

# Florida Department of Education

## CLEVELAND ELEMENTARY



# School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

### PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Cleveland Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Peter Russo	Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia
SAC Chair: Jennifer Fernandez	Date of School Board Approval:

### Student Achievement Data:

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

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	Peter Russo	BS Elem Ed Masters Elem Curriculum Ed Leadership Gifted ESOL	4	8	11/12: B  10/11: B 90% AYP  09/10: B 100% AYP  08/09: C 77% AYP 07/08: C 95% AYP 06/07: F 62% AYP
Assistant Principal	Georgette Johnson	BS Elem Ed & MS Ed Leadership ESOL	15	13	11/12: B  10/11: B 90% AYP  09/10: B 100% AYP  08/09: C 77% AYP 07/08: C 97% AYP 06/07: C 90% AYP

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

### 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	Kelly Skeins	BS Special Ed (SLD/EH) MA Special Ed (VE)	2	7	11/12: B  10/11: B 74% AYP  09/10: A 95% AYP  08/09: C 85% AYP
Science	Nicole Zamora	Ed. S. in Ed Leadership  Master of Elem Ed  BA Elem Ed	1	3	<b>11/12: B</b>  <b>10/11: A 90% AYP</b>

### 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. MAP	Supervisor of Data Analysis	9/12	

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

2. Performance Pay	General Director of Federal Programs	9/12	
3. Salary Differential	Title I office	on-going	
4. Partnering new teachers with veteran teachers	Assistant Principal	on-going	

**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
5	Taking ESOL Courses

**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 Full-time Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years	% of Teachers with 15+ Years	% of Teachers with Ad	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified	% ESOL Endorsed
-------------------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------

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

uc tio nal Sta ff	ers	rs of Exp erie nce	Yea rs of Exp erie nce	rs of Exp erie nce	van ced De gre es	ac her s	ach ers	ied Te ac her s	Tea cher s
35	2 %	34 %	51 %	28 %	51 %	10 0 %	2 %	2 %	60 %

**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
-------------	-----------------	-----------------------	------------------------------

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

Deacon Jones	Samantha Rotella	Mentors and beginning teachers were paired based on grade level. For example, mentors with elementary experience work with elementary teachers.	Mentors provide weekly support to new teachers. This support includes, but is not limited to, observing, co-teaching, planning lessons, modeling lessons, analyzing student work, and conferencing. Mentors conduct observations using a variety of instruments. These include anecdotal records, observation tools from the New Teacher Center,
--------------	------------------	---	--

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

			and other observatio n templates based on Charlotte Danielson' s Framewor k.
--	--	--	---



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

Deacon Jones	Kathleen Malpartida	To further provide support during Year 2 of the Teacher Induction Program.	Mentors provide weekly support to new teachers. This support includes, but is not limited to, observing, co-teaching, planning lessons, modeling lessons, analyzing student work, and conferencing. Mentors conduct observations using a variety of instruments. These include anecdotal records, observation tools from the New Teacher Center,
--------------	---------------------	--	--

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

			and other observatio n templates based on Charlotte Danielson' s Framewor k.
--	--	--	---

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

Deacon Jones	Mancuso	Mentors and beginning teachers were paired based on grade level. For example, mentors with elementary experience work with elementary teachers.	Mentors provide weekly support to new teachers. This support includes, but is not limited to, observing, co-teaching, planning lessons, modeling lessons, analyzing student work, and conferencing. Mentors conduct observations using a variety of instruments. These include anecdotal records, observation tools from the New Teacher Center,
--------------	---------	---	--

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

			and other observatio n templates based on Charlotte Danielson' s Framewor k.
--	--	--	---

**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.

<p><b>Title 1, Part A</b></p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>Title I, Part C- Migrant</b></p> <p>The migrant advocate provides services and support to students and parents. The advocate works with teachers and families to ensure that migrant students' needs are being met</p>

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

**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**

Homeless The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) 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.

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

<b>Violence Prevention Programs</b>
<b>Nutrition Programs</b>
<b>Housing Programs</b>
<b>Head Start</b>  We utilize information from students in Head Start to transition into Kindergarten.
<b>Adult Education</b>
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

School-Based MTSS/Rtl Team
----------------------------

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

**Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.**

1. Principal
2. Assistant Principal
3. School Psychologist
4. Guidance Counselor
5. Social Worker
6. Instructional Coaches (Reading/Science)
7. ESE Specialists
8. ELL Coordinator
9. SAC Chair

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

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

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

Our MTSS Team will meet twice a month to:

- Use the RtI problem solving model to:

- Oversee a multi-tiered model of service delivery (Core/Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3)

- Determine scheduling needs, curriculum and intervention resources

- Review/interpret student data (Academic and Behavioral)

- Organize and support systematic data collection.

- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction:

- Through the implementation of PLCs

- Through the use of school-based Reinforcement Calendars, Mini Lessons and Mini Assessments

- Through the use of Common Assessments given every 4 weeks.

- Through the implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instruction/interventions.

This year our MTSS team will focus on Differentiated Instruction practices.

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

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

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

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



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

- Assist in the implementation and monitoring of the Differentiated Accountability Model
- Identify professional development needs and resources

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 Advisory Council (SAC) Chair is a member of the MTSS team.
- The MTSS Team along with the faculty and SAC were involved in School Improvement Plan development activities that were conducted prior to school being out for 11-12 school year and during preplanning for 12-13.
- The School Improvement Plan is the document that guides the work of the MTSS team. The large part of the work of the MTSS team is outlined in the Action Steps, Evaluation Process, Evaluation Tool, and Professional Development of the School Improvement Plan.
- Since one of the main tasks of the MTSS Team is to monitor student data, it will monitor the effectiveness of the Action Steps on the grade level action plans, progress monitoring forms and suggest modifications if needed

### 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.

**Core Curriculum (Tier 1)**

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released tests	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach/Science Resource/AP
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas.	PLC logs	Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/Leadership Team Member
DRA-2	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher/Reading Coach

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

**Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)**

<b>Data Source</b>	<b>Database</b>	<b>Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring</b>
Extended Learning Program (ELP)*  Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials)  <i>Soar to Success/I-Station</i>	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/ ELP Facilitator
Differentiated mini assessments based on core curriculum assessments.	Individual teacher data base  PLC/Department data base	Individual Teachers/PLCs
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/Reading Coach
Ongoing assessments within Intensive Courses  <i>(Middle/High)</i>	Database provided by course materials (for courses that have one), School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/PLC/Individual Teachers
Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs (Success Maker/FCAT Explorer/FASTT Math)	Assessments included in computer-based programs	PLCs/Individual Teachers

## 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 is a summary of the assessment used to measure student progress in core, supplemental and intensive instruction.

### Core Curriculum

- State Level/ District Level

- FCAT-released tests

-Schools follow a district calendar for Baseline and Midyear Assessments

- District generated assessments by the Office of Assessment

-FAIR (3 times)

- DRA2 (2 times)

### • Common Assessments:

- A Common Assessment is a diagnostic tool and not used for grading purposes. It covers a “chunk” of instruction or a series of skills/benchmarks.

- A Common Assessment is an evaluation given to all students across a specific subject. It covers all of the skills taught within a certain time period. The purpose of the Common Assessment is to assess students’ knowledge of the core curriculum. The results of the Common Assessment are used to:

- Determine if the lesson plans and teaching strategies used to teach the core curriculum were effective or need to be modified.

- Determine which skills need to be taught with alternative strategies.

- Determine which skills need to be re-taught within the core curriculum and which skills need to be moved to the Reinforcement Instructional Calendar.

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

### \*A Common Assessment can be:

-A District generated test

- A PLC developed test using district-adopted curriculum assessment materials/resources

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

- A PLC developed test using the Achievement Series Scantron Testing Bank of questions
- A Chapter test
- A strand test
- In the area of Language Arts/Reading, Common Assessments are given in the core curriculum every week
- In the area of Math, Common Assessments are given in the core curriculum every chapter.
- In the area of Science, Common Assessments are given in the core curriculum every chapter.
- In the area of Writing, writing prompts will be given monthly.
- In Reading, PLCs will identify and build their own Common Formative Assessments using a District-Adopted Assessment Materials or Scantron Testing Bank of questions. In the area of Science and Math, PLCs will also use Common Formative Assessments that have been generated at the District level by Content Supervisors.

Mini-Assessments (Given after instruction on one specific skill.)

- A Mini-Assessment is a diagnostic tool and usually not used for grading purposes.
- Mini-Assessments are given after the Mini-Lesson has been taught
- Tests just one skill area.
- Usually 4-5 questions in length.
- \* The purpose of the Mini-Assessment is to:
  - Determine student mastery of skill level
  - Determine effectiveness of Mini-Lessons
  - Determine if alternative strategies need to be used to teach the Mini-Lessons.

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

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 quarterly (*or 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.

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, 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

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

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
- Reading Coach
- Grade Level Representatives
- Media Specialist
- AIS

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

### *NCLB Public School Choice*

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Hillsborough 2012**  
**Rule 6A-1.099811**  
**Revised July, 2012**



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

**\*High Schools Only**

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

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

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

**Postsecondary Transition**

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

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

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).</b></p>	<p>1.1. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13.</p>	<p>1.1. <u><b>Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas</b></u>  Reading comprehension improves when <u><b>students are engaged in grappling with complex text.</b></u> Teachers need to understand how to <b>select/identify</b> complex text, <b>shift</b> the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and <b>share</b> complex texts with all students. <u>  </u></p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach  <u>How</u> -PLC Logs -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.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.  <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.  <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u>  - FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension District Assessments  <u>During the nine weeks</u> -Weekly Assessments -Unit Assessments -Monthly Fluency Checks -Easy CBM (Comp/ Vocab)  <b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b> <b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b>  <b>K-74%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup>-57%</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-63%</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup>- 47%</b> <b>5<sup>th</sup>- 32%</b></p>		
--	--	--	---	--	---	--	--

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

					<p>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</p> <p>K-75%</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>-60%</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>-64%</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup>-32%</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup>-62%</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup>-61%</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #1:</u></p> <p>In grades 3-5, the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 48% to 53%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u></p>					
	<p><b>48%</b></p>	<p><b>53%</b></p>					

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

		<p>-Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13.</p>	<p>2.2.1.2.  <u>Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas</u>                  Questions of all types and levels are necessary to scaffold students' understanding of complex text. Teachers need to understand and use <u>higher-order, text-dependent questions</u> at the word/phrase, sentence, and paragraph/passage levels. 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.</p>	<p>1.2.  <u>Who</u>                  -Principal                  -AP                  -Reading Coach    <u>How</u>                  PLC Logs                  -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.                  -PLCs receive feedback on their logs.                  -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs                  -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency.                  -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.</p>	<p>1.2.  <u>Teacher Level</u>                  -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.                  -Teachers track the performance of each student.    <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, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.    <u>Leadership Team Level</u>                  -PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.                  -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
--	--	---	---	---	---	-------------	--

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

						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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>2. <b>FCAT 2.0:</b> Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p><b>See Goals #1, 3, &amp; 4</b></p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p><b>2.1. Progress Monitoring Summary:</b></p> <p><b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b></p> <p>K-74%</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>-57%</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>-63%</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup>-47%</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup>- 32%</p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</b></p> <p>K-75%</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>-60%</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>-64%</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup>-32%</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup>-62%</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup>-61%</p>		
---	-------------	--	-------------	-------------	--	--	--

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

<p><u>Reading Goal #2:</u></p> <p>In grades 3-5, the percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 17% to 20%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u></p>					
	<p><b>17%</b></p>	<p><b>20%</b></p>					
				<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	

<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		
---	----------------------------	-----------------	--	--	------------------------	--	--



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

<p><b>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>3.1. 1.- Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum) , as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum.</p> <p>-Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.</p> <p>-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.</p> <p>-Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.</p> <p>- Need</p>	<p>3.1. <b>Tier 1</b> - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' reading comprehension will improve through teachers using the <b>Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM)</b> with core curriculum and providing <b>Differentiated Instruction (DI)</b> as a result of the problem-solving model.</p>	<p>3.1. <u>Who</u></p> <p>-Principal</p> <p>-Reading Coach</p> <p>-Team Leaders</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. Administrators will use the HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). The C-CIM and DI strategies will be added to the form.</p> <p>-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.</p> <p>-PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the</p>	<p>3.1. Grade level- PLC team members will administer weekly assessments and analyze the data that will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spreadsheet and a hard copy kept in PLC Log Notebooks.</p> <p>PLCs Classroom Teachers will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 70% mastery on units of instruction and document at weekly meetings.</p> <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team/Reading Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p>	<p>3.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>- FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension</p> <p>District Assessments</p> <p><u>During the nine weeks</u></p> <p>-Weekly Assessments</p> <p>-Unit Assessments</p> <p>-Monthly Fluency Checks</p> <p><b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b></p> <p><b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b></p> <p><b>K-74%</b></p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup>-57%</b></p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup>-63%</b></p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</b></p> <p><b>4<sup>th</sup>-47%</b></p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup>- 32%</b></p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</b></p>		
--	--	---	--	--	---	--	--

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

	<p>additional training to implement effective PLCs.</p> <p>- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).</p>		<p>SIP strategies across the entire faculty.</p> <p>-Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.</p>		<p>K-75%</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>-60%</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>-64%</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup>-32%</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup>-62%</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup>-61%</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

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

<p><u>Reading Goal #3:</u></p> <p>In grades 3-5, points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 67 points to 70 points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>67 points</b></p>	<p><b>70 points</b></p>					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
--	---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------	--	--

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

<p><b>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>4.1. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies.  -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.</p>	<p>4.1. Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to <u>differentiate instruction</u>.  -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities.  -During the lessons students are involved in flexible grouping techniques.  - 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-</p>	<p>4.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach  <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration -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.</p>	<p>4.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers track student performance/mastery.  <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes. -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 shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.  -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction</p>	<p>4.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> - FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension  District Assessments  <u>During the nine weeks</u> -Weekly Assessments -Unit Assessments -Monthly Fluency Checks  <b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b> <b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b> <b>K-74%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup>-57%</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-63%</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup>-47%</b> <b>5<sup>th</sup>- 32%</b>  <b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</b></p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

		solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/ interventions and how that instruction will be provided.			K-75% 1 <sup>st</sup> -60% 2 <sup>nd</sup> -64% 3 <sup>rd</sup> -32% 4 <sup>th</sup> -62% 5 <sup>th</sup> -61%		
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In grades 3-5, points earned for students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase from 72 to 75 points.							
	<b>72 points</b>	<b>75 points</b>					
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	

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

		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	
<b>5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>							
<u>Reading Goal #5:</u> The percentage of all curriculum students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 48% to 53%.							

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

<p>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>		<p>5A.1. <b>See Goals 1, 3, &amp; 4</b></p>	<p>5A.1.</p>	<p>5A.1.</p>	<p><u>5A.1..2-3x Per Year</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension</li> <li>District Assessments</li> </ul> <p><u>During the nine weeks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Weekly Assessments</li> <li>-Unit Assessments</li> <li>-Monthly Fluency Checks</li> </ul> <p><b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b></p> <p><b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b></p> <p>K-74%</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>-57%</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>-63%</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup>-47%</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup>- 32%</p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</b></p> <p>K-75%</p>		
---	--	---	--------------	--------------	---	--	--



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

					1 <sup>st</sup> -60% 2 <sup>nd</sup> -64% 3 <sup>rd</sup> -32% 4 <sup>th</sup> -62% 5 <sup>th</sup> -61%		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u></p> <p>The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the FCAT Reading will increase from 70% to 71%.</p> <p>The percentage of Black_ students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 39% to 45%.</p> <p>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 53% to 58%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	White: 70% Black: 39% Hispanic: 53% Asian: n/a American Indian: n/a	White: 71% Black: 45% Hispanic: 58% Asian: n/a American Indian: n/a					
		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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1. <b>See Goals 1, 3, &amp; 4</b></p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p><u>5B.1..2-3x Per Year</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension</li> <li>District Assessments</li> </ul> <p><u>During the nine weeks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Weekly Assessments</li> <li>-Unit Assessments</li> <li>-Monthly Fluency Checks</li> </ul> <p><b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b></p> <p><b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b></p> <p>K-74%</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>-57%</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>-63%</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup>-47%</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup>- 32%</p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</b></p> <p>K-75%</p>		
---	--------------	---	--------------	--------------	---	--	--

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

					1 <sup>st</sup> -60% 2 <sup>nd</sup> -64% 3 <sup>rd</sup> -32% 4 <sup>th</sup> -62% 5 <sup>th</sup> -61%		
<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u>  The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 47% to 52%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>47%</b>	<b>52%</b>					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>-Lack of understanding that teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing.</p> <p>-Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing heritage language support.</p> <p>-Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on membership of ELLs.</p> <p>-Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL Program guidelines and job responsibilities of EFT and Bilingual paraprofessional.</p>	<p>ELLs (LYA, LYB &amp; LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards improves through participation in the following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across Reading, LA, Math, Science, and Social Studies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extended time (lesson and assessments)</li> <li>2. Small group testing</li> <li>3. Para support (lesson and assessments)</li> <li>4. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)</li> </ol>	<p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-School based Administrators</p> <p>-ESOL Resource Teachers</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms</p>	<p>Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students.</p>	<p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests</p> <p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>- FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension</p> <p>District Assessments</p> <p><u>During the nine weeks</u></p> <p>-Weekly Assessments</p> <p>-Unit Assessments</p> <p>-Monthly Fluency Checks</p> <p><b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b></p> <p><b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b></p> <p><b>K-74%</b></p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup>-57%</b></p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup>-63%</b></p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</b></p>		
--	--	--	---	---	---	--	--

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

					<p>4<sup>th</sup>-47%</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup>- 32%</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</p> <p>K-75%</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>-60%</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>-64%</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup>-32%</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup>-62%</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup>-61%</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5C:</u></p> <p>The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 50% to 55%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>50%</b></p>	<p><b>55%</b></p>					

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

	—	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		



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

<p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>	<p>5D.1. <b>See Goals 1, 3, &amp; 4</b></p>	<p>5D.1.</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>	<p>5D.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> - FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension District Assessments  <u>During the nine weeks</u> -Weekly Assessments -Unit Assessments -Monthly Fluency Checks  <b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b> <b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b> <b>K-74%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup>-57%</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-63%</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup>-47%</b> <b>5<sup>th</sup>- 32%</b></p>		
--	--------------	---	--------------	--------------	---	--	--

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

					<b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</b> <b>K-75%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup>-60%</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-64%</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-32%</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup>-62%</b> <b>5<sup>th</sup>-61%</b>		
<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>  The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 17% to 25%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>17%</b>	<b>25%</b>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

**Reading Professional Development**

**Professional Development**

Hillsborough 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised July, 2012

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

**(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 Reading Coach	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
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-5	Reading Coach	Grades K-5 teachers & ESE teachers	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team & Reading Coach
Updated DRA2 Training	K-5	Reading Coach	Grades K-5 teachers & ESE teachers	Sept & Oct/2012	DRA Checklist	Administration Team & Reading Coach

*End of Reading Goals*

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

**Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals**

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

<b>Elementary School Mathematics Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).</b></p>	<p>1.1. - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum.  -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.  -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.  -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.  - Need</p>	<p>1.1. Tier 1 - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' math skills will improve through teachers using the <b><u>Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM)</u></b> with core curriculum and providing <b><u>Differentiated Instruction (DI)</u></b> as a result of the problem-solving model.</p>	<p>1.1.- <u>Who</u> Principal/AP  <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.  -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.  -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.  -PSLT will create a walk-through fidelity monitoring tool that includes all of the SIP strategies. This walk-through form will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP strategies across the entire faculty.</p>	<p>1.1. PLC chapter assessment data will be recorded in a course-specific PLC data base (excel spreadsheet).  PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.  PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  - - - <u>During the Nine Weeks</u> -Chapter Tests  -Benchmark mini assessments  <b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b> <b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b> <b>K-79%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup>-71%</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-75%</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup>- 74%</b> <b>5<sup>th</sup>- 62%</b>  <b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</b></p>		
--	---	--	---	---	---	--	--

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

	<p>additional training to implement effective PLCs.</p> <p>- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).</p>		<p>-Monitoring data will be reviewed every nine weeks.</p>		<p><b>K-83%</b>  <b>1<sup>st</sup>-74%</b>  <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-78%</b>  <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-64%</b>  <b>4<sup>th</sup>-79%</b>  <b>5<sup>th</sup>67%</b></p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

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

<p><u>Mathematics Goal #1:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 49% to 53%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>49%</b></p>	<p><b>53%</b></p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p><b>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>-Lack of training using HOTS</p> <p>-Common planning time to create HOT questions</p>	<p>2.1. Strategy</p> <p>Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS)</p> <p>Student 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.</p> <p>-Teachers work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively use higher order questions/activities.</p> <p>-Teachers plan higher order</p>	<p>2.1. <u>Who</u></p> <p>Administration</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-Classroom Walkthroughs</p> <p>-Lesson Plan Checks</p>	<p>2.1. PLC chapter assessment data will be recorded and attached to PLC logs</p> <p>PLCs will review mid-chapter/ chapter assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.</p>	<p>2.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>-Baseline Assessment</p> <p>-Mid-year Assessment</p> <p><u>During Nine Weeks</u></p> <p>-Mid-Chapter Test</p> <p>-Chapter Tests</p> <p>-Math Journals</p> <p>-Interactive Student Notebooks</p> <p><b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b></p> <p><b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b></p> <p><b>K-79%</b></p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup>-71%</b></p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup>-75%</b></p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</b></p> <p><b>4<sup>th</sup>- 74%</b></p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup>- 62%</b></p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70%</b></p>		
---	--	---	--	--	--	--	--



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

		<p>questions/ activities for upcoming lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement.</p> <p>-Teachers plan for scaffolding questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students.</p>			<p><b>Mastery</b></p> <p><b>K-83%</b></p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup>-74%</b></p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup>-78%</b></p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup>-64%</b></p> <p><b>4<sup>th</sup>-79%</b></p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup>67%</b></p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #2:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 20% to 23%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<b>20%</b>	<b>23%</b>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
--	---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------	--	--

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

<p><b>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>4.1. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies.  -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.</p>	<p>4.1. Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to <u>differentiate instruction</u>.  -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities.  -During the lessons students are involved in flexible grouping techniques.  - 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-</p>	<p>4.1. <u>Who</u>  -Principal -AP  <u>How</u>  -PLC logs turned into administration -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.</p>	<p>4.1. <u>Teacher Level</u>  -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.  -Teachers track student performance/mastery.  <u>PLC Level</u>  -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes. -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 shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.  -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction</p>	<p>3.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u>  -Baseline Assessment -Mid-year Assessment  <u>During Nine Weeks</u> -Mid-Chapter Test -Chapter Tests -Math Journals -Interactive Student Notebooks  <b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b> <b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b> <b>K-79%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup>-71%</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-75%</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup>- 74%</b> <b>5<sup>th</sup>- 62%</b></p>		
--	--	---	---	---	---	--	--

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

		solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/ interventions and how that instruction will be provided.			<b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</b> <b>K-83%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup>-74%</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-78%</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-64%</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup>-79%</b> <b>5<sup>th</sup>67%</b>		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 71 points to 75 points.							
	<b>71 points</b>	<b>75 points</b>					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	

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

		B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>4. <b>FCAT 2.0:</b> Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	<p>4.1.</p>	<p>4.1. <b>See Goal #3</b></p>	<p>4.1.</p>	<p>4.1.</p>	<p><u>4.1.2-3x Per Year</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Baseline Assessment</li> <li>-Mid-year Assessment</li> </ul> <p><u>During Nine Weeks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Mid-Chapter Test</li> <li>-Chapter Tests</li> <li>-Math Journals</li> <li>-Interactive Student Notebooks</li> </ul> <p><b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b></p> <p><b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b></p> <p><b>K-79%</b></p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup>-71%</b></p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup>-75%</b></p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</b></p> <p><b>4<sup>th</sup>- 74%</b></p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup>- 62%</b></p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70%</b></p>		
--	-------------	--------------------------------	-------------	-------------	---	--	--

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

					<b>Mastery</b> <b>K-83%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup>-74%</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-78%</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-64%</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup>-79%</b> <b>5<sup>th</sup>67%</b>		
<u>Mathematics Goal #4:</u>  Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 82 points to 85 points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>82 points</b>	<b>85 points</b>					

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

		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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>	
<b>5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>							
<u>Math Goal #5:</u> The percentage of All curriculum students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 50% to 55%.							



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

<p><b>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics</b></p>		<p>5A.1. <b>See Goals 1,2,&amp;3</b></p>	<p>5A.1.</p>	<p>5A.1.</p>	<p>5A.1. <b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b> <b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b> <b>K-79%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup>-71%</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-75%</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup>- 74%</b> <b>5<sup>th</sup>- 62%</b>  <b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</b> <b>K-83%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup>-74%</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-78%</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-64%</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup>-79%</b> <b>5<sup>th</sup>67%</b></p>		
---	--	--	--------------	--------------	---	--	--

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

<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<p>The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 70% to 71%.</p>							
<p>The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 42% to 48%.</p>							
<p>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 53% to 58%.</p>							

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

	<b>White: 70%</b> <b>Black: 42%</b> <b>Hispanic: 53%</b> <b>Asian: n/a</b> <b>American Indian: n/a</b>	<b>White: 71%</b> <b>Black: 48%</b> <b>Hispanic: 58%</b> <b>Asian: n/a</b> <b>American Indian: n/a</b>					
		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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1. <b>See Goals 1,2,&amp;3</b></p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1 <u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Baseline Assessment</li> <li>-Mid-year Assessment</li> </ul> <p><u>During Nine Weeks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Mid-Chapter Test</li> <li>-Chapter Tests</li> <li>-Math Journals</li> <li>-Interactive Student Notebooks</li> </ul> <p><b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b></p> <p><b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>K-79%</b></li> <li><b>1<sup>st</sup>-71%</b></li> <li><b>2<sup>nd</sup>-75%</b></li> <li><b>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</b></li> <li><b>4<sup>th</sup>- 74%</b></li> <li><b>5<sup>th</sup>- 62%</b></li> </ul> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</b></p> <p><b>K-83%</b></p>		
---	--------------	--	--------------	--------------	---	--	--

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

					1 <sup>st</sup> -74%		
					2 <sup>nd</sup> -78%		
					3 <sup>rd</sup> -64%		
					4 <sup>th</sup> -79%		
					5 <sup>th</sup> 67%		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 48% to 53%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>48%</b>	<b>53%</b>					
		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>-Lack of understanding that teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing.</p> <p>-Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing heritage language support.</p> <p>-Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on membership of ELLs.</p> <p>-Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL Program guidelines and job responsibilities of EFT and Bilingual paraprofessional.</p>	<p>ELLs (LYA, LYB &amp; LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards improves through participation in the following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across Reading, LA, Math, Science, and Social Studies:</p> <p>5. Extended time (lesson and assessments)</p> <p>6. Small group testing</p> <p>7. Para support (lesson and assessments)</p> <p>8. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)</p>	<p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-School based Administrators</p> <p>-ESOL Resource Teachers</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms</p>	<p>Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students.</p>	<p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests</p> <p><u>2-3x Per Year</u></p> <p>-Baseline Assessment</p> <p>-Mid-year Assessment</p> <p><u>During Nine Weeks</u></p> <p>-Mid-Chapter Test</p> <p>-Chapter Tests</p> <p>-Math Journals</p> <p>-Interactive Student Notebooks</p> <p><b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b></p> <p><b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b></p> <p><b>K-79%</b></p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup>-71%</b></p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup>-75%</b></p>		
--	--	---	---	---	--	--	--

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

					<p>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup>- 74%</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup>- 62%</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</p> <p>K-83%</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>-74%</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>-78%</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup>-64%</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup>-79%</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup>67%</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u></p> <p>The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 45% to 51%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>45%</b></p>	<p><b>51%</b></p>					



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

		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>	<p>5D.1. <b>See Goals 1,2,&amp;3</b></p>	<p>5D.1.</p>	<p>5D.1.</p>	<p>5D.1 <u>2-3x Per Year</u> -Baseline Assessment -Mid-year Assessment  <u>During Nine Weeks</u> -Mid-Chapter Test -Chapter Tests -Math Journals -Interactive Student Notebooks  <b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b> <b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b> <b>K-79%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup>-71%</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-75%</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-63%</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup>- 74%</b> <b>5<sup>th</sup>- 62%</b>  <b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70%</b></p>		
---	--------------	--	--------------	--------------	---	--	--

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

					<b>Mastery</b> <b>K-83%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup>-74%</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-78%</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-64%</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup>-79%</b> <b>5<sup>th</sup>67%</b>		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>  The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 25% to 28%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>25%</b>	<b>28%</b>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

*End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals*

**Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals \*(Middle and High Schools ONLY)**

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

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

<b>Algebra EOC Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

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

Algebra Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.</b></p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>		
<p><u>Algebra Goal #2:</u></p> <p><b>N/A</b></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

*End of Algebra EOC Goals*

**Mathematics Professional Development**

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader Math Contact	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
District Global Concept	K-5	Math Contact	PLCs	ongoing	Lesson Plan Reviews/classroom	Administration Team
Guides Variety of Math Content Training related to NGSSS	K-5	Math Contact	K-5 & ESE Teachers	ongoing	walkthroughs Administrators will conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor rigor implementation	Administration Team

*End of Mathematics Goals*

**Hillsborough 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised July, 2012**

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



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

**Elementary and Middle School Science Goals**

<b>Science Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.</b></p>	<p>1.1.-Not all teachers know how to identify misconceptions and depth of student knowledge of science concepts.</p> <p>-Not all teachers are able to attend available science trainings on dates available by the district.</p> <p>-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.</p> <p>-Not all PLC meetings include regular discussion of student data</p>	<p>1.1. Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge. To achieve this goal, science teachers will increase the number of <b><u>inquiry based instruction</u></b> (such as student engagement, explore time, accountable talk and higher order questioning) per unit of instruction.</p>	<p>1. <u>Who</u></p> <p>Principal &amp; Science Resource Teacher</p> <p><u>How Monitored</u></p> <p>-PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.</p> <p>- Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administrative walk-throughs.</p> <p>-Classroom walk-throughs observing inquiry based instruction.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-Teachers track students’ performance to calculate their students’ progress towards their SMART goal.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the smart goal data across all classes.</p> <p>For each class, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART goal.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-PLC facilitators share SMART goal data with the PSLT</p> <p>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>2x per year</u></p> <p>District-level baseline and mid-year tests</p> <p><u>Quarterly</u></p> <p>Core Curriculum Assessments</p> <p>Chapter tests</p> <p>End of unit assessments</p> <p>Benchmark Checks</p> <p><b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b></p> <p><b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b></p> <p><b>K-74%</b></p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup>-86%</b></p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup>-77%</b></p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup>-62%</b></p> <p><b>4<sup>th</sup>- 68%</b></p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup>- 85%</b></p>		
--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--

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

	<p>and/or the implementation of the inquiry model.</p> <p>-Teachers are at varying skill levels with the use of achievement series to accurately analyze student data.</p>				<p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</b></p> <p><b>K-84%</b></p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup>-76%</b></p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup>-84%</b></p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup>-62%</b></p> <p><b>4<sup>th</sup>-57%</b></p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup>-71%</b></p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

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

<p><u>Science Goal #1:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 33% to 38%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>33%</b></p>	<p><b>38%</b></p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>2. <b>FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.</b></p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1. Student achievement improves through teachers' collaboration with the science academic coach.  <b>Coach</b> The academic coach rotates through the grade level course PLCs to support &amp; facilitate the following:  -Lesson planning using the 5E Instructional Model that focuses on increased student engagement and hands-on inquiry.  Core</p>	<p>2.1.. <u>Who</u> Administration  <u>How</u> -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)</p>	<p>2.1 Tracking of coach's participation in PLCs.  -Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, de-briefing, professional development, and walk throughs.  -Administrator-Instructional Coach meetings to review log and discuss action plan for coach for the upcoming two weeks.</p>	<p>2.1 .-2x per year  District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  <u>During the Grading Period</u>  Common Assessments: Chapter Tests Probe Modules (mini assessments)  STEM Fair Projects  <b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b>  <b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b>  <b>K-74%</b>  <b>1<sup>st</sup>-86%</b>  <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-77%</b>  <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-62%</b>  <b>4<sup>th</sup>- 68%</b></p>		
---	-------------	---	--	---	--	--	--

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

		<p>curriculum assessment data analysis.</p> <p>Using walk-through data and student data, the coach identifies teachers for co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing.</p> <p>Throughout the school year, the coach conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools and student data.</p> <p><i>(The walk-through data is the coach's monitoring tool for effective instruction in science classes)</i></p>			<p>5<sup>th</sup>- 85%</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</p> <p>K-84%</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>-76%</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>-84%</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup>-62%</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup>-57%</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup>-71%</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	---	--	--

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

<u>Science Goal #2:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 2% to 8%.							
	<b>2%</b>	<b>8%</b>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		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

**Hillsborough 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised July, 2012**

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

PLC activity. PD Content /Topic  and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator  and/or PLC Leader Nicole Zamora	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
Earth Sci. Content Training	K-5		Science		Walk-throughs	N. Zamora/Administration

*End of Science Goals*



**Writing/Language Arts Goals**

<b>Writing/ Language Arts Goals</b>	<b>Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of  Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.</b></p>	<p>1.1. -Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing.  -Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction.  -All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.</p>	<p><u>1.1. Strategy</u> Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing.</p>	<p><u>1.1 Who</u> Principal, District (Writing Team, Supervisors, Writing Resources, DRTs)  <u>How Monitored</u> -PLC logs  -Classroom walk-throughs</p>	<p>1.1. Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes  -PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs  -Receive additional professional development in areas of need  -Seek additional professional knowledge through book studies/research  -Spread the use of effective practices across the school based on evidence shown in the best practice of others  -Use what is learned to begin the cycle again, revise as needed, increase scale if possible, etc.  -Plan ongoing monitoring of the solution(s)</p>	<p>1.1.-Student monthly demand writes/ formative assessments  -Student daily drafts  -Student revisions  -Student portfolios  <b>Progress Monitoring Summary:</b>  <b>Midyear-70% Mastery</b> <b>K-79%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup>-63%</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-17%</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-32%</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup>- 66%</b> <b>5<sup>th</sup>- 72%</b>  <b>3<sup>rd</sup> 9 weeks-70% Mastery</b> <b>K-71%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup>-64%</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>-42%</b></p>		
--	--	---	--	---	--	--	--

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

					3 <sup>rd</sup> -32%		
					4 <sup>th</sup> -58%		
					5 <sup>th</sup> -63%		
<u>Writing/LA Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of students scoring <b>Level 3.0</b> or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 94% to 96%.							
	<b>94%</b>	<b>96%</b>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Writing/Language Arts Professional Development**

**Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Hillsborough 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised July, 2012**

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

**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
	3-5		Grades 3-5 Teachers	On-going	PLC logs turned into administration	Principal
Writing Holistic Scoring Training		PLC facilitators				PLC Facilitators

*End of Writing Goals*

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

**Attendance Goal(s)**

<b>Attendance Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</b>						
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of  Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>1. Attendance</b></p>	<p>1.1. Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance.</p> <p>-Lack of time to focus on attendance</p> <p>-Lack of staff to focus on attendance</p> <p>-During rainy weather, many students do not have a means of transportation other than walking to school</p>	<p>1.1. The Administration Team along with other appropriate staff will meet every 20 days to review the school's Attendance Plan to 1) ensure that all steps are being implemented with fidelity and 2) discuss targeted students.</p> <p>A data base will be maintained for students with excessive unexcused absences and tardies. This data base will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of attendance interventions and to identify students in need of support beyond school wide attendance initiatives.</p>	<p>1.1. AP will run Attendance/Tardy meetings every 20 days with appropriate reports</p> <p>AP will maintain data base</p> <p>Social Worker</p> <p>Guidance Counselor</p>	<p>1.1. Administration Team and Guidance Counselor will examine data monthly</p>	<p>1.1. Attendance Report</p> <p>Tardy Report</p> <p>Attendance Plan</p>		
-----------------------------	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

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

<u>Attendance Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
<p>1. The attendance rate will increase from 94.4% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013.</p> <p>2.The number of students who have 10 or more <b>unexcused</b> absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10%</p> <p>3. The number of students who have 10 or more <b>unexcused</b> tardies to school throughout the school year will remain at 0%.</p>							
	<b>94.4%</b>	<b>96%</b>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>					

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

	<b>71</b>	<b>65</b>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

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

PD Content /Topic  and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator  and/or PLC Leader	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**

*End of Attendance Goals*

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

**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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Suspension</b>	<p>1.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.</li> <li>-There needs to be common procedures followed in all grade levels.</li> <li>-There needs to be age-appropriate consequences for misbehavior.</li> </ul>	<p>1.1. <b>Tier 1:</b> Social Skills Lessons/ Character Ed 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/ expectations and procedures.</p>	<p>1.1. PSLT "behavior" subgroup</p>	<p>1.1. PSLT "behavior" subgroup with review data on Office Discipline Referrals and out of school suspensions monthly.</p>	<p>1.1. Crystal Report ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data.</p>		

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

Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of	2013 Expected Number of					
	<u>In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>In-School Suspensions</u>					
1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.							
2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.							
3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.							
4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.							
	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended</u>					
	<u>In-School</u>	<u>In-School</u>					

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

	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>					
	<u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	<b>39</b>	<b>35</b>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended</u> <u>Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended</u> <u>Out-of-School</u>					
	<b>29</b>	<b>25</b>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	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.

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

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

*End of Suspension Goals*

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

**Dropout Prevention Goal(s)**

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

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

<b>Dropout Prevention Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention</b>						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p><b>1. Dropout Prevention</b></p> <p><u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u></p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i></p>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

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

N/A	<u>2012 Current</u> Dropout Rate:*	<u>2013 Expected</u> Dropout Rate:*					
	<u>2012 Current</u> Graduation Rate:*	<u>2013 Expected</u> Graduation Rate:*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Dropout Prevention Professional Development**

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

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

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

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

*End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*



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

**Parent Involvement Goal(s)**

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>  <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
N/A	<u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					

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

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
<b>Parent Involvement Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement</b>						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>2. Parent Involvement</b>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<u>Parent Involvement Goal #2:</u>							
<b>N/A</b>	<u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					

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

		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

**Parent Involvement Professional Development**

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

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

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

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

**Health and Fitness Goal(s)**

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

<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to</b>						
---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

	<b>Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>1. Health and Fitness Goal</b></p>	<p>1.1.  -Temperature/ Weather  -Scheduling (Time)  -Student/ Teacher Attire  -Teachers' lack of awareness</p>	<p>1.1. Students will engage in 150 minutes of physical activity per week (60 minutes with Coach &amp; 90 minutes with the classroom teacher)  2. Students will use the playground or fitness course (age appropriate) to walk, jog, or run to improve cardiovascular fitness.  3. Teachers will utilize exercise videos, folder on IDEAS, etc. on rainy days.</p>	<p>1.1.-Coach will oversee the use of PE equipment.  -Administration will check lesson plans to monitor the implementation of - Teacher Directed Play.  -Grade Level Meetings-track minutes</p>	<p>1.1. Students will be monitored during PE and progress will be noted.  -Each month students will be evaluated based on the age-appropriate standard.</p>	<p>1.1.  Quarter Fitness Goals- assess progress each nine week period</p>		
--	--	--	---	---	---	--	--

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

Health and Fitness Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
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 65% on the Pretest to 75% on the Posttest.							
	<b>65%</b>	<b>75%</b>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development**

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

Hillsborough 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised July, 2012

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

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

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

### Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>1. Continuous Improvement Goal</b></p>	<p>1.1. Not all teachers are comfortable having others in their classroom to co-teach, plan lessons &amp; analyze student data.  Some teachers are not willing to stay after hours to plan for differentiated instructional purposes.  Not all teachers show flexibility in their day to mentor and support their peers &amp;/or willingly accept suggestions &amp;/or guidance in the areas of need.</p>	<p>1.1. Grade level PLCs will occur on a weekly basis to plan for instruction, analyze data, and share resources/strategies that were shared during professional development training sessions.  The Reading Coach will attend each grade level PLC at least once per month to guide the use of formative assessments, analyzing data and progress monitoring for below level students (RtI Process), &amp; provide on-site training opportunities.  The ELL Resource teacher will share any updates with classroom teachers regarding the CELLA and ELL requirements.</p>	<p>1.1.Administration</p>	<p>1.1. PSLT Meetings &amp; PLC Logs Resource Calendars Grade Level Action Plans</p>	<p>1.1 .PLC Logs Minutes from PSLT meetings Training Evaluations/ Participant Feedback Surveys Grade Level Action Plans</p>		
--	---	--	---------------------------	--	---	--	--



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

		<p>The School Psychologist will attend PLCs as requested to provide teachers with necessary information on the needs of progress monitoring &amp; provide guidance on necessary interventions for non proficient students.</p> <p>The Science Resource Teacher will regularly attend grade level PLC meetings to assist teachers in planning, sharing most current information from district trainings, provide on-site training opportunities &amp; co-teach as needed.</p> <p>Math and Writing Lead Teachers will attend monthly contact meetings and share updates during faculty meetings with the staff.</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

<u>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that “teachers that I work with support and mentor one another” under Resource and Support Systems will increase from 37% to 50% in 2012 to in 2013.							
	<b>37%</b>	<b>50%</b>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development**

**Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional**

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

**Learning  
Community (PLC)  
or PD Activity**

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

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

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

**NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals**

<p><b>A. Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).</p>	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.		
<p><u>Reading Goal A:</u>  N/A</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

		A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	
		A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	
<b>B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</b>	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.		

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

Reading Goal B:  N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	
		B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	

**NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals**

<b>CELLA Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition</b>					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

<p><b>C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.</b></p>	<p>-Lack of understanding that teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing.</p> <p>-Bilingual Education.</p> <p>-Allocation of Bilingual Education</p> <p>-Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL Program guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT</p>	<p>ELLs (LYA, LYB &amp; LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards improves through participation in the following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across Reading, Writing, Math, Science, and Social Studies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extended time (lesson and assessments)</li> <li>2. Small group testing</li> <li>3. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)</li> </ol>	<p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-School based Administrators</p> <p>-ESOL Resource Teacher</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms</p>	<p>Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students.</p>	<p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests</p> <p><u>During the nine weeks</u></p> <p>-Monthly Fluency Checks</p> <p>-Teacher observation/Anecdotal records</p> <p>-Oral Presentations</p>	
<p><u>CELLA Goal #C:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 67% to 70%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u></p>					
	<p><b>67%</b></p>					

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	



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

<p><b>D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.</b></p>	<p>2.1. -Lack of understanding that teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing.  -Bilingual Education.  -Allocation of Bilingual Education  -Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL Program guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT</p>	<p>2.1. ELLs (LYA, LYB &amp; LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards improves through participation in the following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across Reading, Writing, Math, Science, and Social Studies:  1. Extended time (lesson and assessments)  2. Small group testing  3. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)</p>	<p>2.1. <u>Who</u>  -School based Administrators  -ESOL Resource Teacher  <u>How</u>  -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms</p>	<p>2.1. Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students.</p>	<p>2.1. <u>During the Grading Period</u>  -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests  - FAIR On-going Progress Monitoring in comprehension  District Assessments  <u>During the nine weeks</u>  -Weekly Assessments  -Unit Assessments  -Monthly Fluency Checks</p>	
--	---	---	---	--	--	--

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

<p><u>CELLA Goal #D:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 44% to 48%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u></p>					
	<p><b>44%</b></p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>
<p>Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>	

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

<p><b>E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.</b></p>	<p>2.1.</p> <p>-Lack of understanding that teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing.</p> <p>-Bilingual Education.</p> <p>-Allocation of Bilingual Education</p> <p>-Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL Program guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT</p>	<p>2.1. ELLs (LYA, LYB &amp; LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards improves through participation in the following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across Reading, Writing, Math, Science, and Social Studies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extended time (lesson and assessments)</li> <li>2. Small group testing</li> <li>3. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)</li> </ol>	<p>2.1. <u>Who</u></p> <p>-School based Administrators</p> <p>-ESOL Resource Teacher</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms</p>	<p>2.1. Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students</p>	<p>2.1. <u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>- Monthly Cub Writes</p> <p>-Writers' Workshop (written pieces)</p> <p>-Teacher Observations/ Anecdotal Records</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	---	--

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

<p><u>CELLA Goal #E:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 30% to 35%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u></p>					
	<p><b>30%</b></p>					
		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**

<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		
---	----------------------------	-----------------	--	--	------------------------	--	--

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

<p><b>F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).</b></p>	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.		
<p>Mathematics Goal F:</p> <p><b>N/A</b></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
		F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	

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

		F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	
<b>G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b>	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> G:	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
		G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	
		G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	

**NEW Geometry End-of-Course Goals \*(High School ONLY)**

<b>Geometry EOC Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase</b>						

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

	<b>Student Achievement</b>						
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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>H. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry.</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		



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

<p>Geometry Goal H:</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p><b>I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.</b></p>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<p><u>Geometry Goal I:</u></p> <p><b>N/A</b></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	

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

		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
--	--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

**NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal**

<b>Elementary, Middle and High Science Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).</b></p>	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.	J.1.		
<p><u>Science Goal J:</u>  N/A</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p>					

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

		J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	
		J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	

**NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals**

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

<b>Biology EOC Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p><b>K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology.</b></p>	<p>1.1.</p>	<p>1.1.</p>	<p>1.1.</p>	<p>1.1.</p>	<p>1.1.</p>		
<p><u>Biology Goal K:</u></p> <p><b>N/A</b></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	

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

		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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology.</b>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

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

Biology Goal L:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

**NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal**

<b>Writing Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		



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

<p><b>M. Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).</p>	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.	M.1.		
<p>Writing Goal M:  <b>N/A</b></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
		M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	

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

		M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	
--	--	------	------	------	------	------	--

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

<b>STEM Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

<p><u>STEM Goal #1:</u> Our staff will implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science, Science Olympics, and STEM Fair.</p> <p><u>STEM Goal #2:</u> Increase number of student participants.</p>	<p>1.1. Need common planning time for math &amp; science.</p> <p>Materials</p> <p>Lack of Training/Inservice</p> <p>Coursework</p>	<p>1.1.-Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established.</p> <p>-Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs.</p> <p>-Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study guided by science resource teacher</p>	<p>1.1. Science Resource Teacher</p>	<p>1.1 Administrative walk-throughs</p>	<p>1.1 -Logging number of project-based learning in math &amp; science. (Share data with teachers.)</p> <p>-STEM Fair results (school/district)</p> <p>-Science Olympics participation (school/district)</p>
	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>
	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>

**STEM Professional Development**

**Professional**

Hillsborough 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised July, 2012

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

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

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

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

<p><u>CTE Goal #1:</u></p> <p>Students will be given the opportunity to have guest speakers visit, share, and discuss various careers, as well as guest speakers to share information on relative topics being taught in the classroom.</p>	<p>I.1.</p> <p>-Scheduling</p> <p>-Acquiring guest speakers during the work day</p>	<p>I.1. Great American Teach In</p> <p>Family Night(s)</p>	<p>I.1. Assistant Principal &amp; Guidance Counselor</p>	<p>-Student reflection and thank you letters to visitors</p> <p>- AP monitors sign up and schedule</p>	<p>I.1. Guidance Counselor creates/ conducts student/family surveys</p>
	<p>I.2.</p>	<p>I.2.</p>	<p>I.2.</p>	<p>I.2.</p>	<p>I.2.</p>
	<p>I.3.</p>	<p>I.3.</p>	<p>I.3.</p>	<p>I.3.</p>	<p>I.3.</p>

**CTE Professional Development**

**Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning**

Hillsborough 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised July, 2012

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

### Community (PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

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

**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.)

<b>School Differentiated Accountability Status</b>		
Priority	Focus	Prevent

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

**School Advisory Council (SAC)**

*SAC Membership Compliance*

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

X Yes      No

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

Describe the use of SAC funds.			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
Science Goal 1.1	Florida K-1 Science Teacher Module & CD (AIMS)	\$140.00	\$140.00
Science Goal 1.1	Consumable Materials for Hands- on & Enrichment Activities K-5	\$910.00	\$910.00

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

Final Amount Spent	\$1050.00		