FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Oak Park Elementary

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Oak Park Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Joyce M. Miles	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Jameliah Gabriel-Washington	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Highly Qualified Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Joyce M Miles	BS-Elem ED MA-ED Leadership School Principal ESOL	11	11	11/12: C 10/11: D 84% AYP Oak Park 09/10: C 87% AYP-Oak Park
Assistant Principal	Jessica Atkins	BS-Elem ED MS-ED Leadership ESOL	4	4	11/12: C 10/11: D 84% AYP Oak Park 09/10: C 87% AYP-Oak Park
Administrator	Rowena Johnson	BS- Elem ED MA- ED Leadership School Principal	7	7	11/12: C 10/11: D 84% AYP Oak Park 09/10: C 87% AYP-Oak Park

		ESOL			

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Leniece Edwards	Masters in Ed. Leadership	1	1	11/12: 10/11: 09/10:
Reading	Marian Moore-Taylor	Masters in Ed. Leadership	1	1	11/12: 10/11: 09/10:

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 2013	
2. Recruitment Fair	Principal	Ongoing	
3. Salary Differential	General Director	Ongoing	
4. TIF	Supervisor of Data Analysis	October 2013	
5. Performance Pay	General Director	October 2013	

6. TIP/Mentor Meetings	Principal	Ongoing	
7. On-Site Trainings	Principal	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Teachers • 3 out of field	Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented. **Administrators** Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on: • Preparing and taking the certification exam • Completing classes need for certification • Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers • Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s) **Academic Coach** • The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis **PLC** • The teachers will attend PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers

58	5	26	23	4	23	82	3	1	

Teacher Mentoring Program

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Stephanie Collier	Xanthe Davis	Xanthe Davis has been teaching in Hilsborough County Public Schools for the last 8 years. She has extensive experience teaching at Title 1 and Renaissance Schools and has taught on the primary level throughout her teaching career. Xanthe's most recent assignment was teaching 1st grade at Sulphur Springs Elementary School.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Victoria Lyons		SAME AS ABOVE	SAME AS ABOVE
Susan Menendez		SAME AS ABOVE	SAME AS ABOVE
Alexandra Tischler		SAME AS ABOVE	SAME AS ABOVE
Leandra Mikos		SAME AS ABOVE	SAME AS ABOVE
Savanna Langford		SAME AS ABOVE	SAME AS ABOVE
Shonte Brownlee		SAME AS ABOVE	SAME AS ABOVE
Lindsay Murphy		SAME AS ABOVE	SAME AS ABOVE
Jeremy Jackson		SAME AS ABOVE	SAME AS ABOVE
Nava Lundy		SAME AS ABOVE	SAME AS ABOVE
Sarah Drake		SAME AS ABOVE	SAME AS ABOVE
Shawn Swingle		SAME AS ABOVE	SAME AS ABOVE

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
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
N/A
Nutrition Programs
N/A
Housing Programs
N/A
Head Start
We utilize information from students in Head Start to transition into Kindergarten.
Adult Education
N/A

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 N/A

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
The RTI/MTSS Leadership team: ***Elementary*** The leadership team includes: • Principal • Assistant Principal • Principal on Special Assignment • Guidance Counselor • School Psychologist • Social Worker • Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis) • ESE teacher • Representatives from the PLCs for each grade level, K-5 • SAC Chair (Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals and purpose of the meeting)
Describe how the school-based 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 core Leadership Team is to: 1. Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs at all grade levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. The Leadership team meets regularly (weekly). Specific responsibilities include: • Oversee the multi-layered model of instructional delivery RTI (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)

- Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Determine scheduling needs, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers2/3
- Facilitate the implementation of specific programs that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/chats conducted by the PLCs.
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Organize and support systematic data collection (e.g., district and state assessments; during-the-grading period school assessments/checks for understanding; in-school surveys)
- Assist and monitor teacher use of SMART goals per unit of instruction. (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
  - Implementation and support of PLCs
  - Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum Running Records/ Writing Prompts and ERT information such as EasyCBM
  - Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions. (as outlined in our SIP)
  - Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences.
- On a monthly basis, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the month.
- Support the planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs and Specialty PSLT.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) on core curriculum material.
- Coordinate/collaborate/integrate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).

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

- The Chair of SAC is a member of the Leadership Team/PSLT.
- The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the Leadership Team/PLST monitors the effectiveness of instruction and intervention by reviewing student data as well as data related to implementation fidelity (teacher walk-through data).
- The Leadership Team/PSLT communicates with and supports the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by distributing Leadership Team members across the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, the Leadership Team members who are part of the PLCs regularly report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger Leadership Team/PSLT.
- The Leadership Team/PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
  - Use the problem-solving model when analyzing data:
    1. What is the problem? (Problem Identification)
    2. Why is it occurring? (Problem Analysis and Barrier Identification)
    3. What are we going to do about it? (Action Plan Design and Implementation)
    4. Is it working? (Monitor Progress and Evaluate Action Plan Effectiveness)
  - Identify the problem (based on an analysis of the data disaggregated via data sorts) in multiple areas – curriculum content, behavior, and attendance
  - Develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers).

- o Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.
- o Identify appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at regular intervals matched to the intensity of the level of instructional/intervention support provided.
- o Develop grading period or units of instruction//intervention goals that are ambitious, time-bound, and measureable (e.g., SMART goals).
- o Review progress monitoring data at regular intervals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify intervention and/or enrichment support).
- o Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring.
- o Assess the implementation of the strategies on the SIP using the following questions:
  1. Does the data show implementation of strategies are resulting in positive student growth?
  2. To what extent are we making progress toward the school's SIP goals?
  3. If we are making progress, what can we do to sustain what is working?
  4. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?
  5. What should we do next? What should be our plan of action?

MTSS Implementation

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

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released tests	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach/Math Coach/Science Resource/ Writing Resource/ Reading Resource/AP
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall Assessment Binder	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers Reading Coach/Math Coach/Science Resource/ Writing Resource/ Reading Resource/AP
District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability Form A, B, C	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall Assessment Binder	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers Reading Coach/Math Coach/Science Resource/ Writing Resource/ Reading Resource/AP
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall PLC Logs Assessment Binder	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers, RTI Team
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall Assessment Binder	Reading Coach/ Reading Resource Teacher/Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative; AP
Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. Reading	Ed-Line PLC Database PLC logs	Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/Leadership Team Member Reading Coach/Math Coach/Science Resource/

Math Writing Science	Assessment Binder	Writing Resource/ Reading Resource/AP
DRA-2	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher, Reading Resource, Reading Coaches
Reports on Demand	District Generated Database	Leadership Team PSLT, AP

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP)* (see below) Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials) EasyCBM Running Records DRA2	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/ Reading Coach/Math Coach/Science Resource/ Writing Resource/ Reading Resource/AP
Differentiated mini assessments based on core curriculum assessments.	Individual teacher data base PLC/Department data base	Individual Teachers/PLCs
Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs	Assessments included in computer-based programs	PLCs/Individual Teachers

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Leadership Team/will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District's RtI Committee/RtI Facilitators develop(s) resources and staff development trainings on PS/RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions, as identified by teacher needs assessment and/or EET evaluation data, will occur during faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. The Leadership Team will send school team representatives to ongoing PS/RtI trainings/support sessions that are offered district-wide. Our school will invite our area RtI Facilitator to visit as needed to review our progress in implementation of PS/RtI and provide on-site coaching and support to our Leadership Teams/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI as they become available. New teachers to Oak Park and the district of Hillsborough will take courses using the professional Development site.

Describe plan to support RTI process (also known as MTSS)

Response to Intervention (RtI) has also been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions. In order to support MTSS in our schools, we will:

• Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, Steering,

and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).
- Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.
- Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).   • Principal   • Assistant Principal for Curriculum   • Reading Coach   • Reading Teachers   • Media Specialist   • Teachers across content areas (Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies and Electives) who have demonstrated effective reading instruction as reflected through positive student reading gains
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).   The principal is the LLT chairperson. The reading coach is a member of the team and provides extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions. The reading coach and principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instructional support is provided to all teachers.   The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the Problem Solving Leadership team's support plan. Additionally the principal ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?   • Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading goals/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)   • Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan

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

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. FCAT 2.0: **Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).** Reading Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 26% to 33%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **26%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **33%**	1.1. -PLC's struggle with adequate time to meet and collaborate on complex texts. -Limited training on complex text. -Teachers need a better understanding of how to use SMART goals to drive instruction.	1.1. **Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas** Reading comprehension improves when **students are engaged in grappling with complex text**. Teachers need to understand how to **select/identify** complex text, **shift** the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and **share** complex texts with all students. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.** **Action Steps** *Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction* -Grade level PLC's will **select**/evaluate text using the Text Complexity Rubric provided to them at the Professional Study Day training. -PLC's will work together to monitor the balance/**shift** of literary and informational texts being used. -PLC's will develop an instructional plan for **sharing** complex text with students using the backwards design model to connect complex texts with their instructional focus as determined by the student data. -During the lesson, students will be engaged in text dependent tasks using complex texts *PLCs After Instruction* -Teachers will reflect on their lessons using complex text and collaborate with their colleagues to improve the effectiveness of the sharing of complex text. -PLC's will collaborate with the Reading	1.1. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators How -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	1.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect with colleagues on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments Using EasyCBM Monthly Running Records for grades K-2 monthly and DRA2 2xs a year.

		Coach as needed to implement this strategy.		
1.2 .-PLC's struggle with adequate time to meet and collaborate on complex texts. -Limited training on complex text. -Teachers need a better understanding of how to use SMART goals to drive instruction.	1.2. **Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas** Common Core Questions of all types and levels are necessary to scaffold students' understanding of complex text. Teachers need to understand and use higher-order, text-dependent questions at the word/phrase, sentence, and paragraph/passage levels (Webb's, Bloom, Costas). Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Scaffolding of students' grappling with complex text through well-crafted text-dependent question assists students in discovering and achieving deeper understanding of the author's meaning. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation**. **Action Steps** **Action Steps** *Within PLCs <u>Before</u> Instruction and <u>During</u> Instruction* -PLC's will collaborate to develop, write, and select higher–order /text-dependent questions with an emphasis on Webb's Depth of Knowledge question hierarchy -During the lesson, student will grapple with complex text through well-crafted text-dependent questions. *PLCs <u>After</u> Instruction* -Teachers will reflect on their lessons using text-dependent questions and collaborate with their colleagues to improve the implementation of this strategy. -PLC's will collaborate with the Reading Coach as needed to implement this strategy.	1.2. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators <u>How</u> -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	1.2. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect with colleagues on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.2. <u>3x per year</u> - FAIR <u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments Using EasyCBM Monthly Running Records for grades K-2 monthly and DRA2 2xs a year.
1.3 -Teachers are at varying levels of	1.3 The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum.	1.3 <u>Who</u> -Principal	1.3 PLCs will review assessments and chart the	1.3 <u>3x per year</u> - FAIR

		understanding in teaching vocabulary development - Teachers are at varying levels of understanding how to remediate students who have a vocabulary significantly lower than their grade level -PLC meetings do not always include discussion of common word work activities and assessments for content instruction. -PLC meetings do not include the development of word work activities for upcoming lessons. -Administrators and support staff are at varying skill levels with identifying appropriate vocabulary instruction.	Students' vocabulary acquisition will improve through the implementation of appropriately leveled, **vocabulary development** lessons across all content areas. **Action Steps** 1. PLC schedules will provide common planning time. 2. PLCs will familiarize themselves with literacy and non-fiction content standards. 3. PLCs will recognize vocabulary needs within each content area. 4. PLCs come to consensus on the use of common assessments: 1) vocabulary items included in end of the unit/segment assessment 2) LA-embedded vocabulary development activities and/or 3) any program assessment provided in curriculum resources and materials. 5. As a Professional Development activity, PLCs will review vocabulary standards/benchmark to be addressed within each content area. 6. 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 Coach -Subject Area Leaders and Grade Level Subject PLC Facilitators -Reading Leadership Team How -PLC logs turned into administration. -Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-through observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form *(EET tool - Vocabulary strategy will be added to the form under Instructional Practices.)* -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-through. -Leadership Team will review student data every nine weeks.	increase in the number of students reaching at least 70% mastery on units of instruction. PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitator will share data with the Leadership Team. The Leadership Team/and Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	During the Grading Period -Program generated assessments- Istation, Successmaker and FCAT Explorer -Running Records/Fluency Assessments -DRA (Developmental Reading Assessment) scores

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.			2.1.	2.1. **See Goal 1, 3 & 4**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Reading Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 6% to 9%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **6%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **9%**					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.			3.1. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	3.1. **Strategy** Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? **Actions/Details** -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a **Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log** to guide their discussion and way of work.	3.1. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	3.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, and/or leadership team.	3.1. 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
Reading Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 66 points to 69 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **66 Points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **69 Points**					

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

			Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.			
		3.2. -Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.	3.2. **Strategy/Task** Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to **differentiate instruction**. **Actions/Details** *Within PLCs <u>Before</u> Instruction and <u>During</u> Instruction of New Content* -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. *In the classroom* -During the lessons, **students** are involved in flexible grouping techniques *PLCs <u>After</u> Instruction* -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Teachers use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Teachers, using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided. (*Questions are listed in the 2012-2013 Technical Assistance Document under the Differentiation Cross Content strategy*). -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLCs.	3.2. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration, SAL and/or coaches. -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	3.2. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	3.2. <u>3x per year</u> FAIR <u>During the Grading Period</u> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
4. FCAT 2.0: **Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.**			4.1. -Scheduling time for the principal/AP to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis. -Teachers willingness to accept support from the coach.	4.1. **Strategy Across all Content Areas** **Strategy/Task** Student achievement improves through **teachers' collaboration with the academic coach** in all content areas. **Actions/Details** *Academic Coach* -The academic coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the teacher's student past and/or present data. -The academic coach rotates through all subjects' PLCs to: --Facilitate lesson planning that embeds rigorous tasks --Facilitate development, writing, selection of higher-order, text-dependent questions/activities, with an emphasis on Webb's Depth of Knowledge question hierarchy --Facilitate core curriculum assessment data analysis --Facilitate the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students. -Using walk-through data, the academic coach and administration identify teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing. *Leadership Team and Coach* -The academic coach meets with the principal/AP to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year. -Every two weeks, the academic coach meets with the principal/APC to:	4.1. Who Administration How- -Review of coach's log -Review of coach's log of support to targeted teachers. -Administrative walk-throughs of coaches working with teachers (either in classrooms, PLCs or planning sessions)	4.1. Tracking of coach's participation in PLCs. -Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, de-debriefing, professional development, and walk throughs) -Administrator-Instructional Coach meetings to review log and discuss action plan for coach for the upcoming two weeks	4.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 86 points to 89 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **86 Points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **89 Points**					

			--Review log and work accomplished and --Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks.				
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016** / **2016-2017**
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Reading Goal #5:							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** Reading Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 38% to 44%. The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 26% to 33%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 23% to 31%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 38% Black: 26% Hispanic: 23% Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 44% Black: 33% Hispanic: 31% Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. **See Goal 1, 3 & 4**	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.
			5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2
			5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 26% to 33%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **26%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **33%**		**See Goal 1, 3 & 4**			
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 8% to 17%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **8%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **17%**		**See Goal 1, 3 & 4**			

		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5D.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the AP will put a system in place for this school year.	5D.1. **Strategy** SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	5D.1. Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal ESE Specialist How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by AP	5D.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction	5D.1. During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance
Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 4% to 7%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **4%** / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **7%**					
		5D.2. -Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level.	5D.2. **Strategy/Task** SWD student achievement improves through teachers' implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications. **Actions** *Plan*	5D.2. Who -School based Administrators -PLC Facilitators How PLC logs (with specific SWD information) for like	5D.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal.	5D.2. -FAIR During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance

				courses/grades.	PLC Level
		-General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time.	For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our SWD need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD? ***Plan for the "Do"*** What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal? -What resources do we need? -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD? -What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our SWD? -What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help SWD learn? -Specifically how will we implement the _____strategy during the lesson? -What are teachers going to do during the lesson for SWD? -What are SWD going to do during the lesson to maximize learning? ***Reflect on the "Do"/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work <u>during</u> the unit.*** For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers **reflect** and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD: -What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? -What didn't work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next? -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what worked? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons?		-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SWD SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.

| | | | -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what didn't work? Why? What are we going to do next?
-What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding? And/or analysis of student performance?
-How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons?

Reflect/Check – Analyze Data
Discuss one or more of the following:
-What is the SWD data?
-What is the data telling us as individual teachers?
-What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department?
-What are SWD not learning? Why is this occurring?
-Which SWD are learning?

Act on the Data
After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data.
-What are we going to do about SWD not learning?
-What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions (either to individual SWD or small groups)?
-How are we going to re-teach the skill differently?
-How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working? | | | |
| | | 5D.3 | 5D.3

See Goal 1, 3 & 4 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 |

Reading Professional Development

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

				meetings)		
Vocabulary Training	K-5	DRT	Reading K-5	November 2012	Classroom Walk-thrus	Coach AP DRT
DRA2/Running Records	K-5	Coaches	Reading K-5	September 2012	Classroom Walk-thrus	Coaches Reading Resource AP DRT
Complex Text	K-5	Coaches	Reading K-5	October 2012	Classroom Walk-thrus	Coaches Reading Resource DRT

End of Reading Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: **Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).**			1.1. - Lack of implementing Differentiated Instruction - Lack of communication by students - Lack of problem solving - Lack of rigor and teachers concept knowledge -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS	1.1. Students' math skills will improve through cognitive complexity problems. As a result, there will be increased use of higher level questions verses lower level questions for both students and teachers. - Teachers will work with Math Coach to gain on understanding of grade level standards. - Based on complexity level of standards, teachers can develop appropriate problem solving questions to guide the math instructional block. - Teachers will work with Math Coach to implement problem solving based lessons. - Develop Math Leadership Team.	1.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Math Coach Academic Coach -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. - Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.	1.1. - PLC meetings to review assessment data for positive trends and percent of students with mastery. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.	1.1. District Assessments - Form 1 - Form 2 - Mock FCAT During the Nine Weeks - Chapter Assessments - Informal Assessments
Mathematics Goal #1: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Math will increase from 34% to 42%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **34% (97)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **42% (111)**					
			1.2. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques.	1.2. Students' math achievement improves through frequent participation in higher order questions/discussion activities to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality	1.2. Who -Principal -APEI -Math Coach Academic Coach -Classroom walk-	1.2. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.	1.2. District Assessments - Form 1 - Form 2 - Mock FCAT During the Nine Weeks

			questions/prompts and discussion techniques promotes thinking by students, assisting them to arrive at new understandings of complex material.	throughs observing this strategy.		- Chapter Assessments - Informal Assessments
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Math will increase from 9% to 11%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **9% (25)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **11% (31)**	2.1. - Lack of implementing Differentiated Instruction - Lack of communication by students - Lack of problem solving - Lack of rigor and teachers concept knowledge -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS	2.1. Students' math skills will improve through cognitive complexity problems. As a result, there will be increased use of higher level questions verses lower level questions for both students and teachers. - Teachers will work with Math Coach to gain on understanding of grade level standards. - Based on complexity level of standards, teachers can develop appropriate problem solving questions to guide the math instructional block. - Teachers will work with Math Coach to implement problem solving based lessons. - Develop Math Leadership Team to discuss math trends.	2.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Math Coach Academic Coach -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. - Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.	2.1. - PLC meetings to review assessment data for positive trends and percent of students with mastery. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.	2.1. District Assessments - Form 1 - Form 2 - Mock FCAT During the Nine Weeks - Chapter Assessments - Informal Assessments
			2.2. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques.	2.2. Students' math achievement improves through frequent participation in higher order questions/discussion	2.2. Who -Principal -APEI -Math Coach	2.2. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.	2.2. District Assessments - Form 1 - Form 2 - Mock FCAT

			-Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.	activities to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality questions/prompts and discussion techniques promotes thinking by students, assisting them to arrive at new understandings of complex material. Students' math achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to **differentiate instruction**.	Academic Coach -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.		During the Nine Weeks - Chapter Assessments - Informal Assessments
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1. - Lack of implementing Differentiated Instruction - Lack of communication by students - Lack of problem solving - Lack of rigor and teachers concept knowledge -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS	3.1. Students' math skills will improve through cognitive complexity problems. As a result, there will be increased use of higher level questions verses lower level questions for both students and teachers. - Teachers will work with Math Coach to gain on understanding of grade level standards. - Based on complexity level of standards, teachers can develop appropriate problem solving questions to guide the math instructional block. - Teachers will work with Math Coach to implement problem solving based	3.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Math Coach Academic Coach -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. - Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.	3.1. - At least monthly PLC meetings to review assessment data for positive trends. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.	3.1. District Assessments - Form 1 - Form 2 - Mock FCAT During the Nine Weeks - Chapter Assessments - Informal Assessments
Mathematics Goal #3: In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math will increase from 59 to 62	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **59 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **62 points**					

				lessons. - Develop Math Leadership Team to discuss math trends.			
			3.2. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques.	3.2. Students' math achievement improves through frequent participation in higher order questions/discussion activities to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality questions/prompts and discussion techniques promotes thinking by students, assisting them to arrive at new understandings of complex material.	3.2. Who -Principal -APEI -Math Coach Academic Coach -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	3.2. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.	3.2. District Assessments - Form 1 - Form 2 - Mock FCAT During the Nine Weeks - Chapter Assessments - Informal Assessments
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math will increase from 74 to 76	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **74 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **76 points**	4.1. - Lack of implementing Differentiated Instruction - Lack of communication by students - Lack of problem solving - Lack of rigor and teachers concept knowledge -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS	4.1. Students' math skills will improve through cognitive complexity problems. As a result, there will be increased use of higher level questions verses lower level questions for both students and teachers. - Teachers will work with Math Coach to gain on understanding of grade level standards. - Based on complexity level of standards, teachers can develop appropriate problem solving questions to guide	4.1. Who -Principal -APEI -Math Coach Academic Coach -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. - Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans	4.1. - PLC meetings to review assessment data for positive trends and percent of students with mastery. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.	4.1. District Assessments - Form 1 - Form 2 - Mock FCAT During the Nine Weeks - Chapter Assessments - Informal Assessments

				the math instructional block.	seen during administration walk-throughs.		
				- Teachers will work with Math Coach to implement problem solving based lessons. - Develop Math Leadership Team to discuss math trends.			
			4.2. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.	4.2. Students' math achievement improves through frequent participation in higher order questions/discussion activities to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality questions/prompts and discussion techniques promotes thinking by students, assisting them to arrive at new understandings of complex material. Students' math achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to **differentiate instruction**.	4.2 . Who -Principal -APEI -Math Coach Academic Coach -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	4.2. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.	4.2. District Assessments - Form 1 - Form 2 - Mock FCAT During the Nine Weeks - Chapter Assessments - Informal Assessments
			4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016** | **2016-2017**
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			See Goals				

Math Goal #5:			1.1 and 1.2				
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics**			5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.
Reading Goal #5A: In grades 3-5, the percentage of our Subgroup students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 62% Black: 33% Hispanic: 46% Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 66% Black: 40% Hispanic: 51% Asian: American Indian:					
			5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.
			5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Mathematics Goal #5B: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 35 to 40. .	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **35%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **40%**	See Goals 1.1 and 1.2				
			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C: In grades 3-5, the percentage of ELL students making learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math will increase from 23 to 25.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **23%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **25%**	See Goals 1.1 and 1.2				
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. See goal 1.1 and 1.2	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D: In grades 3-5, the percentage of SWD students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from _30%_ to _32%_.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **30%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **32%**					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.

		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary School Science Goals

Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science. Science Goal #1: In 5th Grade, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science will increase from 25% to 28%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 25% (26/103 students)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 28% 22/ 80 students)	1.1. Not all teachers know how to identify misconceptions and depth of student knowledge of science concepts. -Not all teachers are able to attend available science trainings on dates available by the district. -Not all teachers are knowledgeable of the strategies of inquiry based instruction such as engaging the students, explore time, accountable talk, higher order questioning, etc. -Not all PLC meetings include regular discussion of student data and/or the implementation of the inquiry model. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with the use of achievement series to accurately analyze student data.	1.1. **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge. To achieve this goal, science teachers will increase the number of **inquiry based instruction** (such as student engagement, explore time, accountable talk and higher order questioning) per unit of instruction. Action Steps 1. Teachers will attend District Science training and share information with their PLCs. 2. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling inquiry based instruction strategies. 4. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum and inquiry based instruction strategies.	1.1. Who Principal AP Science Resource Science Teachers How Monitored - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administrative walk-throughs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing inquiry based instruction	1.1. Formative and Minis assessments will be graded by PLC and/or Resource teacher. Scores will be charted to show the increase in the number of students reaching at least 70% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator or Resource Teacher will share data with the Leadership Team. The Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	1.1. 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests and end-of year tests. Semester Exams During the nine weeks - Mini Assessments -Unit assessments

| | | | | 5. At the end of the Big Idea or lesson, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.
6. Teachers bring assessment data to PLC's.
7. Based on the data, teachers discuss inquiry based instruction strategies that were effective.
8 Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning inquiry based instruction strategies.
9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. | | | |
| | | | 1.2
- Teachers at varying skills levels with the ACTIVE THINKING model.
- Lack of common planning time to develop/identify common mini assessments to use (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring.
- Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data.
- Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide. | **1.2**
Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science skills will improve through teachers using the **CIM** strategy on identified tested benchmarks.

Action Steps
1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, science teachers identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation.
2. Based on the data, a 10 day projected timeline/calendar for re-teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum.
3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify and/or | 1.2
Who
Teacher
Principal
APC
Science Resource

How
-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.
-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.
- | 1.2:
-PLCs will review mini-assessment data. recorded in a course specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet).

-For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 70% mastery on each mini-assessment.

PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team reviews data that includes all skills covered during the nine week period. | 1.2.
2x per year
District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing

Semester Exams

During the Nine Weeks
-Benchmark mini assessments
-Unit and/or Segment assessments
- School-generated nine week assessment of all mini lesson skills covered during the nine weeks. |

			develop mini 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 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. PLCs record their work in logs.			
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science. Science Goal #2: In grade 5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students who scored a Level 4 or higher on the 2011 FCAT Science maintained at 2%. An increase of 28% is expected on the 2013 FCAT	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **26%** 2013Expected Level of Performance:* **28%**	2.1. Not all teachers know how to identify misconceptions and depth of student knowledge of science concepts. -Not all teachers are able to attend available science trainings on dates available by the district. -Not all teachers are knowledgeable of the strategies of inquiry based instruction such as engaging the students, explore time, accountable talk, higher order	2.1 **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge. To achieve this goal, science teachers will increase the number of **inquiry based instruction** (such as student engagement, explore time, accountable talk and higher order questioning) per unit of instruction. Action Steps 1. Teachers will attend	2.1 Who Principal AP Science Resource Science Teachers How Monitored - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administrative walk-throughs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing inquiry based instruction	2.1 Formative and Minis assessments will be graded by PLC and/or Resource teacher. Scores will be charted to show the increase in the number of students reaching at least 70% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator or Resource Teacher will share data with the Leadership Team. The Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	2.1 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests and end-of year tests. Semester Exams During the nine weeks - Mini Assessments -Unit assessments

			questioning, etc. -Not all PLC meetings include regular discussion of student data and/or the implementation of the inquiry model. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with the use of achievement series to accurately analyze student data.	District Science training and share information with their PLCs. 2. PLCs write SMART goals based on each nine weeks of material. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling inquiry based instruction strategies. 4. PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum and inquiry based instruction strategies. 5. At the end of the Big Idea or lesson, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. 6. Teachers bring assessment data to PLC's. 7. Based on the data, teachers discuss inquiry based instruction strategies that were effective. 8 Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning inquiry based instruction strategies. 9. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.			
	2.2 - Teachers at varying skills levels with the ACTIVE THINKING model. - Lack of common planning time to develop/identify common mini assessments to		**2.2** **Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' science skills will improve through teachers using the **CIM** strategy on identified	2..2 Who Teacher Principal APC Science Resource How	2.2: -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. recorded in a course specific PLC data base (excel spread sheet).	2.2 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams During the Nine Weeks	2.2.

	use (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring. - Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. - Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide.	tested benchmarks. Action Steps 1. Through data analysis of FCAT, baseline data, classroom assessments and student performance, science teachers identify essential tested benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. 2. Based on the data, a 10 day projected timeline/calendar for re-teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. 3. As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons/assessments. 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 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. PLCs record their work in logs.	-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty. Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks. -	-For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 70% mastery on each mini-assessment. PLCs will review evaluation data. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team reviews data that includes all skills covered during the nine week period.	-Benchmark mini assessments -Unit and/or Segment assessments - School-generated nine week assessment of all mini lesson skills covered during the nine weeks.	

		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Technology and Hands-On Activities, Powerpoints, Videos HOT Questioning, Active Thinking Questioning	Grades 3-5	Science Resource Classroom Teachers Science Dept. Guests	Science Teachers- Whole department	1 half day in fall and I half day in spring	Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor Technology and Hands-On Activity implementation	Administration Team Science Resource

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing. Writing/LA Goal #1: There will be an increase in the percent of students scoring a 3.5 of higher on FCAT Writes from 78% in 2012 to 80% or above in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **78% (88)**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **80% (83)**	• Teachers do not have ESE Support • Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing. • All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.	• Based on baseline data PLC's write SMART goals for each month. (for example during the first month, 40% of the students will score a 3.5 or on above on the monthly formative writing prompt.) • As a Professional Development activity PLC discussions help draw teachers to a consensus regarding students trends, needs and scores based on connecting student writing with the new state anchors. • As a Professional Development Activity during PLC discussion teachers will use a checklist across grade levels to make sure the students are mastering the crafts and writing techniques being taught. • As a Development activity PLC's will examine student conferences, daily drafts, and or monthly writing menu of teaching points, share and implement ideas to	Who • Principal • Assistant Principal • Writing Resource Teacher • District Academic Coaches How Monitored • Weekly PLC logs turned into administration and administration will provide feedback • Classroom walkthroughs observing this strategy. • Evidence of strategy in teacher's lesson plans seen during administration and district academic coaches' walkthroughs. • HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In-form (EET tool). • Monitoring data will be	• PLC's will identify trends(deficiencies and growth) in student writing performance and collaborate to modify the instruction calendar to provide differentiated instruction as appropriate. • PLC's will review monthly formative writing assessments with the Elementary Writing supervisor/District Academic Writing Coach to determine number of students scoring above proficient as determined by the state rubric. • PLC's will chart the increase in the number of students reaching a 3.5 or above on the monthly writing prompt. • PLC facilitator will share data with the STARR team. The STARR team will review assessment data for positive trends.	• Student monthly demand writes, students daily drafts, conferencing notes, formative assessments, student revisions and anecdotal notes

				push students forward. • As a Professional activity	reviewed every month.		
			• Teachers lack skills and understanding regarding the FCAT Writing Assessment and Scoring Rubric.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			• Teachers not being able to get in FCAT Writing trainings.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Rubric Training for Embedded Assessments	K-5	• Writing Resource Teacher • District Level Staff • Teachers	• Language Arts Teachers grades K-5 • Vertical team PLC's	• Department meetings across September 2012-May 2013	• PLC LOGS TURNED INTO ADMINISTRATION. • Monthly Writing Prompts. • Percent of students making adequate progress toward goal will be calculated monthly. • Focused administration walkthroughs looking for Writer's Workshop strategies.	• Administration • Writing Resource Teacher • Academic Writing Coaches
Holistic Scoring Training	K-5	• District Trainers • Writing Resource Teacher • Administration	• Language Arts Teachers grades K-5 • Writing Resource Teacher • Vertical team PLC's	• Through Spring 2013	• PLC logs turned into administration. • Checking PDS in-service records for attendance	• Administration • Writing Resource Teacher • Academic Writing Coaches

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance			
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance **Attendance Goal #1:** The yearly attendance rate will increase from 93.41% in 2011-2012 to 94.00% in 2012-2013. **Attendance Goal #2:** The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will decrease from 146 in 2011-2012 to 139 in 2012-2013. **Attendance Goal #3:** -The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease from 185 in 2011-2012 to 176 in 2012-2013.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* **93.41%** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) **146** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) **185**	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* **94%** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) **139** **(5%)** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) **176** **(5%)**	**Attendance Goal #1:** -Serious personal or family issues that present barriers to consistent daily attendance. -Lack of staff to focus on attendance and serve on committee -Time for the Attendance committee to meet monthly -Extensive medical appointments scheduled during the school day -Training and time for teachers to complete the required forms -Parents not ensuring students are at the bus stop on time -Teachers taking accurate attendance daily	**Attendance Goal #1/2/3:** **Tier I** -Attendance Committee will develop a School Wide Attendance Plan to which addresses 5 day absence, 10 days Excused for the school year, 3 days unexcused, 10 day unexcused, and excesses sign-ins and sign-outs and also includes an Incentive plan -Teachers will take accurate daily attendance and contact parents to discuss how attendance is affecting academic performance -Teachers will discuss targeted students at PLC's - Attendance Monitor will contact parents for all unexcused absences from the daily attendance report -Registrar will correct unexcused absences once contact is made with parents by the Attendance Monitor. Create daily attendance procedures -SSW will provide teachers with a roster of targeted students and consult with teachers	**Attendance Goal #1/2/3:** **Who** Administration PSL/RtI Team Attendance Committee Attendance Monitor Social Worker Guidance Counselor Registrar Attendance Monitor Truancy Officer **How** *Administration* - Will meet with parents who are not responding to interventions -Will send request for doctor's note *Attendance Committee* -Will develop a school wide attendance plan to include an Incentive Program -Meet monthly to discuss targeted students -Make referral to CST *Teacher* -Take daily attendance -Reward students with perfect and improved attendance weekly with Lion Loot and Treasure box. -Contact parents after the 3rd consecutive absence and complete the Oak Park	1.1. -Attendance Committee will examine data monthly using school district reports	**Attendance Goal #1/2/3:** -Attendance Reports -Tardy Report -Attendance Plan -CST notes -RtI Notes

				Attendance Monitoring Form. -Contact parents after the 3rd consecutive absence and complete the Oak Park Attendance Monitoring ***Registrar*** -Checks attendance line for messages, and sends 5 & 10 day letters -Will run data on regular basis for meetings: SD4133A(Unexcused absences) SD4130A (Excessive absences) SD4219A (Percent of attendance by homeroom) SD4120A (Homeroom attendance report) SD4230A (Percent of attendance by grade) SD4230B (Percent of attendance by school) SD4125A (Perfect Attendance by homeroom) 5 and 10 day attendance letters ***School Social Worker*** -Monitor attendance -Remind students via morning show -Remind parents of policy and procedures at via various methods of communication -Meet with students who have excessive absences -Consult with teacher of students with excessive absences -Meet with Attendance Committee to discuss targeted students -Conduct home visits for		

					targeted students -Minutes from all meetings will be provided to the principal.		
			Attendance Goal #2: -Parents fail to call the attendance line and report the absence -Extensive medical appointments	**Tier II** -SSW will provide administration and teachers with a roster of targeted students -Targeted students will be discussed at monthly Attendance Committee -Targeted students will be invited to attend group counseling and/or receive a mentor -SSW and Truancy Officer will make home visits for targeted students -SSW will make referrals to outside agencies to address barriers -Partnership with Big Brother/Big Sister, Academy of Hope, 100 Black Mentors, SEEDS, CINS/FINS **Tier III** -Targeted students will be discussed at monthly Attendance Committee - Referral to the Attendance Review Board	**Attendance Goal #3:** ***Attendance Monitor*** -Contact parents of all unexcused absences -Remind parents of policy and procedure when daily phone calls are made from any school personnel -Provide a copy of daily updates to SSW and registrar ***Registrar*** -Will correct unexcused absences once contact is made with a parent by Attendance monitor	1.2.	1.2.
			Attendance Goal #3: -Teachers taking accurate daily attendance	**Attendance Goal #3:** -SSW will	**Attendance Goal #3:**	1.3.	1.3.

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance Counts	K-5	SSW	School wide	Faculty Meeting		
RtI	K-5	Psychologist	School Wide	Early Release/Faculty Meeting		

Effective parent Conferencing	K-5	SSW	School Wide	Faculty Meeting		

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: The Total number of In-School suspensions will decrease from _20_ in 2011-2012 to __4_ in 2012-2013. The Total number of students receiving In-School Suspension will decrease from _15__ in 2011-2012 to __4_ in 2012-2013. The Total number of Out of School Suspension will decrease from __92__ in 2011-2012 to ___75__ in 2012-2013.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions **4** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School **4** 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions **92** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School **64**	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions **20** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School **15** 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions **75** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School **20**	1.1. There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	1.1. Tier I: Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey and discussion, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations.	1.1. PSLT will do behaviors and remediation.	1.1 PSLT "behavior subgroup" with review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspension monthly.	1.1. Crystal Report ODR and suspension cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data.
			1.2. Data indicates that there is wide variation in number of ODRs generated across classrooms	1.2. PSLT "Managing and Motivating" subgroup will review data and make recommendations to the PSLT for additional training in classroom management for	1.2. "Managing and Motivating" subgroup PSLT	1.2. PSLT "Managing and Motivating" subgroup with review data on ODRs and out of school suspensions monthly in targeted classrooms	1.2. "UNTIE" ODR and suspension data cross referenced with mainframe discipline data

		teachers in need (e.g. CHAMPS training)			
		1.3. Few opportunities exist for students to connect and establish mentoring relationships with adults at school.	1.3. Tier 2 "Check and Connect" also known as Breakfast club will be implemented to support students who accrue more than 10 suspension days in one semester.	1.3. Guidance Social Worker School Psychologist Administrator on Special Assignment	1.3. A subgroup of the PSLT will review suspension data and determine the percent of student with 10 or more suspensions per semester. The PSLT will review suspension data biweekly and report progress monthly.	1.3 Biweekly suspension data.

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Positive Behavior Support (PBS)	K-5	District/ USF Trainer	School Wide	Early Release Dates	Monthly Data Review with support from PBS Coach. PSLT will review the attendance and behavior data on a weekly basis, providing mentoring to students, and establishing ongoing contact with parents.	Principal and Assistant Principal

End of Suspension Goals

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

ADDITIONAL GOAL(S)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal Additional Goal #1:			1.	1. Students will engage in the equivalent of one hour twice per week.	1.APEI PE Coaches	1.Checking student schedules Classroom walk-throughs Class schedules	1. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.
During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from __67_% on the Pretest to __84_% on the Posttest.	2012 Current Level : 67	2013 Expected Level : 84		**2.** Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the PE Coach.	**2.** PE Coaches	**2.** Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ)	**2.** PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.
				3.	**3.**	**3.**	**3.**

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity					
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	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)

ADDITIONAL GOAL(S)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal Additional Goal #1:			1.1 -There is still confusion on how to conduct PLCs that are focused on deepening the knowledge base of teachers and improving student performance by the implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. -Still confusion on how the Plan-Do-Check-Act model works. -Still some resistance to staff members attending PLCs and/or arriving on time to meetings. -Teachers asking for more PLC collaboration time. Possibility of waiver will be explored.	1.1 The leadership team will become trained on the use of the PLC "Unit of Instruction" log that follows the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. PLC facilitators will guide their PLCs through the Plan-Do-Check-Act model for units of instruction. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Leadership Team.	1.1 Who Principal AP Leadership Team Team Leaders PLC facilitators	1.1 The Leadership Team will review the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results from the PLC forms with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training.	1.1 PLC Plan Do Check Form
The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students' learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning)" will increase from _65%_in 2012 to 85%_in 2013.	2012 Current Level : 65%	2013 Expected Level : 85%					
			1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLCs	K-5	Team Leaders PLC Facilitators	All K-5	November 2012	Administrator and leadership team walk-throughs Administrator and leadership attendance at PLC meetings	Team Leaders Resource Team Principal AP
Plan-Do-Check-Act	Leadership Team	Leadership Team	School-wide	PLCs meet once a month for	Administrator and leadership team	Leadership Team

Model	All teachers	PLC Facilitators		Plan-Do-Check-Act PLCs.	walk-throughs Administrator and leadership attendance at PLC meetings	

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

A. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9)			2B.1. Teaching effective reading strategies based on access points	2B.1. Student driven progress monitoring and clearly defined expectations.	2B.1. ESE Specialist, Reading Coach and Administrators	2B.1. Progress monitoring data from regularly administered Classroom assessments	2B.1. Individualized standardized assessments (Brigance), District Assessments, SRA Reading Assessments
Reading Goal A: *80% of students taking the FAA in reading will maintain a score of a 4 or higher*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *100% (8)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *100% (5)*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.
B. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1. Providing effective interventions for students on access points	3B.1. Utilize district approved software and specialized personnel to address reading deficits through Direct Instruction	3B.1. ESE Specialist, Reading Coach and Administrators	3B.1. Progress monitoring data and professional learning communities	3B.1. Individualized standardized assessments (Brigance), District Assessments, SRA Reading Assessments
Reading Goal #B: *70% of students taking the FAA will make learning gains in reading.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *100%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *70% (3)*					
			3B.2.	3B.2. Enrichment & extension in classrooms	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

Editor Note: Data for this goal can be found on The Office of Assessment's SIP Evaluation and Development Report

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
C. Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in Listening/Speaking. CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from __36__% to __38__%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: **42%(36)**	1.1.	1.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
D. Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in Reading. CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from _28___% to __30__%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : **28% (36)**	2.1.	2.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the	**Student Evaluation Tool**

					effectiveness of strategy?	
E. Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in Writing.		2.1.	2.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from _14___% to __16__%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : **14% (36)**					
		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

F. Florida Assessment: Students scoring proficient in math (Levels 4-9)			2B.1. Teaching effective math strategies based on access points	2B.1. Student driven progress monitoring and clearly defined expectations.	2B.1. ESE Specialist, Math Coach, Teachers and Administrators	2B.1. Progress monitoring data	2B.1. Individualized standardized assessments (Brigance), District Assessments, Success Math Assessments
Reading Goal #2B: *80% of students taking the FAA in math will score a 4 or higher*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *90% (8)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *80% (5)*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.
G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in math.			3B.1. Providing effective interventions for students on access points.	3B.1. Utilize district approved software and specialized personnel to address math deficits through Direct Instruction	3B.1. ESE Specialist, Math Coach, Teachers and Administrators	3B.1. Progress monitoring data and professional learning communities	3B.1. Individualized standardized assessments (Brigance), District Assessments, Success Math Assessments
Reading Goal #3B: *70% of students taking the FAA will make learning gains in math*	2012 Current Level of Performance: *	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *70% (3)*					
			3B.2.	3B.2. Enrichment & extension in classrooms	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

Elementary Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9). Science Goal J: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:	J.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	J.1. **Strategy** SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	J.1. Who Principal, ESE Specialist Assistance Principal How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by AP	J.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	FAA Brigance Progress Monitoring EasyCBM
			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

I. **Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient (Level 4-9) in Writing**			2B.1. Teaching effective writing strategies based on access points	2B.1. Participate in writing workshops offered in the district	2B.1. ESE Specialist, Writing Resource Teacher, Teachers	2B.1. Progress monitoring data, Writing Samples	2B.1. Demand Writes Assessments, Teacher observation
Reading Goal #2B: *80% of fourth grade students taking the FAA in writing will score a 4 or higher.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *100% (2)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *80% (4)*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.
J. **Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient (Level 4-9) in Science.**			2B.1. Teaching effective science skills based on access points	2B.1. Teachers will help students deepen their knowledge of Science content through access points, inquiry, and hands on experiments	2B.1. ESE Specialist, Science Resource Teacher, Teachers	2B.1. Progress monitoring data	2B.1. Teacher- Made Assessments, Teacher observation
Reading Goal #2B: *80% of fifth grade students taking the FAA in science will score a 4 or higher.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *100% (2)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *80% (4)*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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

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

STEM Goal #1: Increase the number of participation in STEM competitions and events. Including Math Bowl, Science Bowl and Science Olympics.	1.1. Lack of Resources Common Planning Time	1.1. Documentation of planning and units	1.1. Math Resource Science Resource	1.1. Log In project base learning in Math and Science every 9 weeks.	1.1. Share data with PLCs
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity					
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
STEM Integration	K-5	Math and Science Resource	K-5 Math and Science Teachers	January 2013	Meeting with PLC	Math Resource Science Resource DRTs Administration
Project Based Learning	K-5	Math and Science Resource	K-5 Math and Science Teachers Resource Teachers	December 2012	Meeting with PLC DRT Walk Thrus	Math Resource Science Resource DRTs Administration

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

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

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: Sustain/Increase student interest and career opportunities and program selection prior to middle school. The school will increase the frequency of career exposure activies/events from _1_ in 2011-2012 to _2__in 2012-2013	1.1.	1.1. Invite middle school persons to attend a student achievement day. Implement special speakers to visit and share with students about CTE careers throughout the year and during the great American teach-in. Use career workbooks, videos and/or activities to increase CTE	1.1. G.A.T Coordinator Guidance Counselor	1.1. Title I visitor log	1.1. Log of assemblies
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Integration of career opportunities in core academic areas	K-5	Guidance Counselor	K-5 Guidance District Staff	November 2012		Site G.A.T. Coordinator
Availability of career course work at the feeder middle schools	5th	Administration	5th Grade Team Admin Guidance Middle School Staff	May 2013		Administration Guidance

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
See Writing Goal 1.1	Ink Jet cartridges for classroom teachers	746.55	
See Math Goal 2.1	School Supplies for students	746.55	
Final Amount Spent			1493.10