. | Writing Resource Teacher | PLCs will identify trends | | |
| | Assessment and | Students' writing | | (deficiencies and growth) in | | |
| | Scoring Rubric. | skills will | PLCs | student writing performance | | |
| | <i>y</i> | improve through | | and collaborate to modify | | |
| | - Teachers new | participation of | | the instructional calendar | | |
| | | best practices for | | to provide differentiated | During Grading Period | |
| | may not have | teaching writing. | How | instruction as appropriate. | | |
| | - | Best practices | | | | |
| • | Ç | | - PLC logs turned | | | |
| | training | include PLC | into administration. | | Writing Prompts | |
| | | <u>instructional</u> | | PLCs - Review of | | |
| | - Teachers do not | calendars. | | monthly formative writing | STAR conference | |
| | have confidence | <u>Differentiated</u> | recusuek. | assessments to determine | | |
| | using holistic | Instruction and | - Classroom walk-throughs | | | |
| | scoring methods | effective holistic | | students scoring above | | |
| | | scoring methods | | proficiency as determined by | | |
| | Teachers lack | | | | | |
| | sufficient time | | | the assignment rubric. PLCs | | |
| | to score student | | | will chart the increase in the | | |
| | papers | L | | number of students reaching | | |
| | . . | | C | 4.0 or above on the monthly | | |
| | - Teachers | Action Steps: | | writing prompt. | | |
| | lack common | 1 4 | -HCPS Informal | | | |
| | planning time to | 1. As a | Observation Pop-In Form | | | |
| | · · DIC | Professional | (EET tool). | | | |
| | discuss common | Development | | PLC facilitator will share | | |
| | deficiencies in | activity, teachers | | data with the Problem | | |
| | | new to the | through fidelity monitoring | Solving Leadership Team_ | | |
| | writing | profession and/or | tool that includes all of | l | | |
| | | content area are | the SIP strategies. This | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | | required to attend | walk-through form will | <u> </u> | | |
| | | district level | be used to monitor the | The Problem Solving | | |
| | | trainings. | implementation of the SIP | Leadership Team will review | | |
| | | | | assessment data for positive | | |
| | | 2. As a | | trends. PLCs will participate | | |
| | | Professional | will be reviewed every nine | in rubric Norming sessions | | |
| | | Development | will be reviewed every filme weeks. | to identify teacher barriers | | |
| | | activity, teachers | | impeding effective holistic | | |
| | | participate in | | scoring. | | |
| | | participate in | <u> -</u> | pcoring. | | |

| assessn | ment and | | |
|---------------------|--------------|------|--|
| | refresher | | |
| courses | es and | | |
| practice | ce scoring | | |
| practice L.::4:: | DI Ca | | |
| within | IPLCS. | | |
| | | | |
| 3. As a | a | | |
| Profess | ssional | | |
| Develo | opment | | |
| activity | y, | | |
| Langua | age Arts | | |
| SAL/D | OH and | | |
| grade lo | level | | |
| (PLC) | chaire | | |
| [1 LC] (| clidits | | |
| will fac | ncilitate | | |
| advanc | ced scoring | | |
| session | ns. | | |
| | | | |
| 4. Base | sed on | | |
| baselin | ne data, | | |
| PLCs v | write | | |
| SMAR | RT goals for | | |
| each ni | nine weeks. | | |
| (For ex | xample, | | |
| during | g the first | | |
| ning we | veeks, 50% | | |
| of the a | students | | |
| of the s | students | | |
| Will Sco | core 4.0 | | |
| or abov | ove on | | |
| the mor | onthly | | |
| | tive writing | | |
| prompt | ot.) | | |
| | | | |
| 5. As a | a | | |
| Profess | ssional | | |
| Develo | opment | | |
| activity | v PLC | | |
| discuss | sions | | |
| | teachers | | |
| | onsensus | | |
| to a con | DISCHSUS | | |
| regardi | ling student | | |
| | , needs, | | |
| and sec | cores based | | |
| on com | nnecting | | |
| student | nt writing | | |

| | 1 | | |
|--|---------------------|--|--|
| | with state | | |
| | anchors. | | |
| | | | |
| | 6. Based on | | |
| | student writing | | |
| | reviews and | | |
| | PLC discussions | | |
| | regarding trends | | |
| | and needs, | | |
| | teachers create | | |
| | teachers create | | |
| | monthly writing | | |
| | menus for craft, | | |
| | elaboration, and | | |
| | genres as a list of | | |
| | essential teaching | | |
| | points for the | | |
| | month ahead. | | |
| | | | |
| | 7. Teachers | | |
| | implement the | | |
| | ideas based on | | |
| | specific student | | |
| | needs. | | |
| | needs. | | |
| | | | |
| | 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. | | |
| | 0 PI G | | |
| | 9. PLCs review | | |
| | nine week data, | | |
| | set a new goal | | |
| | for the following | | |
| | nine weeks. | | |
| | | | |

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

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 Gra

Grade Level/ Subject PD Facilitator

PLC Leader

PD Participants

Target Dates and Schedules

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or

(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

(e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)

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 Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |

| 1. Attendance | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1 | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
|---------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|--|
| 1. Attenuance | | | ••• | | | |
| | Most students | The Administration | Social Worker will | Administration Team and | Attendance Report | |
| | with significant | | | subset of PSLT will examine | | |
| | | | | data monthly | Tardy Report | |
| | | | with appropriate reports | data monthly | ruruy Report | |
| | | every 20 days to | with appropriate reports | | Attendance Plan | |
| | | review the school's | | | r titeridance i ian | |
| | | Attendance Plan | | | | |
| | that are impacting | | Social Worker will | | | |
| | | , | maintain data base | | | |
| | | implemented with | | | | |
| | -Lack of time | fidelity and 2) | | | | |
| | | discuss targeted | | | | |
| | attendance | students. A | | | | |
| | | data base will | | | | |
| | -Lack of staff | be maintained | | | | |
| | to focus on | for students | | | | |
| | attendance | 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 | | ĺ | I | |

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

| Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | | | |
|--|--|------|------|------|------|--|
| | 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 Grade Level/ PD Facilitator PD Participants Person or Position Responsible for Target Dates and Schedules Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring Subject Monitoring (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or and/or PLC Focus (e.g., Early Release) and and/or

school-wide) Schedules (e.g., frequency of PLC Leader meetings)

Administrators Review plan and student data every 20 Social Worker Social Worker At Administrator staff meting August/October/Jan days

Attendance Plan

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 Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |

| 1. Suspension | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | There needs to be common school- | | subgroup | Discipline Referrals and out of school suspensions | Crystal Report ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data | |
| | | New behavior plan implemented school wide. Staff trained during preplanning. Love and Logic behavior training for all staff. | | | | |

| Suspension Goal #1: | 2012 Total Number | 2013 Expected | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---|--|---|
| • | <u>of</u> | Number of | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | L | | | | |
| 1 | <u>In –School</u> | In- School | | | |
| | Suspensions | Suspensions | | | |
| | <u> </u> | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| The total number | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| of In-School | | | | | |
| Suspensions will | | | | | |
| Suspensions win | | | | | |
| decrease from 2 in | | | | | |
| 2010-2011 to 1 in | ĺ | | | | |
| 2011 2012 | ĺ | | | | |
| 2011- 2012 | I | | l | | |
| | | | | | |
| | I | | l | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| -The total number | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| of students | | | | | |
| receiving In-School | | | | | |
| C | | | | | |
| Suspension will | | | | | |
| decrease from 5 in | | | | | |
| 2011-2012 to 4 in | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 2012-2013 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | I | | | | 1 |
| 1 | I | | l | | |
| -The total number of | I | | l | | |
| | | | | | |
| Out-of-Suspensions | | | | | |
| will decrease from 8 | I | | | | 1 |
| | | | l | | |
| in 2011-2012 to 7 in | | | | | |
| 2012-2013. | | | | | |
| | I | | | | 1 |
| | I | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| - The total number of | | | | | |
| students receiving Out- | I | | l | | |
| of Coloral Commencia | | | | | |
| of-School Suspensions | I | | l | | |
| throughout the school | I | | | | 1 |
| year will decrease by | | | | | |
| 100/ for the 2012 2012 | I | | l | | |
| 10% for the 2012-2013 | | | | | |

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

| a a la a a 1 a a a a a | i | 1 | | | İ | | |
|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|
| school year. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | _ | 1 | | | | | |
| | 5 | 4 | | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| | of Students | Number of Students | | | | | |
| | Suspended | Suspended | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | In-School | <u>In -School</u> | | | | | |
| | 5 | 4 | | | | | |
| | P | | | | | | |
| | 2012 Number of | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| | | Number of | | | | | |
| | Suspensions | | | | | | |
| | | Out-of-School | | | | | |
| | | <u>Suspensions</u> | | | | | |
| | 8 | 7 | | | | | |
| | 2012 Total Number | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| | of Students | Number of Students | | | | | |
| | Suspended | Suspended | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Out- of- School | Out- of-School_ | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 0 | 7 | | | | | |
| | 8 | / | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | Data indicates | | Managing and Motivating" | Administration and | "UNTIE" ODR and suspension | |
| | | that there is | | subgroup | PSLT will review | data cross-referenced with | |
| | | wide variation | and Motivating" | | | mainframe discipline data | |
| | | in the number of | subgroup will review | PSLT | Discipline Referrals | · | |
| | | discipline referrals | data and make | | (ODRs) and out of | | |
| | | generated across | recommendations | | school suspensions | | |
| | | classrooms. | to the PSLT for | | monthly in targeted | | |
| | | | additional training | | classrooms | | |
| | | | in classroom | | | | |
| | | | management for | | | | |
| | | | teachers in need | | | | |
| | | | (CHAMPS) | | | | |

| 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
|---|--|--|--|
| exist for student to connect and establish mentor | ect and implemented to support Social Worker of mentoring students who accrue more aships with than 3 suspension days in School Psychological workers. | 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 | |

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

Grade Level/ Subject

PD Facilitator

PLC Leader

PD Participants

Target Dates and Schedules

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or

(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

(e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

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 Achieveme nt | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|----------------------------|--|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |

| 4 77 141 1794 | l ₁ | l ₁ | Ī1 | Ī ₁ | 1 | T | 1 |
|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| 1. Health and Fitness | 1. | 1. | 1. | 1. | 1. | | |
| Goal | | ĺ | | | | | |
| | | Elementary | Principal | Classroom walkthroughs | Classroom teachers | | |
| | | School students | • | | document in their lesson | | |
| | | | Assistant Principal | Class schedules | plans 90 min. Teacher | | |
| | | 150 minutes | i issistant i imoipai | | Directed pe per week | | |
| | | of p.e. per | | | | | |
| | | week in grades | | | Physical Ed. Teachers | | |
| | | Kindergarten | | | schedules will reflect 60 | | |
| | | through 5. | | | minutes | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| | Level :* | Level:* | | | | | |
| D : 11 2012 2012 1 1 | | | | | | | |
| During the 2012-2013 school | | | | | | | |
| year, the number of students | | | | | | | |
| scoring in the "Healthy Fitness | | | | | | | |
| Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer | | | | | | | |
| for assessing aerobic capacity | | | | | | | |
| and cardiovascular health will | | | | | | | |
| increase from 75% on the | | | | | | | |
| Pretest to 85% on the Posttest | | | | | | | |
| l retest to 6570 on the rostiest | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 75% | 85% | | | | | |
| | 7570 | 0370 | | | | | |
| | | | 2.Health and physical | .2.PE teacher | 2.Data on the number | 2. | |
| | | | activity initiatives developed | | of students scoring in | | |
| | | | and implemented by PE | | the Health Fitness Zone | DACED took common and of the | |
| | | | teacher | | (HEZ) | PACER test component of the | |
| | | | | | | FITNESSGRAM PACER for | |
| 1 | ĺ | | | | I | assessing cardiovascular health | |

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

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

opic Grade Level/ Subject

/

PD Facilitator

and/or

PLC Leader

acılıtator PD Parti

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)).

| _ | Triffic asing percentages | when using percentages, merade the name of stadents the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 7070 (32)). | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ſ | | Problem- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Additional Goal(s) | Solving | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Auditional Goal(s) | Process to | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | Increase Student Achieveme nt | | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----|--|---|--|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | | | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |
| 1. Continuous Improvement Goal | | PLCs will meet after faculty meetings and when possible for additional time. | Who | | 1.1. PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST team on progress of their PLC. | |

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

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

| 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--|------|--|
| | | | | | | |
| - Not all staff is trained in | Vertical PLC's during Staff | Principal and trained staff members | PSLT will review data. | PLC Facilitators will provide feedback | | |
| PLCs. | PLC's | memoers | | to PLST team on | | |
| - PLC | | | | progress of their PLC | | |
| Facilitators/ | | <u>How</u> | | | | |
| Team Leaders are not all | | - Administration monitor | | | | |
| trained to lead | | - Administration monitor | | | | |
| PLCs. | | | | | | |
| - Difficulty | | | | | | |
| making the transition | | | | | | |
| for keeping | | | | | | |
| meetings focused. | | | | | | |
| locused. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 1.3 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| PLCs do not always have a | | | | | | |
| clear focus | | | | | | |
| - PLCs not | | | | | | |
| sure what they | | | | | | |
| should be doing in the | | | | | | |
| meetings. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------------|---|------|--|
| include the SIP's goals. | Teachers who have received District training in PLCs and PLC Facilitation How | PSLT will review data | PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST team on progress of their PLC. | | |

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 Subject

ΑII

Grade Level/

PD Facilitator

PD Participants

Target Dates and Schedules

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

(e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)

PLC Leader

and/or

PSLT leaders Teachers

October/November

PSLT meetings

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

RTI

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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

| Reading Goal A: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| 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%. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | A.2. | |
| | | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | |

| B. Florida Alternate | B.1. | B.1. | В.1. | B.1. | B.1. | |
|---|------|--------------|------|------|------|--|
| Assessment: | | | | | | |
| Percentage of students making Learning Gains in | | See | | | | |
| reading. | | Rea | | | | |
| | | ding Goal | | | | |
| | | Goal | | | | |
| | | 5d | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

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

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. | | Strategy | | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |
| D. Students scoring proficient in Reading. | | 2.1. See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4 | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | |

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

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

| 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

| | i e | i e | | | | |
|--|-------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Based on the analysis of | Anticipated | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool | |
| student achievement data, | | | | | | |
| and reference to "Guiding | | | 571 11 21141 | or 21.4 1 2 4 1.14 1 | | |
| Questions", identify and | | | Who and how will the | How will the evaluation tool data be | | |
| define areas in need of | | | fidelity be monitored? | used to determine the effectiveness | | |
| improvement for the | | | | of strategy? | | |
| following group: | | | | | | |
| | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | |
| - • - 1011444 | l'.1. | r.1. | r.1. | ₽ `.1. | F.1. | |
| Alternate | | | | | | |
| Assessment: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | l_ | | | | |
| at in mathematics | | See | | | | |
| (Levels 4-9). | | pcc | | | | |
| (Zeveis 19). | | h | | | | |
| | | VI ath | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| Ţ | | Guai | | | | |
| | | l | | | | |
| | | 5 d | | | | |
| | | P u | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9). | | See Math Goal 5d | | | | |

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

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

| C. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| 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

| Elementary, Middle and High Science Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme nt | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|----------------------------|--|
| 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: | | | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool | |

| J. Florida Alternate | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | Teacher made | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Assessment: Students | | | | | Assessments | |
| scoring at proficient in | -Need to | Strategy | Who | Teacher Level | | |
| science (Levels 4-9). | provide | | | | District Assessments as | |
| serence (Eevels 17). | a school | | Principal, Assistant | -Teachers reflect on lesson | Appropriate | |
| | | achievement | Principal, ESE Specialist | outcomes and use this | | |
| | structure and | improves | | knowledge to drive future | | |
| | procedure for | through the | | instruction. | | |
| | regular and on- | effective and | тт. | DI C.L d | | |
| | going review of | implementatio | <u>How</u> | PLC Level | | |
| | To address | n of students' | IEP Progress Reports | -PLCs reflect on lesson | | |
| | | IEP goals, | illi Tiogiess Reports | outcomes and data used to | | |
| | | strategies, | Academic Reviews | drive future instruction. | | |
| | | modifications, | | | | |
| | | and | | Leadership Team Level | | |
| | | accommodatio | | | | |
| | | ns. | | -Data is used to drive | | |
| | | | | teacher support and student | | |
| | | -Throughout | | supplemental instruction. | | |
| | | 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. | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| Science Goal J: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| 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%. | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | |
| | | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | |

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

| M. Florida | M.1. | M.1. | M.1. | M.1. | M.1. | |
|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--------|--|
| • | IVI. I. | | 171.1. | 171.1. | 141.1. | |
| Alternate | 27 17 | C44 | XX71 | Tanahan Lawal | | |
| | | <u>Strategy</u> | Who_ | Teacher Level | | |
| Students scoring | provide a school | CWD at a dama | Deignaignal ESE agranialist | Taraham mellast an lasan | | |
| | . O | SWD student achievement | Principal, ESE specialist, | -Teachers reflect on lesson | | |
| writing (Levels 4-9). | structure and | | Assistant Principal | outcomes and use this | | |
| | procedure for | improves through | | knowledge to drive future | | |
| | regular and on- | the effective | | instruction. | | |
| | going review of | and consistent | How | DLC Laval | | |
| | students' IEPs | implementation of students' IEP | How_ | PLC Level | | |
| | To address this | | IED Dragnage Danaste | -PLCs reflect on lesson | | |
| | barrier. | goals, strategies, modifications, | IEP Progress Reports Academic Reviews | outcomes and data used to | | |
| | | and | Academic Reviews | drive future instruction. | | |
| | | accommodations. | | drive future instruction. | | |
| | | 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. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Writing Goal M: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|--|--|------|------|------|------|--|
| 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.3. | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | |

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| areas in need of improvement: | | | fidelity be monitored? | How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | |
| STEM Goal #1: | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| | | | PLC or grade level lead | Administrative/resource teacher walk-throughs | 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

Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012

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

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

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

| School Differentiated Accountability | | , |
|--------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Status | | |
| Priority | □Focus | Prevent |

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

□ Yes No

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

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

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