

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| School Name: Lawton Chiles Elementary | District Name: Hillsborough |
| Principal: Kim Pietsch | Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia |
| SAC Chair: Amy Bolt | 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 | Kim Pietsch | MA, BS, ESOL | 5 | 12 | 11/12 A 633 points, 10/11 A 95%AYP, 09/10 A 100%AYP |
| Assistant Principal | Mary Booth | MA, BS, ESOL | 4 | 4 | 11/12 A 633 points, 10/11 A 95%AYP, 09/10 A 100%AYP |

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

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

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Reading | Mary Landeta | BS K-3, ESOL | 6 | 13 | 11/12 A 633 points, 10/11 A 95%AYP, 09/10 A 100%AYP |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 1. Teacher Interview Day | Principal/General Directors | June 2012 | |
| 2. Performance Pay | Supervisor of Human Resources | November 2012 | |
| 3. EET Mentoring program | EET Mentors | ongoing | |
| 4. District Peer Program | District Peers | ongoing | |
| 5. School-based teacher recognition system | Principal | ongoing | |
| 6. Opportunities for teacher leadership | Principal | ongoing | |
| 7. Regular time for teacher collaboration | Principal | ongoing | |

Non-Highly 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 |
|--|---|
| 4 out of field | <p><u>Administrators</u> Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) <p><u>Reading Coach</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis <p><u>Team Leader/PLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 67 | 9% (5) | 21% (14) | 37% (25) | 33% (22) | 45% (30) | 94% (63) | 5% (3) | 17% (11) | 65% (43) |

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 |
|--------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| Michele Winterberg | Elizabeth Bisaccia | Michele Winterberg is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement. | Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving |
| Michele Winterberg | Hilary Bolt | Michele Winterberg is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement. | Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving |
| Michele Winterberg | Megan Wells | Michele Winterberg is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement. | Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving |
| Michele Winterberg | Chelsea Bowen | Michele Winterberg is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has | Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing |

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

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| | | strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement. | student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving |
| Michele Winterberg | Savita Pooran | Michele Winterberg is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring and increasing student achievement. | Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving |
| Lynn Goodwin | Hilary Bolt | School Based Mentor- Lynn Goodwin is the first grade team leader. She has 10 years of teaching experience. | On-going co-planning, modeling of lessons and observation with feedback. |
| Sabrina Pattie | Megan Wells | School Based Mentor- Sabrina Pattie is a teacher leader. She has 9 years of experience teaching 1 st grade and kindergarten. She is the RTI facilitator for first grade. | On-going co-planning, modeling of lessons and observation with feedback. |
| Tracey Tupler | Elizabeth Bisaccia | School Based Mentor- Tracey Tupler has been teaching for 25years. She is a teacher leader at our school. | On-going co-planning, modeling of lessons and observation with feedback. |
| Michelle Carmen | Chelsea Bowen | School Based Mentor- Michelle Carmen is a National Board Certified Teacher. She is the fifth grade team leader and has been teaching for 40 years. | On-going co-planning, modeling of lessons and observation with feedback. |
| Alishia Marsh | Colleen Titus | School Based Mentor- Alishia Marsh is a teacher leader. She currently is a district math trainer. | On-going co-planning, modeling of lessons and observation with feedback. |
| Alishia Marsh | Savita Pooran | School Based Mentor- Alishia Marsh is a teacher leader. She currently is a district math trainer. | On-going co-planning, modeling of lessons and observation with feedback. |
| Sabrina Pattie | Amanda L Smith | School Based Mentor- Sabrina Pattie is a teacher leader. She has 9 years of experience teaching 1 st grade and | On-going co-planning, modeling of lessons and observation with feedback. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | kindergarten. She is the RTI facilitator for first grade. | |
|--|--|---|--|

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

| School-Based MTSS/RtI Team |
|--|
| <p>Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.</p> <p>School Psychologist, reading coach, administration, grade level representatives, ELL Resource Teacher, ELP Coordinator, ESE representative, guidance counselor, speech specialist, social worker, attendance committee representative, SAC chair.</p> |
| <p>Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?</p> <p>The purpose of the MTSS in our school is to ensure that high quality instruction/intervention is matched to student needs. The leadership team reviews school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs at all grade levels. We use performance level and learning rate over time to make data based decisions to guide instruction. The MTSS Committee meets biweekly to review school wide data to address the progress of low performing students and determine the enrichment and acceleration needs of high performing students. We support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core and interventions/enrichment (tiers 2/3) levels. The major goal is for all students to achieve annual learning gains and improve other long term outcomes. We 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. Finally, we communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.</p> <p>The Leadership team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversees the multi-layered model of instructional delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive) • Creates, manages and updates the school resource map • Ensures the master schedule incorporates allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels. • Determine scheduling needs, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers 2/3 • Facilitate the implementation of specific programs (e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school; Saturday School) that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/charts 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) |

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

- 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 implementation and support of PLCs, review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT), use of Common Core Assessments by teachers teaching the same grade/subject area/course (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT), 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 PSLT.

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

The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the MTSS. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections for school wide goals in reading, math writing, science, attendance and behavior. Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the MTSS will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies developed in problem solving plans by reviewing student data as well as data related to various levels of fidelity. Using data gathered from PLCs the team will monitor the data and make progress statements on the School Improvement Plan at the end of the first, second, and third nine weeks. The MTSS team will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning MTSS members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger MTSS team through the subject are MTSS representatives.

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 individual professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.

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). They also communicate with and support 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.

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

- The Leadership Team/PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving(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).
 - Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.
 - Identify appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at regular intervals matched to the intensity of the level of instructional/intervention support provided.
 - Develop grading period or units of instruction//intervention goals that are ambitious, time-bound, and measureable (e.g., SMART goals).
 - 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).
 - Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring.
 - 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

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

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

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

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

| Data Source | Database | Person (s) Responsible |
|--|---|--|
| FCAT released tests, FCAT Item Test Specs | School Generated database, FLDOE website | Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers AP |
| Baseline and Midyear District Assessments | Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall | MTSS, PLCs, individual teachers |
| Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing and Science | Scantron Achievement Series PLC logs | MTSS, PLCs, individual teachers |
| Program Generated Assessments | I-Station, Easy CBM | Individual teachers |
| FAIR | Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall | Reading Coach/, MTSS Individuals Teachers, and PLC Facilitators |
| CELLA | IPT | ELL, PSLT Representative |
| Common Assessments* (<i>see below</i>) of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources | Subject Area Generated Database PLC data/logs | Individual teachers, PSLT representative PLCs, |
| Mini-Assessments on specific tested Benchmarks | Subject Area Generated Excel Database | Individual teachers |

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff received overview training over the course of several faculty meetings during the 2012-2013 school year. PSLT/MTSS members who attended the district level RtI trainings served as consultants to the PLCs to guide the process of data review and interpretation. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District's Problem Solving Team develops resources and staff development trainings on PS/RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions, as identified by teacher needs assessment or by EET evaluation data, will occur during Tuesday faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. 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 PSLT/PLCs. In addition, our school psychologist will in-service the staff on RTI and the problem solving process during faculty meetings. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI as they become available.

Describe plan to support 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, and 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).

The Reading Leadership Team serves as the school's literacy Professional Learning Community. The team is comprised of:

- Principal
- Assistant Principal for Curriculum
- Reading Coach

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

- Reading Teachers and Content area teachers
- Media Specialist

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool |
| 1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5). | | | 1.1. Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers | 1.1. 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 Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans. | 1.1. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -PLCS turn their logs into administration. -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 on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use grade level common assessments 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 Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | 1.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common grade level assessments. (pre, post, intervention checks) |
| Reading Goal #1: In grades 3-5, the percentage of standard curriculum students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT reading will increase from 85% - 87% | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 85% | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 87% | 1.2. Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers | 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 | 1.2. Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Resource Teachers -Team Leaders/PLCs How - PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete | 1.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use common assessments to calculate their students’ progress towards the development of their individual/PLC 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 | 1.2. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) |
| Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012 | | | | | | | |

Reading Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity <small>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</small> | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| 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 |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------|---|--|----------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| The 3 S's of Complex Text: Selecting/Identifying Complex Text, Shifting to Increased Use of Informational Text, and Sharing of Complex Text with All Students (K-12) | Grades K-5 | -Team Leaders -PLC Facilitators Reading Coach | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team Reading Coach |
| Identifying and Creating Text-Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension (K-12) | Grades K-5 | -Team Leaders -PLC Facilitators Reading Coach | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team Reading Coach |
| Designing and Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning (K-12) | Grades K-5 | -Team Leaders -PLC Facilitators Reading Coach | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team Reading Coach |
| ELL Strategies | Grades K-5 | English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT) | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team |

Elementary 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 infrastructure to support technology | 1.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students’ math achievements improve through the use of technology and hands-on activities to implement the Common Core State Standards. In addition, student practice taking on-line assessments to prepare students for on-line state testing. | 1.1. <u>Who</u> - Principal/APEI -Math contact | 1.1 PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction. | 1.1. <u>Grades 3-5:</u> Form A, B, Mock FCAT Assessments |
| Mathematics Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 76% to 78%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 76% | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 78% | -Lack of technology hardware -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS | <u>Action Steps</u> -PLCs use their core curriculum information to learn more about hands-on and technology activities. | <u>How Monitored</u> -Classroom walkthroughs observing math instruction | PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends. | <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.) |
| | | | | 1.2. Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. -Finding time to conduct Webb’s Depth of Knowledge walkthroughs is sometimes challenging. | 1.2. <u>Strategy/Task</u> Students’ math achievement improves through frequent participation in higher order questions/discussion activities to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality questions and discussion techniques promote thinking by students. | 1.2. <u>Who</u> -Administration | 1.2 PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction. |
| | | | | <u>Actions/Details</u> <u>Within PLCs</u> -Teachers work to incorporate higher order questions/activities effectively into lessons. -Teachers plan for scaffolding questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students. -After the lessons, teachers examine student work samples and classroom questions using Webb’s Depth of Knowledge to evaluate the complexity of students’ thinking. <u>In the classroom</u> <u>During the lessons, teachers:</u> -Ask questions and/or provides activities that require students to engage in frequent higher order thinking. -Wait for full attention from the class before asking questions and provide students with wait time. -Use probing questions to encourage students to elaborate and support their answers from the text. -Allow students to “unpack their thinking” by describing how they arrive at | <u>How Monitored</u> -Classroom walkthroughs. | PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends | <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.) |
| Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012 | | | | | | | |

Mathematics Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Differentiated Instruction | Grades 3-4 | Math District Resource Teacher | Math teachers | PLC Meetings | Administrators conduct targeted classroom walkthroughs to monitor DI implementation | Administration Team |
| IEP Training | K-5 | ESE Teachers | ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs | On-going | Case Manager | ESE Contact |
| SWD Co-Teaching | K-5 | ESE Teachers | ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team |
| ELL Strategies | K-5 | English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT) | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team |

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. | | | 1.1 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model. -Lack of common planning time to facilitate and hold PLCs for like courses. | 1.1 Strategy Students’ science skills will improve through participation in the 5E instructional model. Action Steps -Teachers will attend District Science training and share 5 E Instructional Model information with their PLCs. -PLCs write SMART goals based for units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively building 5E Instructional Model for upcoming lessons. -PLC teachers instruct students using the 5E Instructional Model. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans to drive future instruction. | 1.1 Who Principal APEI How Monitored -Classroom walkthroughs observing this strategy. | 1.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use assessments 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 grade level, 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. | 1.1 <u>2x per year</u> District-level baseline and mid-year tests <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc.) |
| Science Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 79% to 80%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance: * 79% | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 80% | | | | | |
| Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012 | | | 1.2 -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. | 1.2 Strategy Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning using the 5E Instructional Model. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What is it we expect them to learn?2. How will we know if they have learned it?3. How will we assess and if | 1.2 Who -Principal -AP PLC Facilitators How -PLC logs turned into administration provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis | 1.2 School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration. | 1.2 <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing <u>During the Grading Period</u> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) |

Science Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Inquiry and the 5E Instructional Model | Grades K-5 | Science Resource | Grade level PLCs | On-going in Grade level science PLCs 3 times per month | Administrators conduct targeted walkthroughs to monitor 5 E Instructional Model lessons. | Administration Team |
| Close Reading | Grades K-2 | Reading Coach | Grade level PLCs | One PLC meeting per month | Reading Coach walkthroughs | Administration Team & Reading Coach |

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. | | | 1.1 -All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state. | 1.1 Strategy Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing. Action Steps -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.) Plan: -Professional Development for updated rubric courses -Professional Development for instructional delivery of mode-specific writing -Training to facilitate data-driven PLCs -Using data to identify trends and drive instruction -Lesson planning based on the needs of students Do: -Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points -Daily/ongoing conferencing Check: Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes -PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs Act: -Receive additional professional development in areas of need -Spread the use of effective practices across the school | 1.1 Who Principal APEI How Monitored -PLC logs -Classroom walkthroughs Observation Form | 1.1 See “Check” & “Act” action steps in the strategies column | 1.1 -Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios |
| Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 91% to 95%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 91% | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 95% | | | | | |
| Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012 | | | | | | | |

Writing 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 |
| Writing Rubric Training | Grade 3-5 Writing Holistic Scoring Training | District Personnel | Writing Contact PLC facilitators All teachers grade 3-5 | PLC-grade level | On-going | Rubric proficiency reported to administration |
| Language Arts Common Core Training K-1 | Model-based Writing Training | District Personnel | K-1 Teachers | PLC-grade level | On-going | -Administration walkthroughs -PLC s notes are turned into administration |
| | | | | | | |

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| 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 | | | 1.1 -Attendance committee needs to meet on a regular basis throughout the school year. -PLC needs to address and keep track of attendance within their grade level. | 1.1 Tier 1 The school will establish an attendance committee comprised of Administrators, guidance counselors, teachers and other relevant personnel to review the school’s attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. The attendance committee will also maintain a database of students with significant attendance problems and implement and monitor interventions to be documented on the attendance intervention form (SB 90710) The attendance committee meets every two weeks. | 1.1 Attendance committee will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the Principal on a monthly basis and shared with faculty. | 1.1 Attendance committee will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students. | 1.1 Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data Ed Connect |
| Attendance Goal #1: | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:* | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* | | | | | |
| 1. The attendance rate will increase from 96.31% in 2011-2012 to 97% in 2012-2013. | 96.31 | 97 | | | | | |
| 2. The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10% | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | | | |
| | 34 | 30 | | | | | |
| 3. The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. | 2012 Current Number of Students with Unexcused Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Unexcused Tardies (10 or more) | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2 -Time constraints in monitoring attendance reports | 1.2 Tier 1 All teachers will keep track of student attendance | 1.2 Assistant Principal/Team leaders will monitor attendance | 1.2 Principal will use reports to monitor attendance | 1.2 Attendance Reports |
| | | | 1.3 There is no system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance. | 1.3 Tier 2 Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, the data processor ensures that a letter is sent home to parents outlining the state statute that requires parents send students to school. If a student’s attendance improves (no absences in a 20 day period) a positive letter is sent home to the parent regarding the increase in their child’s attendance. | 1.3 Data Processor Social Worker Guidance Counselor PSLT | 1.3 The attendance committee (which is a subset of the leadership Team) will disaggregate attendance data for the “Tier 2” group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children. | Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data |

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

| 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 and Tardy Group | K-5 | AP, Guidance Counselor, Social Worker | School-wide | September and then as needed basis | Weekly check of attendance and tardies for students with attendance issues | Guidance Counselor, Social Worker |
| Attendance and Tardy Monitoring | K-5 | PSLT | School-wide | Monthly | Parent Communication | Administration |
| | | | | | | |

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| 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 | | | 1.1 There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior. | 1.1 Tier 1 Expectations will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey, discipline data, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations. -Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and rules. -Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats. | 1.1 Who -PSLT Behavior Committee -Leadership Team -Administration | 1.1 - PSLT /Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions, ATOSS data monthly. | UNTIE , EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data |
| Suspension Goal #1: | <u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u> | | | | | |
| 1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. | 1 | 0 | | | | | |
| <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> | | | | | | |
| 2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. | 1 | 0 | | | | | |
| <u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | | | | | | |
| 3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School</u> | | | | | | |
| 4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | | | | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | | | | 1.3. |

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 |
| Ongoing Parent | K-5 | Administration/ | School-wide | Weekly | Administration/ Teacher/ Student | Administration, PSLT |

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

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------|--|
| Communication | | Teachers | | | conferences | |
| | | | | | | |

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

| Additional Goal(s) | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Health and Fitness Goal | | | 1. | 1.1 Elementary students will engage in the equivalent of 30 minutes per day of physical education. | 1.1 Classroom Teacher Physical Education Teacher AP | 1.1 Checking student schedules | 1.1 Physical Education Assessments |
| Health and Fitness Goal #1: | <u>2012 Current Level :*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> | | | | | |
| During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the “Healthy Fitness Zone” (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 82% on the Pretest to 85% on the Posttest. | 82% | 85% | | | | | |
| | | | | 1.2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the Physical Education Teachers. | 1.2. Physical Education Teachers. | 1.2. Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ) | 1.2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health. |
| | | | | 1.3. 150 minutes physical education per week | 1.3. Physical Education Teacher/ Classroom Teacher | 1.3. Classroom walk-throughs Class schedules | 1.3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health. |

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Physical Fitness opportunities | K-5 | Physical Education Teacher | K-5 Students | Running Club (gr 4&5 every other Wed), Jump Rope for Hearts (November), etc | Teachers’ lesson plans | Administrators |
| | | | | | | |

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

| Additional Goal(s) | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Continuous Improvement Goal | | | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Continuous Improvement Goal #1: 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 90% in 2012 to 92% in 2013. | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | 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. | 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 notes that are reviewed by the Leadership Team. | Who Principal PLC facilitators | “Quick” PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training. | PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach (Anne Jolly) |
| | 90% | 92% | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| | | | -Not enough time to meet in PLCs. | Leadership team will use teacher survey information every nine weeks to determine next steps for PLC professional development. | Who Leadership team How Leadership team aggregates the data | “Quick” PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training. | PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach (Anne Jolly) |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

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

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

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-------------|--|---|-----------------|
| | | | | meetings) | | |
| PLCs | K-5 | Leadership Team | School-wide | Weekly | PLC Notes | Administrators |
| Plan-Do-Check-Act Model | Leadership Team All teachers | Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC Facilitators | School-wide | PLCs meet every three weeks for Plan-Do-Check-Act PLCs. | Administrator and leadership team walk-throughs Administrator and leadership attendance at PLC meetings PLC Survey data | Leadership Team |
| | | | | | | |

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

| CELLA Goals | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|-------------------------|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking. | | 1.1. | 1.1. See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4 | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| <u>CELLA Goal #C:</u> | <u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u> | | | | | |
| The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 24% to 27%. | 24% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 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 in Reading. | | 2.1. | 2.1. See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4 | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| <u>CELLA Goal #D:</u> | <u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u> | | | | | |
| The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 38% to 40%. | 38% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 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 effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| E. Students scoring proficient in Writing. | | 2.1. | 2.1. See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| <u>CELLA Goal #E:</u> | <u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u> | | | | | |
| Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A adopted 09/28/11 Revised July 2012 The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 35% to 37%. | 35% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

| STEM Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|-------------------------|
| | 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 the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
| STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math and science. | 1.1 Finding the time and resources to make it effective. | 1.1 -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units. -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study | 1.1 PLCs | 1.1 Administrative walk-throughs | 1.1 Unit Tests |

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 |
| Project-based learning | K-5 | Science and Math Contacts | Science, math, & ELA teachers | On-going | Administrator walk-throughs | PLCs |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

| CTE Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| CTE Goal #1: Use classroom guidance and social studies lessons to increase student awareness of careers and opportunities in the technological industry. | 1.1. Need curriculum/ teacher training for grades K-5 | 1.1. Utilize Junior Achievement program in all grades. All classrooms will also participate in The Great American Teach-In. | 1.1. Team Leaders | 1.1. Career/Technological information will be recorded in student journals | 1.1. Students will participate in JA economic activities throughout the year. |
| | 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 |
| Junior Achievement Training | K-5 | PTA | PTA volunteers and Teachers | On going | Steering Committee dialogue | Team Leaders |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

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

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

| Describe the use of SAC funds. | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------|
| Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan | Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement | Projected Amount | Final Amount |
| Reading 3.1 and Writing 1.3: 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: 5. What is it we expect them to learn? 6. How will we if they have learned it? 7. How will we respond if they don't learn? How will we respond if they already know it? | The Primary (K-2) Daily 5 Book Study will be used to assist teacher in working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Teachers will use the information learned in this training to plan effective instruction in all parts of literacy instruction. | \$300 | \$289.60 |
| Math 1.1: Students' math achievements improve through the use of technology and hands-on activities to implement the Common Core State Standards. In addition, student practice taking on-line assessments to prepare students for on-line state testing. | Four teachers will go to a FASTT Math Training and bring back information to share with our staff. This will assist students in improving their math skills through use of technology and hands-on activities to support the Common Core State Standards. | \$1,000 | |
| Reading and Writing 4.2: Students' achievement improves through receiving supplemental instruction on targeted skills that are not at the mastery level. | Our HOST program will pay teachers to provide extra support with academics after school. This will help students' achievement improve through receiving supplemental instruction on targeted skills. | HOST will pay for teachers for one hour per day. | |
| | | | |
| Final Amount Spent | | | |