FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mitchell Elementary School

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name:	Henry L. Mitchell Elementary School	District Name:	Hillsborough
Principal:	Joanne Baumgartner	Superintendent:	Mary Ellen Elia
SAC Chair:	Kathy Hill	Date of School Board Approval:	

Student Achievement Data:

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

Highly Qualified Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Joanne Baumgartner	MA & BA Early Childhood Ed Elementary Ed Reading K-12 School Principal (All Levels)	9	30	11-12 A (High Standards 81% Rdg, 77% Math, 96% Writing, 74% Science) (Learning Gains 86% Rdg., 82% Math) (Lowest 25%- 91% Rdg., 73% Math) 10-11 B (High Standards 90% Rdg. 89% Math, 96% Writing, 81% Science) (Learning Gains 70% Rdg. 59% Math) (Lowest 25% 61 % Rdg. 44% Math)
Assistant Principal	Deborah Anderson	MA & BA Elementary Ed ESOL Gifted Ed Leadership (All Levels)	5	5	11-12 A (High Standards 81% Rdg, 77% Math, 96% Writing, 74% Science) (Learning Gains 86% Rdg., 82% Math) (Lowest 25%- 91% Rdg., 73% Math) 10-11 B (High Standards 90% Rdg. 89% Math, 96% Writing, 81% Science) (Learning Gains 70% Rdg. 59% Math) (Lowest 25% 61 % Rdg. 44% Math)

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	Noy Sullivan	BA & MA Elementary Ed ESOL	2	7	11-12 A (High Standards 81% Rdg, 77% Math, 96% Writing, 74% Science) (Learning Gains 86% Rdg., 82% Math) (Lowest 25%- 91% Rdg., 73% Math) 10-11 B (High Standards 90% Rdg. 89% Math, 96% Writing, 81% Science) (Learning Gains 70% Rdg. 59% Math) (Lowest 25% 61 % Rdg. 44% Math)

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	Area Director/Principal	June 2012	
2. Best practice strategies for interviewing and hiring	Principal	As needed	
3. Provide support for new teachers through EET Grant, mentoring, and coaching.	Principal, AP, Mentor & Peer teachers, Reading Coach	Throughout the school year	
4.			

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly qualified.	**Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective**
There are six staff members that are teaching out of field/and who are not highly qualified. Four of these teachers are missing the ESOL Endorsement and two are working toward the Gifted Endorsement.	All teachers are continuing to take the needed courses to meet requirements. Administration is supporting teachers and continuing to monitor progress towards reaching certification goals.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
60	5% (3)	32% (19)	33% (20)	30% (18)	22% *(13)	100% (57)	1.8% (2)	1.8% (2)	65% (39)

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

Sara Suarez	Katey Lackey, Caitlyn Tierney, Jessica Magni, Rachel Roche, Katie White, Kristen Antonello, Natasha Hakun	Ms. Suarez is a mentor Teacher through the EET initiative. She has strengths and experience with best practice and moving achievement forward.	Weekly visits to included modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work and data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Noy Sullivan	Katey Lackey, Caitlyn Tierney, Jessica Magni, Rachel Roche, Katie White, Kristen Antonello, Natasha Hakun	Ms. Noy is the Reading Coach for our school and will assist and work with our new teachers.	Ongoing co-planning, modeling of lessons, and observations with feedback.

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

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 RtI efforts?

The purpose of the MTSS Leadership Team in our school is to ensure high quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and using performance level and learning rate over time to make data-based decisions to guide instruction. The MTSS Leadership Team reviews school-wide data to address the progress of low-performing students and determine the enrichment and acceleration needs of high performing students. The major goal is for all students to achieve adequate yearly progress and improve other long-term outcomes (behavior, attendance, etc.). The team uses the Collaborative Culture Problem Solving Model and ALL decisions are guided by the review and analysis of student data.

The PSLT is considered the main leadership team in our school. The MTSS Leadership Team will meet and use the problem solving process to:

- Oversee the multi-layered model of service delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Based on student data, recommend, coordinate and implement supplemental services (Tiers 2 and 3) that match students' non-mastery of skills through:
  - Tutoring during the day in small group pull-outs in reading, math and science
  - Extended Learning Programs during and after school
  - Intensive Reading and Math classes
  - Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Determine curriculum materials and intervention resources based on identified needs derived from data analysis
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Review and interpret student data (academic, behavior and attendance) at the school and grade levels
- Organize and support systematic data collection as needed
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
  - Implementation and support of PLCs
  - Use of school-based *Reinforcement Instructional Calendars*, *Mini-Lessons* and *Mini-Assessments*
  - Use of Mini Assessments (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)
  - Use of *Common Core Assessments* at the end of segments/chapters (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)
  - Implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions (e.g., Differentiated Instruction)

- Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences

- At the end of each nine weeks, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the nine weeks.
- Assist with planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) and F-CIM (Florida Continuous Improvement Model on specific tested benchmarks) and progress monitoring.
- Coordinate/collaborate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).
- Use intervention planning forms to communicate initiatives between the PSLT and PLCs.

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 Chair of SAC is a member of the MTSS Leadership Team.
- The MTSS Leadership Team and SAC were involved in the School Improvement Plan development that was initiated prior to the end of the 2011-12 school year and during preplanning for the 2012-13 school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the MTSS Leadership Team. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the MTSS Leadership Team will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies developed in problem solving plans by reviewing student data as well as data related to various levels of fidelity. Using data gathered from PLCs, the team will monitor the data and make progress statements on the School Improvement Plan at the end of the first, second and third nine weeks. The MTSS Leadership Team will use the following rubric to evaluate Strategy Fidelity of Implementation and Strategy Effectiveness:

Not Evident	Teacher monitoring indicates strategy implementation has not begun.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing no positive effect on student achievement.
Emerging	Some (25-75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates early or preliminary stages of implementation.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing minimal or poor effect on student achievement.
Operational	Most (>75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates active implementation.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is mostly showing a positive effect on student achievement.
Highly	Teacher monitoring indicates that all of the intended teachers are implementing the	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing a significant positive effect on student

Functional	strategy with fidelity. Evidence exists that the strategy is fully integrated and effectively/consistently implemented.	achievement.

The MTSS Leadership Team will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning MTSS Leadership Team members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger MTSS Leadership Team through the grade level MTSS Leadership Team representative.

- The MTSS Leadership Team and PLCs both use the problem solving process: Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
  - review and analyze screening and collateral data
  - develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers)
  - develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses
  - establish methods to track students' progress with appropriate progress monitoring assessments at intervals matched to the intensity of the interventions and/or enrichment
  - develop progress monitoring goals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify interventions and/or enrichments)
  - review goal statements to ensure they are ambitious, time-bound and meaningful (e.g., SMART goals)
  - assess the fidelity of instruction/intervention implementation and other MTSS/RtI processes

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.
The following table contains a summary of the assessments used to measure student progress in core, supplemental and intensive instruction and their sources and management:

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released test	School Generated Excel Database	Principal, AP, Reading Coach, SAC chairs
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	MTSS Leadership Team , PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing and Science	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	MTSS Leadership Team , PLCs, individual teachers
Program Generated Assessments	Software	Individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative

Common Assessments* *(see below)* of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources	Subject Area Generated Database	Individual teachers, MTSS Leadership Team
Unit, quarterly, mid-year, end of year formative & summative assessments	Subject Area	Individual teachers, MTSS Leadership Team
Mini-Assessments on specific tested Benchmarks	Subject Area	Individual teachers

*A Common Assessment covers a "chunk" of instruction within the District adopted curriculum. 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.

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP)* *(see below)* Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials)	School Generated Database	MTSS Leadership Team / ELP Facilitator
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database	MTSS Leadership Team / Reading Coach
easyCBM	School Generated Database	MTSS Leadership Team / Reading Coach
Other Curriculum Based Measurement** *(see below)*	School Generated Database	MTSS Leadership Team /PLCs

*Students receiving pull-out tutoring during the school day or Extended Learning Program (ELP) after school will receive instruction on the specific skills they have not mastered in the core curriculum. As students work on these specific skills, they will be assessed during tutoring and ELP to ensure mastery of skills. In order to make this process effective, a communication system between classroom teacher and the tutor/ELP teacher will be developed by the MTSS Leadership Team and monitored for effectiveness throughout the school year. As students progress through Supplementary Support and Intensive Instruction, the number/type of supplemental services, time spent in the supplemental services and frequency of assessment will increase in duration.

** In addition to Core assessments, progress monitoring the outcomes of intensive interventions requires additional Curriculum Based Measures (CBM) that:

- assess the same skills over time
- have multiple equivalent forms
- are sensitive to small amounts of growth over time.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
School psychologist and guidance counselor will train faculty on MTSS. MTSS process training will be provided for RTI Vertical team, Problem Solving Leadership Team and PLC's. Dia Davis, our RtI facilitator trained each grade level during the month of October on the RtI/MTSS changes and reviewed and clarified tier one and tier two.S

School-Based MTSS Leadership Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team

- Principal, Joanne Baumgartner
- Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Debbie Anderson
- School Psychologist, Jim Landers
- Guidance counselor, Monica Mirasola
- Reading Coach, Noy Sullivan
- SAC Chair, Kathy Hill
- ESOL Teacher Ruth Hughes
- Team Leaders, Lorraine Clementi
- School Social Worker, Raven Lewis

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 RtI efforts?

The purpose of the MTSS Leadership Team in our school is to ensure high quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and using performance level and learning rate over time to make data-based decisions to guide instruction. The MTSS Leadership Team reviews school-wide data to address the progress of low-performing students and determine the enrichment and acceleration needs of high performing students. The major goal is for all students to achieve adequate yearly progress and improve other long-term outcomes (behavior, attendance, etc.). The team uses the Collaborative Culture Problem Solving Model and ALL decisions are guided by the review and analysis of student data.

The MTSS Leadership Team is considered the main leadership team in our school. The MTSS Leadership Team will meet and use the problem solving process to:

- Oversee the multi-layered model of service delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)

- Based on student data, recommend, coordinate and implement supplemental services (Tiers 2 and 3) that match students' non-mastery of skills through:
  - Tutoring during the day in small group pull-outs in reading, math and science
  - Extended Learning Programs during and after school
  - Intensive Reading and Math classes
  - Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Determine curriculum materials and intervention resources based on identified needs derived from data analysis
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Review and interpret student data (academic, behavior and attendance) at the school and grade levels
- Organize and support systematic data collection as needed
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
  - Implementation and support of PLCs
  - Use of school-based *Reinforcement Instructional Calendars*, *Mini-Lessons* and *Mini-Assessments*
  - Use of Mini Assessments (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the MTSS Leadership Team)
  - Use of *Common Core Assessments* at the end of segments/chapters (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the MTSS Leadership Team)
  - Implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions (e.g., Differentiated Instruction)
  - Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences
- At the end of each nine weeks, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the nine weeks.
- Assist with planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) and F-CIM (Florida Continuous Improvement Model on specific tested benchmarks) and progress monitoring.
- Coordinate/collaborate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).
- Use intervention planning forms to communicate initiatives between the MTSS Leadership Team and PLCs.

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

- The Chair of SAC is a member of the MTSS Leadership Team.
- The MTSS Leadership Team and SAC were involved in the School Improvement Plan development that was initiated prior to the end of the 2011-12 school year and during preplanning for the 2012-13 school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the MTSS Leadership Team. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the MTSS Leadership Team MTSS Leadership Team will monitor the effectiveness of the strategies developed in problem solving plans by reviewing student data as well as data related to various levels of fidelity. Using data gathered from PLCs, the team will monitor the data and make progress statements on the School Improvement Plan at the end of the first, second and third nine weeks. The MTSS Leadership Team will use the following

rubric to evaluate Strategy Fidelity of Implementation and Strategy Effectiveness:

Not Evident	Teacher monitoring indicates strategy implementation has not begun.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing no positive effect on student achievement.
Emerging	Some (25-75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates early or preliminary stages of implementation.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing minimal or poor effect on student achievement.
Operational	Most (>75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates active implementation.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is mostly showing a positive effect on student achievement.
Highly Functional	Teacher monitoring indicates that all of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence exists that the strategy is fully integrated and effectively/consistently implemented.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing a significant positive effect on student achievement.

The MTSS Leadership Team will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning MTSS Leadership Team members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger PSLT team through the grade level PSLT representative.

- The MTSS Leadership Team and PLCs both use the problem solving process: Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
  - review and analyze screening and collateral data
  - develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers)
  - develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses
  - establish methods to track students' progress with appropriate progress monitoring assessments at intervals matched to the intensity of the interventions and/or enrichment
  - develop progress monitoring goals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify interventions and/or enrichments)
  - review goal statements to ensure they are ambitious, time-bound and meaningful (e.g., SMART goals)
  - assess the fidelity of instruction/intervention implementation and other PS/RtI processes

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.
The following table contains a summary of the assessments used to measure student progress in core, supplemental and intensive instruction and their sources and management:

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released test	School Generated Excel Database	Principal, AP, Reading Coach, SAC chairs
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing and Science	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
Program Generated Assessments	Software	Individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Common Assessments* *(see below)* of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources	Subject Area Generated Database	Individual teachers, PSLT
Unit, quarterly, mid-year, end of year formative & summative assessments	Subject Area	Individual teachers, PSLT
Mini-Assessments on specific tested Benchmarks	Subject Area	Individual teachers

*A Common Assessment covers a "chunk" of instruction within the District adopted curriculum. 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.

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP)* *(see below)* Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials)	School Generated Database	MTSS Leadership Team LT/ ELP Facilitator
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database	MTSS Leadership Team / Reading Coach

Other Curriculum Based Measurement** *(see below)*	School Generated Database	MTSS Leadership Team /PLCs

*Students receiving pull-out tutoring during the school day or Extended Learning Program (ELP) after school will receive instruction on the specific skills they have not mastered in the core curriculum. As students work on these specific skills, they will be assessed during tutoring and ELP to ensure mastery of skills. In order to make this process effective, a communication system between classroom teacher and the tutor/ELP teacher will be developed by the PSLT and monitored for effectiveness throughout the school year. As students progress through Supplementary Support and Intensive Instruction, the number/type of supplemental services, time spent in the supplemental services and frequency of assessment will increase in duration.

** In addition to Core assessments, progress monitoring the outcomes of intensive interventions requires additional Curriculum Based Measures (CBM) that:

- assess the same skills over time
- have multiple equivalent forms
- are sensitive to small amounts of growth over time.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
School psychologist and guidance counselor will train faculty on MTSS. RTI process training will be provided for MTSS Vertical team, MTSS Leadership Team and PLC's.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

- Principal, Joanne Baumgartner
- Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Debbie Anderson
- Reading Coach, Noy Sullivan
- Reading Teachers, Kathy Hill, Ruth Hughes, Lorraine Clementi
- Media Specialist, Juli Schmidt

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
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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).			1.1. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	1.1. **Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas** Reading comprehension improves when **students are engaged in grappling with complex text**. Teachers need to understand how to **select/identify** complex text, **shift** the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and **share** complex texts with all students. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.**	1.1. Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -Reading PLC Logs -Language Arts PLC Logs -Social Studies PLC Logs -Elective PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.	1.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson	1.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks, including easyCBM)
Reading Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 81% to 82%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **81%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **82%**					

				Action Steps Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	-Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	
			1.2. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	1.2. **Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas** Common Core Questions of all types and levels are necessary to scaffold students' understanding of complex text. Teachers need to understand and use **higher-order, text-dependent questions** at the word/phrase, sentence, and paragraph/passage levels (Webb's, Bloom, Costas). Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Scaffolding of students' grappling with complex text through well-crafted text-dependent question assists students in discovering and achieving deeper understanding of the	1.2. Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach How -Reading PLC Logs -Language Arts PLC Logs -Social Studies PLC Logs -Elective 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	1.2. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.	1.2. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)

			author's meaning. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation**. **Action Steps** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.	-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	
		1.3. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	1.3. **Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas** Teachers need to understand how to **design** and **deliver** a **close reading** lesson. Student reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in close reading instruction using complex text. Specific close reading strategies include: 1) multiple readings of a passage 2) asking higher-order, text-dependent questions, 3) writing in response to reading and 4) engaging in text-based class discussion. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.** **Action Steps** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.3. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -Reading Logs -Language Arts Logs -Social Studies Logs -Elective Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate	1.3. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student	1.3 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)

				the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.	supplemental instruction.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.		2.1.	2.1. See Goal 1.1-1.3	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Reading Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 57% to 58%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **57%** / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **58%**	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.		3.1. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	3.1. **Strategy** Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect	3.1. Who -Principal -AP -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and	3.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, and/or leadership team.	3.1. 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) progressing monitoring using easyCBM
Reading Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading be greater than 80 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **86 points** / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **80 points**					

				them to learn? 2. How will we if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? **Actions/Details** -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a **Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log** to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.		
			Strategy/Task	**Strategy/Task**	**Strategy/Task**	**Strategy/Task**	**Strategy/Task**
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4.1.	4.1. See Goal 3.1 and 3.2	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will be greater than 75 points	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **91 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **75 points**					

		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016** / **2016-2017**
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Reading Goal #5:						
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** Reading Goal #5A: The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from _47__% to __52__%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:86% Black:47% Hispanic:73% Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:87% Black:52% Hispanic:73% Asian: American Indian:	5A.2 -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	5A.2 **Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas** Reading comprehension improves when **students are engaged in grappling with complex text**. Teachers need to understand how to **select/identify** complex text, **shift** the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and **share** complex texts with all students. **All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.** **Action Steps** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	5A.2 Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -Reading PLC Logs -Language Arts PLC Logs -Social Studies PLC Logs -Elective 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.	5A.2 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads	5A.2 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)

						shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	
			5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2
			5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from __53_% to __57__%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **53%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **57%**	5.B.2 -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	5.B.2 **Strategy** Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 5. What is it we expect them to learn? 6. How will we if they have learned it? 7. How will we respond if they don't learn? 8. How will we respond if they already know it? **Actions/Details** -Grade level/like-course	5.B.2. Who -Principal -AP -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	5.B.2 School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, and/or leadership team.	5.B.2 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

				PLCs use a **Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log** to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.			
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1.	5C.1. See Goal 5.B.1	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from _42__% to __43__%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **42%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **43%**					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.

Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from _33__% to _40___%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **33%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **40%**		See Goal 5.B.1			
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	-Subject Area Leaders -Course specific PLC Facilitators -Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	-On-going -Demonstration classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders
The 3 S's of Complex Text: Selecting /Identifying Complex Text, Shifting to Increased Use of Informational Text, and Sharing of Complex Text with All Students (K-12)	K-5	Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders
Identifying and Creating Text-Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension (K-12)	K-5	Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).			1.1. Not all teachers are aware of how to increase the depth and rigor necessary to meet the NGSSS and/or CCCSM	1.1. **Strategy** Students' math skills will improve through participation in lessons designed to increase knowledge of depth and **rigor** of content. Teachers will also use the DOE links to the NGSSS and CCSSM highlighting the depth and rigor of each of the benchmarks. **Action Steps** -Show teachers how to access www.floridastandards.org link. -Model for teachers how to use the website. -PLCs write SMART goals based on each Grading Period of material. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss specific benchmarks being addressed in class and how to increase the rigor of the benchmark in classroom.	1.1. Who Teacher Principal AP Math Resource/Contact District Math Team Academic Coaches Generalist How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing lessons designed with rigor and depth. -Elementary Mathematics *(available from Elementary Math)* Walk-through Form -Mathematics PLC Recording Document *(available from Elementary Math)*	1.1. PLCs – Periodic (weekly or bi-weekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores, daily teacher observations, and response through modification of lesson plans based on data are reviewed to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment. 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. District Math Team-Monthly meetings to support progress is discussed at Resource Teacher/Lead Teacher meetings. Individual site support is provided as needed based on data.	1.1. 4x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Form 1 Form 2 NGSSS(optional) -EOY test During the Grading Period -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments -Prerequisite Skills Tests -Go Math! BOY Test -Go Math! MOY Test -Go Math! EOY Test
Mathematics Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 77% to 78%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **77%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **78%**					

				Teachers will also use the DOE links to the NGSSS and CCSSM highlighting the depth and rigor of each of the benchmarks. -Teachers implement the lessons with depth and rigor strategies discussed in their PLCs. -Teachers implement the common assessments. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Using the data, teachers discuss the effectiveness of the rigor and depth strategies that were implemented. -Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of rigor and depth lesson planning. -PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. -Teachers will attend district math content trainings to increase their knowledge of math content.			
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1. See Goal 1.1	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 51% to 52%.	**51%**	**52%**					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	3.1. **Strategy** Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 9. What is it we expect them to learn? 10. How will we if they have learned it? 11. How will we respond if they don't learn? 12. How will we respond if they already know it? **Actions/Details** -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a **Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log** to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on	3.1. Who -Principal -AP -Mentor teachers -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	3.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.	3.1. 4x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Form 1 Form 2 NGSSS(optional) -EOY test During the Grading Period -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments -Prerequisite Skills Tests -Go Math! BOY Test -Go Math! MOY Test -Go Math! EOY Test
Mathematics Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will be greater than or equal to 70 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **82 points**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **70 points**					

				grade level/content area PLC action plans.			
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1.	4.1. See 3.1	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 73 points to 70 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	73 points	**70 points**					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016** / **2016-2017**
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							

Math Goal #5:							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics**			5.A.2 Not all teachers are aware of how to increase the depth and rigor necessary to meet the NGSSS and/or CCCSM	5.A.2 **Strategy** Students' math skills will improve through participation in lessons designed to increase knowledge of depth and **rigor** of content. Teachers will also use the DOE links to the NGSSS and CCSSM highlighting the depth and rigor of each of the benchmarks. **Action Steps** -Show teachers how to access www.floridastandards.org link. -Model for teachers how to use the website. -PLCs write SMART goals based on each Grading Period of material. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss specific benchmarks being addressed in class and how to increase the rigor of the benchmark in classroom. Teachers will also use the DOE links to the NGSSS and CCSSM highlighting the depth and rigor of each of the benchmarks. -Teachers implement the lessons with depth and rigor	5.A.2 Who Teacher Principal AP Math Resource/Contact District Math Team Academic Coaches Generalist How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing lessons designed with rigor and depth. -Elementary Mathematics *(available from Elementary Math)* Walk-through Form -Mathematics PLC Recording Document *(available from Elementary Math)*	5.A.2 PLCs – Periodic (weekly or bi-weekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores, daily teacher observations, and response through modification of lesson plans based on data are reviewed to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency toward benchmark attainment. 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. District Math Team-Monthly meetings to support progress is discussed at Resource Teacher/Lead Teacher meetings. Individual site support is provided as needed based on data.	5.A.2 Not all teachers are aware of how to increase the depth and rigor necessary to meet the NGSSS and/or CCCSM
Mathematics Goal #5A: The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from __54_% to __52__%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will be at greater than or equal to 64%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:82% Black:47% Hispanic:69% Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:84% Black:52% Hispanic:64% Asian: American Indian:					

				strategies discussed in their PLCs. -Teachers implement the common assessments. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Using the data, teachers discuss the effectiveness of the rigor and depth strategies that were implemented. -Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of rigor and depth lesson planning. -PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. -Teachers will attend district math content trainings to increase their knowledge of math content.			
			5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.
			5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5B.1. See Goal 5.A.2	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Mathematics Goal #5B: . The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from __59_% to __61__%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **59%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **61%**					

		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from __54_% to ___55_%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **54%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **55%**	See Goal 5.A.2			
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from _43__% to __44__%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **43%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **44%**	See Goal 5.A.2			
		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

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	Grades K-5	-Math Liaison -AP	Math specific PLCs	PLC Meetings monthly	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation	Administration Team

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.			1.1 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model. -Lack of common planning time to facilitate and hold PLCs for like courses.	1.1 **Strategy** Students' science skills will improve through participation in the **5E instructional model.** **Action Steps** -Teachers will attend District Science training and share 5 E Instructional Model information with their PLCs. -PLCs write SMART goals based for units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively building 5E Instructional Model for upcoming lessons. -PLC teachers instruct students using the 5E Instructional Model. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans to drive future instruction.	1.1 Who Principal APC How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	1.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc.)
Science Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 74% to 75%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **74%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **75%**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.			2.1 -Not all teachers have received the CCLS for Science overview. -Not all teachers understand how to integrate close reading with the 5E instructional model. -Not all PLCs routinely look at curriculum materials beyond those posted on the curriculum guide	2.1 **Strategy** Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text (textbooks and other supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the **close reading model** (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least _____ times per nine weeks. **Action Steps** ***Professional Development*** -The Reading Coach along with the Departmental Leaders/Coach/SAL conduct small group departmental trainings to develop teachers' ability to use the close reading model. -The Reading Coach attends science departmental PLCs to co-plan with teachers, developing lessons using the close reading model. -Teachers within departments attend professional development provided by the district/school on text complexity and close reading models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model. ***In PLCs/Department***	2.1 Who Principal AP Reading Coach Reading Leadership Team How Monitored Administration, -PLC logs turned into administration. -Administration provides feedback.	Science PLC Resource meetings PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing baseline achievement level to 80% mastery using the proximal evaluation tool.	2.1 - 3x-per year District level baseline, mid-year, and pre-EOC administration During the Grading Period -mini-assessments -unit assessments
Science Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will be greater than or equal to 34%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **39%**	2013Expected Level of Performance:* **34%**					

				-Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks. -PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile. -PLCs assign appropriate NGSSS benchmark to Close Reading passage -To increase stamina, teachers select high-Lexile, complex and rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous - Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons. ***During the lessons, teachers:*** -Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text using the following: --Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text. --Stating an essential question prior to reading --Using questions to check for understanding. --Using question to engage students in discussion. --Requiring oral and written responses to text. -Ask text-based questions that require close reading of the text and multiple reads of			

				the text. ***During the lessons, students:*** -Grapple with complex text. -Re-read for a second purpose and to increase comprehension. -Engage in discussion to answer essential question using textual evidence. -Write in response to essential question using textual evidence.			
			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 PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Inquiry and the 5E Instructional Model	Grades K-5	Science Contact	School wide	On-going in science PLCs 3 times per month	Administrators /Science coach conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor 5 E Instructional Model lessons.	Administration Team
Close Reading	Grades K-5	Reading Coach	School wide	One PLC meeting per month	Reading Coach walk-throughs	Administration Team & Reading Coach

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.			-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.	**Strategy** Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing. **Action Steps** -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.) ***Plan:*** -Professional Development for updated rubric courses -Professional Development for instructional delivery of mode-specific writing -Training to facilitate data-driven PLCs -Using data to identify trends and drive instruction -Lesson planning based on the needs of students ***Do:*** -Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points	Who Principal APC District (Writing Team, Supervisors, Writing Resources, Academic Coaches, and DRTs) How Monitored -PLC logs -Classroom walk-throughs Observation Form -Conferencing while writing walk-through tool (for coaches)	See "Check" & "Act" action steps in the strategies column	-Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios
Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring **Level 3.0** or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will remain 96% or higher.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **96%**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **96%**					

				-Daily/ongoing conferencing ***Check:*** Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes -PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs ***Act:*** -Receive additional professional development in areas of need -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)			
			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 Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Holistic Scoring Training	K-5	Writing Liaison	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	PLC logs turned into administration	Principal APC PLC Facilitators
Mode-based Writing Training	K-5	Writing Liaison	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	-Administration or Coach walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration	Principal APC PLC Facilitators

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Attendance			1.1 -Ability to enforce attendance with parents	1.1 **Tier 1** The school will establish an attendance committee comprised of Administrators, guidance counselors, teachers and other relevant personnel to review the school's attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. The attendance committee will also maintain a database of students with significant attendance problems and implement and monitor interventions to be documented on the attendance intervention form (SB 90710) The attendance committee meets every two weeks.	1.1 School will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the Principal on a monthly basis and shared with faculty.	1.1 School will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students.	1.1 Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data Ed Connect
Attendance Goal #1: 1. The attendance rate will remain at 96% in 2012-2013. 2. The number of students that have excessive absences decrease by 10%. 3.The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* **96%** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) **48** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) **72**	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* **96%** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) **42** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) **65**					
			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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Suspension			1.1 There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	1.1 -Conscious Discipline in Kindergarten Classes -Positive Behavior Support (PBS) or CHAMPS will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey, discipline data, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations. -Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and rules. -Leadership team conducts walkthroughs using a PBS or CHAMPS walk-through	1.1 Who -PSLT Behavior Committee -Leadership Team -Administration	1.1 - PSLT /Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions, ATOSS data monthly.	UNTIE , EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data
Suspension Goal #1: 1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will be less than 10 2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will be less than 10 3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will be less than 10 4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions **2** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School **2** 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions **6** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions **Less 10** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School **Less 10** 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions **Less 10** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					

throughout the school year will be less than 10	**2**	**Less 10**		form (generated by the district RtI facilitators). -The data is shared with faculty at a monthly meeting, tracking the overall improvement of the faculty. -Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats.			
			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.						
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
CHAMPS	New Teachers	District	School-wide	Every two months on early release days	Administration, district RtI facilitator and guidance walk-throughs	Administration, district RtI facilitator and guidance walk-throughs
Conscious Discipline	Kindergarten Select teachers	District	Kindergarten and select classrooms		Administration, district RtI facilitator and guidance walk-throughs	Administration, district RtI facilitator and guidance walk-throughs

End of Suspension Goals

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Health and Fitness Goal			1.1. Students come in at all fitness levels.	**1.1** Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the Principal's designee.	**1.1** administration.	**1.1** Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ)	**1.1** PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.
Health and Fitness Goal #1: During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from _68___% on the Pretest to __80___% on the Posttest.	2012 Current Level :* **98%**	2013 Expected Level :* **80%**					
			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 Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
1. Continuous Improvement Goal			1.1 -There is still confusion on how to conduct PLCs that are focused on deepening the knowledge base of teachers and improving student performance by the implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. -Still confusion on how the Plan-Do-Check-Act model works. -Still some resistance to staff members attending PLCs and/or arriving on time to meetings. -Teachers asking for more PLC collaboration time. Possibility of waiver will be explored.	1.1 The leadership team will become trained on the use of the PLC "Unit of Instruction" log that follows the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. Subject Area Leader and/or PLC facilitators will guide their PLCs through the Plan-Do-Check-Act model for units of instruction. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Leadership Team.	1.1 Who Principal Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC facilitators	1.1 "Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training.	1.1 PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach (Anne Jolly)
Continuous Improvement Goal #1: The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students' learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning)" will increase from 85% in 2012 to 90% in 2013.	2012 Current Level :* **85%**	2013 Expected Level :* **90%**					
			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 Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLCs						
Plan-Do-Check-Act Model	Leadership Team All teachers	Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC Facilitators	School-wide	PLCs meet every three weeks for Plan-Do-Check-Act PLCs.	Administrator and leadership team walk-throughs Administrator and leadership attendance at PLC meetings PLC Survey data	Leadership Team

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.			See Reading Goal 5.B.1			
CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 CELLA listening and speaking test will remain at 48%	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: **48%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.		2.1.	2.1. See Reading Goal 5.B.1	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 CELLA reading test will remain at 31%	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : **31%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.

CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 CELLA writing test will remain at 29%	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : **29%**		See Writing Goal1			
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM electives.	1.1 Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers	1.1 -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established. -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs. -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.	1.1 PLC or grade level lead -Subject Area Leaders	1.1 Administrative/SAL walk-throughs	1.1 Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM elective per nine week. Share data with teachers.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Project-based learning	K-5	Science Contact	Science, math, ELA and technology teachers PLCs	On-going	Administrator walk-throughs	Administration

End of STEM Goal(s)

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Describe the use of SAC funds.			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
Reading Goal 1	Incentives given to reward student achievement and effort	500.00	
Attendance Goal	Incentives for attendance	300.00	
Reading Goal 1	Purchase of complex text	700.00	
Final Amount Spent			