

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Differentiated Accountability



Hugo Schmidt Elementary School

Update as of January 15, 2013
School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

PART I

School Information

School Name: Schmidt Elementary School	District Name: Hillsborough County School District
Principal: Janet Kelly	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Angelette Green-Lewis	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data

The following links will open in a separate browser window. Longitudinal data will be displayed in the print view of the SIP.

[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.)

[Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\) Trend Data](#) (Use this data to complete Sections 3A-3D of the reading and mathematics goals and Section 3A-3D of the writing goals.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\) Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

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 performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Include three years of data for the principal. Add more rows if needed.

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 (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year)
Principal	Janet Kelly	Masters Education, Post Bach.-Educational Leadership, Elementary Education, ESOL	As of July 2012	5	11/12 A 100% AYP 10/11 A 100% AYP 09/10 A 100% AYP 08/09 A 100% AYP

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Assistant Principal	Kenneth Gay	EDS, BA, El Ed (K-6), ESOL	9	6	11/12 C Lowest Quartile: Reading 62% Math 42% 10/11: B 74% AYP Schmidt 09/10: A 90% AYP Schmidt 08/09: A 90% AYP Schmidt
---------------------	-------------	----------------------------	---	---	---

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 performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). 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. Include two years of data. Add more rows if needed.

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 (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year)
Reading Coach	Jane Casteel	Elementary PK-6 ESOL M.A. Reading Education	9	12	11/12 C Lowest Quartile: Reading 62% Math 42% 10/11: B 78% AYP Schmidt Reading 71% 09/10: A 90% AYP Schmidt Reading 69% 08/09: A 90% AYP Schmidt Reading 73%
Reading Resource	Jane Thompson	Early Ed PK-K Elementary Gr. 1-6 ESOL Gifted Endorsement	9	2	11/12 C Lowest Quartile: Reading 62% Math 42% 10/11: B 78% AYP Schmidt Reading 71%

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	District staff	June	
2. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	ongoing	

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

3. District Peer Program	District Peers	ongoing	
4. School-based teacher recognition system	Principal	ongoing	
5. Opportunities for teacher leadership	Principal	ongoing	
6. Regular time for teacher collaboration	Principal	Ongoing/weekly	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly qualified. Add more rows if needed.

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
Teachers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 out of field 	Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented. <p><u>Administrators</u></p> Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparing and taking the certification exam • Completing classes need for certification • Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers • Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s) <p><u>Academic Coach</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis <p><u>Subject Area Leader/PLC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teachers will attend PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all.

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school who are teaching at least one academic course.

*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
56	2% (1)	36% (20)	36% (20)	27% (15)	32% (18)	100% (56)	3% (2)	5% (3)	82% (46)

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
Kristy Sheehan (District EET Mentor)	Alicia Costa	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Kristy Sheehan (District EET Mentor)	Alexa Dempsey	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Bi-weekly co-planning in PLCs.
Kristy Sheehan (District EET Mentor)	Alanna Hazzard	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	On-going co-planning, modeling of lessons and observation with feedback.
Kristy Sheehan (District EET Mentor)	Krystal Weaver	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: in school tutoring, resource teachers, additional 30 minute (RTI) small group instruction, after school ELP, summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers and mentors.
Title I, Part C- Migrant NA
Title I, Part D NA
Title II NA
Title III Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners
Title X- Homeless The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs.

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Violence Prevention Programs NA
Nutrition Programs NA
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start We utilize information from students in Head Start and EELP to transition into Kindergarten.
Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other NA

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

Some of the examples listed below have been divided into elementary and middle/high responses. Use only the text that applies to your level. Make sure this section is a reflection of what is actually happening in your school.

School-based PSLT Team
<p><i>Identify the school-based MTSS Team.</i></p> <p><u>Elementary</u></p> <p>Identify the school-based PSLT Leadership Team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Principal, Jan KellyB. Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Kenneth GayC. School Psychologist, Brooke CurtissD. Guidance Counselor, Deborah BadertscherE. Elementary: PLC facilitators for grades K-5, all listedF. Instructional Coaches/Resource Teacher, Jane Casteel, Jane Thompson, Susie Ellis

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

- G. ESE Specialist, Shellie Murdock
- H. School Advisory Council Chair, Angelette Lewis

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

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

Our MTSS will service as the main leadership team of the school. The MTSS will meet every second and fourth Monday and is comprised of one member of all grade level PSLT in order to disseminate information which is held the second and fourth Tuesday of every month:

- Use the MTSS problem solving model to:
 - Oversee a multi-tiered model of service delivery (Core/Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3)
 - Determine scheduling needs, curriculum and intervention resources
 - Review/interpret student data (Academic, Behavior, FAIR, PBS)
 - Organize and support systematic data collection.
 - Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction:
 - Through the implementation of PLCs
 - Through the use of school-based Reinforcement Calendars, Mini Lessons and Mini Assessments
 - Through the use of Common Assessments given every 6-9 weeks.
 - Through the implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instruction/interventions across all academic areas.
 - Plan, implement and oversee the supplemental and intensive interventions for student progression in Tier 2 and Tier 3.
 - Monitor interventions and data assessment in Tier 2 and Tier 3.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model and progress monitoring
- Coordinate/collaborate with other working committees such as the Reading Leadership Team, Science, Math, PBS, Fitness, and Writing.
- Assist in the implementation and monitoring of the Differentiated Accountability Model
- Identify professional development needs and resources

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS in the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. Describe how the problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP.

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

- The Chair of SAC is a member of the PSLT.
- The PSLT 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 PSLT. 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 PSLT will monitor the effectiveness of instruction and intervention by reviewing data as well as data related to implementation fidelity.

The MTSS will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning MTSS members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger MTSS team through the subject area PLC's known as the ANCHORS which are vertical teams supporting each curriculum area.

○

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	Reading Coach/AP
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability	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
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Common Assessments* (<i>see below</i>) of	School Generated Database	Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/PSLT

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources		Member
DAR	School Generated Database	Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator/ Classroom Teacher
DRA-2	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher
Mini-Assessments on specific tested Benchmarks	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher

*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
School Wide 30 *minute intervention time will serve as ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials)	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT Facilitator/PLC’s
FAIR	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/ Reading Coach
Ongoing assessments within the curriculum area	Database provided by course materials	PSLT/PLC/Individual Teachers
Other Curriculum Based Measurement** (<i>see below</i>)	Unit Tests	PSLT/PLCs

*All students are involving in Sail To Success, a daily 30 minute intervention block where above level students receive enrichment, on level students receive more depth and rigor, and below level students focus on remediation.

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

** 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.

The FAIR Toolkit Ongoing Progress Monitoring measures are one example of this type of assessment that can be used frequently to track student progress in Tiers 2 and 3. The PSLT will work to develop an Excel database to be used by interventionists to enter data from FAIR OPMs and other CBM data for ongoing analysis of outcome data for supplementary and intensive supports. The PLCs (with support from PSLT consultants) will determine how often students will be assessed using CBM during the course of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, but in general CBM progress monitoring will occur at least once per month for instruction at Tier 2 and weekly to bi-monthly for Tier 3. These assessments will provide more immediate feedback to determine if the alternative teaching strategies are working so that decisions can be made concerning continuing, fading or modifying intervention strategies.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Teacher Training Modules, as posted under the RtI Icon, were delivered to faculty members over the course of several faculty meetings during the 2011-2012 as well as during 2012-2013 preplanning. PSLT members who attended the district level RtI trainings served as consultants to the PLCs to guide the process of data review and interpretation. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District's RtI Committee develops resources and staff development trainings on PS/RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions as identified by teacher needs assessment and/or EET evaluation data, will occur during faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. Our school will invite our area RtI Facilitator to visit quarterly to review our progress in implementation of PS/RtI and provide on-site coaching and support to our PSLT/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI as they become available.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

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

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

- Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).
- Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.
- Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
<p>Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The Reading Leadership Team serves as the school’s literacy Professional Learning Community. The team is comprised of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Principal• Assistant Principal for Curriculum• Reading Coach• Reading Teachers• Media Specialist• Teachers across content areas (Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies.) who have demonstrated effective reading instruction as reflected through positive student reading gains.
<p>Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading goals and strategies identified on the SIP.</p> <p>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.</p>

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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

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

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

NCLB Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

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

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

In Hillsborough County Public schools, all kindergarten children are assessed for Kindergarten Readiness using the FLKRS (Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener.) This state-selected assessment contains a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System and the first two measures of the Florida Assessments in Reading (FAIR). The instruments used in the screening are based upon the Florida Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Education Standards. Parents are provided with a letter from the Commissioner of Education, explaining the assessments. Teachers will meet with parents after the assessments have been completed to review student performance. Data from the FAIR will be used to assist teachers in

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

creating homogeneous groupings for small group reading instruction. Children entering Kindergarten may have benefited from the Hillsborough County Public Schools' Voluntary Prekindergarten Program. This program is offered at elementary schools in the summer and during the school year in selected Head Start classrooms and as a blended program in several Early Exceptional Learning program (EELP) classrooms. Starting in the 2012-2013 school year, students in the VPK program will be given the state-created VPK Assessment that looks at Print Knowledge, Phonological Awareness, Mathematics and Oral Language/Vocabulary. This assessment will be administered at the start and end of the VPK program. A copy of these assessments will be mailed to the school in which the child will be registered for kindergarten, enabling the child's teacher to have a better understanding of the child's abilities from the first day of school. Parent Involvement events for Transitioning Children into Kindergarten include Kindergarten RoundUp. This event provides parents with an opportunity to meet the teachers and hear about the academic program. Parents are encouraged to complete the school registration procedure at this time to ensure that the child is able to start school on time. All students registered for kindergarten participate in an academic screening prior to school beginning so that they can be placed appropriately.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

READING GOALS				
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient/satisfactory in reading (Level 3-5).				
<u>Reading Goal #1:</u>		<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 54% to 57%.		54%	57%	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>-Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.</p> <p>Teachers across content areas are at varying levels of understanding of the ELA Common Core State Standards (CCSS)</p> <p>- PLC meetings across content areas do not regularly and consistently include discussion of text complexity and the crafting of higher order questioning strategies and close reading strategies for upcoming lessons as demanded by the CCSS.</p>	<p>1.1 Strategy: This reading strategy crosses all content areas. The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content improves by participation in consistent, effective and appropriate Differentiated Instruction strategies. Differentiated Instruction is based on: acceleration, enrichment, extensions and remediation. This strategy focuses on the following types of flexible grouping: -Homogeneous/Cluster/Ability Grouping -Heterogeneous/Mixed Ability Grouping -Individualized Work/Independent Study -Whole Class Instruction -Pairs or Partners -MTSS (Sail To Success)</p> <p>Action Steps Plan <u>Teacher Planning</u> -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content with increased use of instructional text to provide rigor . -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?"</p> <p>Check/Act <u>Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment</u> -Teachers bring their common assessment data to their PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a) -PLCs teachers discuss the outcomes of their DI lessons and share the effectiveness of their lessons. -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d) -Using the data, effective Differentiated Instruction strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e)</p>	<p><u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Reading Resource Teacher -Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p><u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p><u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning 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 the average unit assessment score for all their students per class/course. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery according to reading levels.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u> -PLCs calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students across the PLC per class/course. -PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to identify effective activities in future lessons.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> -Leadership Team determines what specific data will be reported to the Leadership Team to include Formative Assessments, FAIR and reading levels. -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional</p>	<p><u>3x per year</u> FAIR <u>Ongoing</u> Running Records <u>During the grading period</u> Common assessments(pre, post, mid, end of the unit)</p>
--	---	--	---	--

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>-Based on the data, teachers plan future Differentiated Instruction lessons (either as a whole lesson or mini lesson) to the whole class or targeted students.</p>		<p>development for teachers.</p>	
<p>1.2. -Teachers need more work in the area of “guided practice” of the lesson.</p>	<p>1.2. This reading strategy crosses all content areas. The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students’ comprehension of course content improves by participating in lessons where teachers consistently follow the Gradual Release lesson delivery model such as: --Explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice, and independent practice. --I do, we do, you do --Preview, guided practice, independent practice, process (EET Rubric: 1a, 1b, 3a, 3c, 3e)</p> <p>Action Steps Plan <u>Teacher PD</u> -Reading coach and resource teacher provide school-based professional development on how to plan appropriately paced lessons that allows students sufficient opportunity to practice new skills using a research-based lesson format that promotes a gradual release of responsibility. (EET Rubric: 1a, 1b, 3a, 3c, 3e)</p> <p><u>Planning/PLCs before the Lessons</u> -Within PLCs, teachers brainstorm ideas for implementing the gradual release model of responsibility such as: --Discuss specific guided practice teaching strategies that can be implemented in upcoming lessons such as the “I, We, You Overview” from <i>Teach Like a Champion</i> (pages 71-74). --Discuss specific strategies for involving students in active participation in learning such as: *Cooperative grouping *Manipulatives *Accountable Talk --Discuss and plan ways to increase student practice and discussion of skills learned in the lesson. (instead of lesson being teacher centered)</p>	<p><u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Reading Resource Teacher -Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p><u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school’s SIP strategies.</p>	<p><u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u> - PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to identify effective activities in future lessons.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> -Leadership Team determines what specific data will be reported to the Leadership Team. -Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress. -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers.</p>	<p><u>3x per year</u> - FAIR</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u> -Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) -Projects</p>

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>(EET Rubric: 1a, 1b, 4d) -Increase rigor -Word of the week -MTSS</p> <p>Do/Check <u>Teacher Actions in the Classroom</u> -Teachers implement the gradual release model in the classroom ensuring the pacing of the lesson is appropriate, providing students the time needed to be intellectually engaged in each stage. (EET Rubric: 3a, 3c, 3e) -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. (EET Rubric 3d) -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>Check/Act <u>Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment</u> -Teachers bring their common assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a) -Using the data, effective gradual release strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e)</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.		
<u>Reading Goal #2:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 28% to 31%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 28%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 31%
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement		

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>2.1. - Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. - PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.</p>	<p>2.1 <u>Strategy</u> This reading strategy crosses all content areas. Students' comprehension of course content/standards increase through participation in higher order thinking questioning techniques to promote critical thinking and problem-solving skills. This strategy will be implemented across all content areas. For this strategy, teachers implement a variety or series of questions/prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote meta-cognition. (EET Rubric 1e, 3b)</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u> Plan <i>Teacher PD for General Higher Order</i> -Teachers attend professional development activities on higher order questioning strategies and apply those strategies in the classroom.</p> <p><i>Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson</i> -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question "How do we know if they have learned it?" (EET Rubric 1f, 4d) -Within PLCs, teachers discuss how to scaffold questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students for upcoming lessons. -Teachers design higher order questions to increase rigor in lesson plans and promote student accountable talk. (EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1e, 1f, 3b, 4a, 4d) -Within PLCs, teachers plan and write for higher order questions in upcoming lessons. (EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 3b, 4d)</p> <p>Do/Check <i>Teachers in the Classroom</i> -During the lesson, teachers frequently ask higher order questions. The teacher responds to students' correct answers by probing for higher-level understanding in an effective manner. (EET Rubric 1b, 3b, 3e) -During the lesson, teachers successfully engage all students in the discussion. (EET Rubric 1b, 3b, 3e) -Students formulate many of the high-level questions and ensure that all voices are heard. (EET Rubric 3b) -Students are provided with opportunities to reflect on classroom discussion and discourse to increase understanding of learning objective. (EET Rubric</p>	<p><u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Reading Resource Teacher -Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p><u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p><u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning 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 the average unit assessment score for all their students per class/course. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery according to reading and comprehension levels.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u> -PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> -Leadership Team determines what specific data will be reported to the Leadership Team to include Formative assessments, FAIR, and reading levels. -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers.</p>	<p><u>3x per year</u> - FAIR</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u> -Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) -Projects</p> <p>-Formative assessments</p>

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>1c, 3a, 3b, 3c)</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers administer the common assessment.</p> <p>Check/Act <u>PLCs After the Common Assessment</u> -Teachers bring their common assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a) -Using the data, effective higher order strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e) -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d)</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.				
<p>Reading Goal #3:</p> <p>Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 64 points to 67 points.</p>		<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>64 points</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>67 points</p>	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3.1.	3.1. See Goals 1 and 2	3.1	3.1	3.1

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.				
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u>		2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	
Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 62 points to 65 points		62 points	65 points	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4.1	4.1 See Goals 1 and 2	4.1	4.1	4.1

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Reading Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 66% to 69%.</td> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White: 66% Black: 35% Hispanic: 56% Asian: NA American Indian :NA</td> <td>White: 69% Black: 42% Hispanic:60% Asian: NA American Indian: NA</td> </tr> </table> The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 35% to 42%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 56% to 60%.	Reading Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 66% to 69%.	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	White: 66% Black: 35% Hispanic: 56% Asian: NA American Indian :NA	White: 69% Black: 42% Hispanic:60% Asian: NA American Indian: NA	<h1>See Goals 1 and 2</h1>					
Reading Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 66% to 69%.		2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*								
	White: 66% Black: 35% Hispanic: 56% Asian: NA American Indian :NA	White: 69% Black: 42% Hispanic:60% Asian: NA American Indian: NA									

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool						
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:					Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?							
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.						
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Reading Goal #5B:</td> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 47% to 52%.</td> <td>47%</td> <td>52%</td> </tr> </table>			Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance	The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 47% to 52%.	47%	52%		<h1>See Goals 1 and 2</h1>			
Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance											
The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 47% to 52%.	47%	52%											
			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool						
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:					Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?							
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1	5C.1	5C.1	5C.1	5C.1						
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Reading Goal #5C:</td> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 30% to 37%.</td> <td>30%</td> <td>37%</td> </tr> </table>			Reading Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance	The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 30% to 37%.	30%	37%	<p>-Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority.</p> <p>-The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school’s ERT.</p>	<p>ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/standard improves through participation in the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) strategy across Reading, Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science.</p> <p>Action Steps</p> <p>-ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons.</p>	<p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from: The CALLA Handbook, p. 101, Table 5.4 “Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction.</p>	<p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students’ progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-Using the individual teacher</p>	<p>5C.1</p> <p>-FAIR -CELLA</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/segment tests with data aggregated for</p>
Reading Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance											
The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 30% to 37%.	30%	37%											

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>-Teachers implementation of CALLA is not consistent across core courses.</p> <p>-ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses.</p> <p>-Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of CALLA/ in order to effectively conduct a CALLA fidelity check walk-through.</p>	<p>-ERT models lessons using CALLA.</p> <p>-ERT observes content area teachers using CALLA and provides feedback, coaching and support.</p> <p>-District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of CALLA.</p> <p>-Core content teachers set SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming core curriculum assessments.</p> <p>-Core content teachers administer and analyze ELLs performance on assessments.</p> <p>-Teachers aggregate data to determine the performance of ELLs compared to the whole group.</p> <p>-Based on data core content teachers will differentiate instruction to remediate/enhance instruction.</p>		<p>data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses.</p> <p>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data.</p> <p>- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p> <p>-ERTs meet with RTI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)</p>	ELL performance
		<p>5C.2.</p> <p>-Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority.</p> <p>-The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT.</p> <p>-Teachers</p>	<p>5C.2.</p> <p>ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards increases in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through the use of the district's on-line program <u>A+Rise</u> located on IDEAS under Programs for ELL.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>-ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to access and use A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs at http://arises2s.com/s2s/ into core content</p>	<p>5C.2.</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-School based Administrators</p> <p>-District Resource Teachers</p> <p>-ESOL Resource Teachers</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the CRISS walkthrough form</p>	<p>5C.2</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL</p>	<p>5C.2</p> <p>-FAIR</p> <p>-CELLA</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL</p>

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>implementation of A+ Rise is not consistent across core courses. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of A+ Rise in order to effectively conduct an A+ Rise fidelity check walk-through.</p>	<p>lessons. -ERT models lessons using A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs. -ERT observes content area teachers using A+Rise and provides feedback, coaching and support. -District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of A+ Rise strategies for ELLs.</p>		<p>SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)</p>	<p>performance</p>
		<p>5C.3 -Lack of understanding teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing. -Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing support. -Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on number of ELLs. -Administrators at varying levels of</p>	<p>5C.3 ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves through participation in the following <u>day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across</u> Reading, LA, Math, Science, and Social Studies: 1. Extended time (lesson and assessments) 2. Small group testing 3. Para support (lesson and assessments) 4. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)</p>	<p>5C.3 <u>Who</u> -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers <u>How</u> -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms</p>	<p>5C.3 Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students.</p>	<p>5C.3 <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests</p>

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		expertise in being familiar with the ELL guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT and Bilingual paraprofessional.				
		<p>5C.4</p> <p>-Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority.</p> <p>-Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the ELL level.</p>	<p>5C.4</p> <p>ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through teachers working collaboratively to focus on ELL student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to structure their way of work for ELL students.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>-Teachers analyze CELLA data to identify ELL students who need assistance in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing.</p> <p>-Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL effective teaching strategies (CALLA and A+ Rise) in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing.</p> <p>-Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL Differentiated Instruction lessons using the district provided ELL Differentiated Instruction binders (provided by the ELL Department) in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies.</p> <p>-PLCs generate SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming units of instruction.</p> <p>-PLCs/teachers plan for upcoming lessons/units using targeted CALLA and A+ Rise strategies and Differentiated Instruction strategies based on ELLs needs in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing.</p> <p>-PLCs/teachers plan for accommodations for core curriculum content and</p>	<p>5C.4</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-School based Administrators</p> <p>-ESOL Resource Teachers</p> <p>-PLC Facilitators</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>PLC logs (with specific ELL information) for like courses/grades.</p>	<p>5C.4</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses.</p> <p>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data.</p> <p>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p> <p>-ERTs meet with RTI team to</p>	<p>5C.4</p> <p>-FAIR</p> <p>-CELLA</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <p>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance</p>

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			assessment. -When conducting data analysis on core curriculum assessments, PLCs aggregate the ELL data. -Based on the data, PLCs/teachers plan interventions for targeted ELL students using the resources from CALLA, A+ Rise, and Differentiated instruction binders.		review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)	
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	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5D.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students’ IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the AP will put a system in place for this school year.	5D.1. Strategy SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students’ IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students’ IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	5D.1. Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal ESE Specialist How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by AP	5D.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students’ progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	5D.1. -FAIR During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance
Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 25% to 33%.	2012 Current Level of Performance: 25%	2013 Expected Level of Performance: 33%				

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>5D.2. -Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. -General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time.</p>	<p>5D.2. Strategy/Task SWD student achievement improves through teachers' implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications. Actions Plan For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our SWD need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD? Plan for the "Do" What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal? -What resources do we need? -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD? -What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our SWD? -What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help SWD learn? -What are teachers going to do during the lesson for SWD? -What are SWD going to do during the lesson to maximize learning? Reflect on the "Do"/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work during the unit.</p>	<p>5D.2 Who -School based Administrators -PLC Facilitators How PLC logs (with specific SWD information) for like courses/grades.</p>	<p>5D.2 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SWD SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>5D.2 -FAIR During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance</p>	

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers reflect and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? -What didn't work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next? -What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding? And/or analysis of student performance? -How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons? <p>Reflect/Check – Analyze Data Discuss one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What is the SWD data? -What is the data telling us as individual teachers? -What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department? -What are SWD not learning? Why is this occurring? -Which SWD are learning? <p>Act on the Data After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What are we going to do about SWD not learning? -What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions (either to individual SWD or small groups)? -How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? -How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working? 			
--	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	-- PLC Facilitators	School-wide	PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Reading Coaches
Gradual Release	K-5	- PLC Facilitators -Reading Coach	School-wide	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Reading Coaches
Higher Order Thinking	K-5	-- PLC Facilitators -Reading Coach	School-wide	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Reading Coaches
Using mini-lessons to re-teach and reinforcement essential skills in the core curriculum	3-5	- PLC Facilitators -Reading Coach	School-wide	PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Reading Coaches

Mathematics Goals

Goal 1 – Elementary FCAT Math Data

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in mathematics (Level 3-5).				
<u>Mathematics Goal #1:</u>		<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 49% to 52%.		49%	52%	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>-Not all teachers of the same course give the same common assessment at the end of the instructional cycle.</p> <p>- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).</p>	<p>1.1 <u>Strategy</u> The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the math core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, teachers provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u> Plan <u>Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson</u> -PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question, "What do we want students to learn?" (EET Rubric 1e, 4d) -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?" Specifically, PLCs reflect on the following questions: -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers plan for Differentiated Instruction using data from previous assessments to guide student groupings.</p>	<p><u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p><u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p>	<p><u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards the SMART Goal.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions: <i>1. How are we using data to</i></p>	<p><u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>Do/Check <i>Teachers in the Classroom</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating effective strategies and Differentiated Instruction activities discussed at their PLC meetings. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. (EET Rubric 3d) <p>Check/Act <i>Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. (EET Rubric 3d, 4d) -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a) -Based on the data, teachers discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies that were effective. (EET Rubric 4a, 4d) -Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons for the entire class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. (EET Rubric 1b and 1c) -PLCs discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies for re-teaching of essential skills. -PLCs discuss how the data will be used to Differentiate Instruction during the initial teaching of the upcoming lesson. -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d) 		<p>inform our instruction? 2. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them? 3. To what degree are we making progress towards our SMART goal? 4. Are there skills that need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class? 5. Are there skills that need to be re-taught as mini-lessons to the entire class? 6. Are there skills that need to re-taught to targeted students?</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Not all teachers are aware of how to model for students on how to read a mathematics word problem and apply problem-solving strategies. -Not all teachers are comfortable with problem solving being the primary focus of math instruction. 	<p>1.2 Strategy Students' math skills will improve through participation in lessons where teachers model for students on how to read a mathematics word problem and apply problem-solving strategies.</p> <p>Action Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers/Coaches will attend district offered Connections training, HOT Talk Cool Moves training and Problem Solving Training in Mathematics. -PLCs write SMART goals based on each Grading Period of material. -As teachers attend trainings, problem-solving strategies for word problems are discussed in PLCs as a Professional Development strategy. -Teachers implement the lessons, modeling for students on how to read a mathematics word problem and apply problem-solving strategies. -Teachers implement the common assessments. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -As a Professional Development activity, teachers use the data to discuss the 	<p><u>Who</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher Principal AP Math Resource/Contact District Math Team Academic Coaches Generalist <p><u>How Monitored</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Classroom walk-throughs observing lessons designed with problem-solving strategies. -Elementary Mathematics (available from Elementary Math) Walk-through Form -Mathematics PLC Recording 	<p>PLCs – Periodic (weekly or bi-weekly) progress monitoring of assessment scores, 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.</p> <p>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction.</p>	<p><u>4x per year</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Form 1 Form 2 NGSSS(optional) -EOY test <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Chapter Tests -Benchmark mini assessments -Prerequisite Skills

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	effectiveness of the problem-solving strategies that were implemented to guide future instruction.	Document (<i>available from Elementary Math</i>)	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.	Tests -Go Math! BOY Test -Go Math! MOY Test -Go Math! EOY Test
--	--	--	--	---

Goal 2 – Elementary using FCAT Math Data

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.				
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 20% to 23%.		20%	23%	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2.1. - Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. - PLC meetings need to focus on identifying	2.1 <u>Strategy</u> The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the math core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through participation in <u>higher order thinking questioning techniques to promote critical thinking and problem-solving skills</u> . This strategy will be implemented across all content areas. For this strategy, teachers implement a variety or series of questions/prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote meta-cognition. (EET Rubric 1e, 3b)	<u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Math Contacts -Peer and Mentor Evaluators <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration	<u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system.	<u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing <u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments (pre, post,

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.</p>	<p>Action Steps</p> <p>Plan</p> <p><i>Teacher PD for General Higher Order</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers attend school-based professional development activities on higher order questioning strategies and apply those strategies in the classroom. <p><i>Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question “How do we know if they have learned it?” (EET Rubric 1f, 4d) -Within PLCs, teachers discuss how to scaffold questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students for upcoming lessons. -Teachers design higher order questions to increase rigor in lesson plans and promote student accountable talk. (EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1e, 1f, 3b, 4a, 4d) -Within PLCs, teachers plan and write for higher order questions in upcoming lessons. (EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 3b, 4d) <p>Do/Check</p> <p><i>Teachers in the Classroom</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -During the lesson, teachers frequently ask higher order questions. The teacher responds to students’ correct answers by probing for higher-level understanding in an effective manner. (EET Rubric 1b, 3b, 3e) -During the lesson, teachers successfully engage all students in the discussion. (EET Rubric 1b, 3b, 3e) -Students formulate many of the high-level questions and ensure that all voices are heard. (EET Rubric 3b) -Students are provided with opportunities to reflect on classroom discussion and discourse to increase understanding of learning objective. (EET Rubric 1c, 3a, 3b, 3e) -At the end of the unit, teachers administer the common assessment. <p>Check/Act</p> <p><i>PLCs After the Common Assessment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers bring their common assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a) -Using the data, effective higher order strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e) -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d) 	<p>provides feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school’s SIP strategies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students per class/course. -Teachers chart their students’ individual progress towards mastery. <p>PLC Level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to identify effective activities in future lessons. <p>Leadership Team Level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Leadership Team determines what specific data will be reported to the Leadership Team -Leadership Team determines and maintains a school-wide data system to track student progress. -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers. 	<p>mid, section, end of unit)</p>
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p><u>Administrators/Leadership Team</u> -Through walkthroughs teachers are identified that excel in <u>higher order thinking questioning techniques</u> in order to set up demonstration classrooms. (EET 4d, 4e) -Classroom coverage is provided for teachers to attend demonstration classrooms. (EET 4e)</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

Goal 3 – Elementary using FCAT Math Data

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics				
Mathematics Goal #3:		2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	
Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 51 points to 54 points.		51 points	54 points	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>-Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.</p>	<p>3.1 Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the math core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content improves by participation in consistent, effective and appropriate <u>Differentiated Instruction</u> strategies. Differentiated Instruction is based on: acceleration, enrichment, extensions and remediation. This strategy focuses on the following types of flexible grouping: -Homogeneous/Cluster/Ability Grouping -Heterogeneous/Mixed Ability Grouping -Individualized Work/Independent Study -Whole Class Instruction -Pairs or Partners</p> <p>Action Steps</p>	<p><u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Math Coach -Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p><u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal evaluations</p>	<p><u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery.</p>	<p><u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) Formative assessments</p>

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>Plan</p> <p><i>Teacher Planning</i></p> <p>-Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons.</p> <p>Do I give my students:</p> <p>--Different ways to take in information</p> <p>--Different amounts of time to complete the work</p> <p>--Different assignments depending on ability, readiness, comprehension level, learning preferences/styles, and interests.</p> <p>-Different types of assessments</p> <p>For all students, do I:</p> <p>--Use data to drive instruction before beginning a unit of study, during the unit of study and at the end of unit of study.</p> <p>--Create a variety of activities and tasks that allows students to explore concepts and standards in different ways.</p> <p>-Give students choices in some of their learning activities.</p> <p>For High Performing, Gifted, do I:</p> <p>--Make modifications to ensure students are challenged with higher-level thinking activities.</p> <p>-Use curriculum compacting, independent study, and extension activities where appropriate</p> <p>For Lower Ability and Students with Learning Difficulties:</p> <p>-Assess specific skills and knowledge that need remediation and utilize a variety of strategies to help students in these areas.</p> <p>For English Language Learners:</p> <p>--Use gestures, visuals and graphic organizers when explaining concepts</p> <p>-Specifically pinpoint and teach the academic language these students need to learn in order to complete a task.</p> <p>-Recognize cultural/experiential differences, and when feasible includes these in units and examples.</p> <p>(EET Rubric 4d, 4e)</p> <p>-Teachers use student data (formative assessments, common assessments, daily work, etc.), student interests, and student learning styles to plan appropriate Differentiated Instruction lessons that meet the individual needs of all students in the classroom. (EET Rubric 1b)</p> <p>-PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question, "What do we want students to learn?"</p> <p>(EET Rubric 1e, 4d)</p> <p>-PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?"</p>	<p>-EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor)</p> <p>-School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-PLCs calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students across the PLC per class/course.</p> <p>-PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team.</p> <p>-Data is used to identify effective activities in future lessons.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-Leadership Team determines what specific data will be reported to the Leadership Team.</p> <p>-PLC facilitator share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.</p> <p>-PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers.</p>	
--	---	---	---	--

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>Do/Check <u>Teachers in the Classroom</u> -Teachers implement lessons using Differentiated Instruction activities. (EET Rubric 3c) -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>Check/Act <u>Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment</u> -Teachers bring their common assessment data to their PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a) -PLCs teachers discuss the outcomes of their DI lessons and share the effectiveness of their lessons. -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d) -Using the data, effective Differentiated Instruction strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e) -Based on the data, teachers plan future Differentiated Instruction lessons (either as a whole lesson or mini lesson) to the whole class or targeted students.</p> <p><u>Administrators/Leadership Team</u> -Through walkthroughs teachers are identified that excel in Differentiated Instruction strategies and techniques in order to set up demonstration classrooms. (EET 4d, 4e) -Classroom coverage is provided for teachers to attend demonstration classrooms. (EET 4e)</p>			
<p>-Lack of infrastructure to support technology -Lack of technology hardware -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS</p>	<p>3.2 Tier 1 – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the math core curriculum. Students’ comprehension of course content improves through the use of technology and hands-on activities to implement the Common Core State Standards. Action Steps -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling technology and hands-on strategies. -PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating strategies from their PLC discussions. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the</p>	<p><u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Math Contacts -Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p><u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers’ lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs.</p>	<p><u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students per class/course. -Teachers chart their students’ individual progress towards mastery.</p>	<p><u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing <u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) Formative assessments</p>

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>core curriculum material. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -As a Professional Development activity, teachers use data to discuss strategies that were effective.</p>	<p>-EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p><u>PLC Level</u> -PLCs calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students across the PLC per class/course. -PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to identify effective activities in future lessons.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> -Leadership Team determines what specific data will be reported to the Leadership Team. -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

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

Goal 4 – Elementary using FCAT Math Data

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.				
<u>Mathematics Goal #4:</u> Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 42 points to 50 points.		<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>		<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>
		42 points		50 points
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4.1.	4.1. See goals 1, 2, and 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 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?															
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015															
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	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.															
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Mathematics</u></td> <td><u>2012 Current</u></td> <td><u>2013 Expected</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Goal #5A:</u></td> <td><u>Level of</u></td> <td><u>Level of</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><u>Performance:</u></td> <td><u>Performance:</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 56% to 60%.</td> <td>White: 56% Black: 32% Hispanic: 50% Asian: NA American Indian: NA</td> <td>White: 60% Black: 39% Hispanic: 55% Asian: NA American Indian: NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 32% to 39%.</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<u>Mathematics</u>	<u>2012 Current</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u>	<u>Goal #5A:</u>	<u>Level of</u>	<u>Level of</u>		<u>Performance:</u>	<u>Performance:</u>	The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 56% to 60%.	White: 56% Black: 32% Hispanic: 50% Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: 60% Black: 39% Hispanic: 55% Asian: NA American Indian: NA	The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 32% to 39%.			See goals 1, 2, and 3			
<u>Mathematics</u>	<u>2012 Current</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u>																	
<u>Goal #5A:</u>	<u>Level of</u>	<u>Level of</u>																	
	<u>Performance:</u>	<u>Performance:</u>																	
The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 56% to 60%.	White: 56% Black: 32% Hispanic: 50% Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: 60% Black: 39% Hispanic: 55% Asian: NA American Indian: NA																	
The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 32% to 39%.																			

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 50% to 55%.</p>										
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p>			<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>				
<p>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>			<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>				
<p>Mathematics Goal #5B: The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 43% to 49%.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="371 836 497 911"> <p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p> </td> <td data-bbox="497 836 622 911"> <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="371 911 497 1321"> <p>43%</p> </td> <td data-bbox="497 911 622 1321"> <p>49%</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>	<p>43%</p>	<p>49%</p>		<p>See goals 1, 2, and 3</p>			
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>									
<p>43%</p>	<p>49%</p>									

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check
					Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?
<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>			<p>5C.1 -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority. -The majority of the math teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT. -Math teachers implementation of CALLA is not consistent across math courses. -ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of CALLA/ in order to effectively conduct a CALLA fidelity check walk-through.</p>	<p>5C.1 ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/standard improves through participation in the <u>Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)</u> strategy in math.</p> <p>Action Steps -ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all math area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons. -ERT models lessons using CALLA. -ERT observes content area teachers using CALLA and provides feedback, coaching and support. -District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of CALLA. -Math teachers set SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming core curriculum assessments. -Math teachers administer and analyze ELLs. In particular, teachers aggregate data to determine the performance of ELLs compared to the whole group. -Based on data math teachers differentiate instruction to remediate/enhance instruction.</p>	<p>5C.1 <u>Who</u> -School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers</p> <p><u>How</u> -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from: <u>The CALLA Handbook</u>, p. 101, Table 5.4 "Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction"</p>	<p>5C.1 <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Math PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving</p>
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u></p> <p>The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 33% to 38%.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p> <p>33%</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p> <p>38%</p>				

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

						Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)
		<p>5C.2. -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority. -The majority of the math teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT. -Math teachers implementation of A+ Rise is not consistent across core courses. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of A+ Rise in order to effectively conduct an A+ Rise fidelity check walk-through.</p>	<p>5C.2. ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards increases in math through the use of the district's on-line program A+Rise located on IDEAS under Programs for ELL.</p> <p>Action Steps -ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all math area teachers on how to access and use A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs at http://arises2s.com/s2s/ into math lessons. - ERT models lessons using A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs. - ERT observes content area teachers using A+Rise and provides feedback, coaching and support. - District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs.</p>	<p>5C.2. Who -School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers</p> <p>How -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs looking for implementation of A+ Rise strategies.</p>	<p>5C.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 ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Math PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving</p>	

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

					Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)
		<p>5C.3</p> <p>-Lack of understanding that math teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing.</p> <p>-Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing heritage language support.</p> <p>-Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on membership of ELLs.</p> <p>-Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL Program guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT and Bilingual paraprofessional.</p>	<p>5C.3</p> <p>ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves through participation in the following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments in math:</p> <p>-Extended time (lesson and assessments)</p> <p>-Small group testing</p> <p>-Para support (lesson and assessments)</p> <p>-Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)</p>	<p>5C.3</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-School based Administrators</p> <p>-ESOL Resource Teachers</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>-Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms</p>	<p>5C.3</p> <p>Analyze math core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students.</p>
		<p>5C.4</p> <p>-Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority.</p> <p>-Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the ELL level.</p>	<p>5C.4</p> <p>ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves in math through teachers working collaboratively to focus on ELL student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to structure their way of work for ELL students.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u></p> <p>-Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL effective teaching strategies (CALLA and A+ Rise) in order to integrate them into</p>	<p>5C.4</p> <p><u>Who</u></p> <p>-School based Administrators</p> <p>-ESOL Resource Teachers</p> <p>-PLC Facilitators</p> <p><u>How</u></p> <p>PLC logs (with specific ELL information) for like courses/grades.</p>	<p>5C.4</p> <p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <p>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.</p> <p>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <p>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL</p>

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			<p>the math lessons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL Differentiated Instruction lessons using the district provided ELL Differentiated Instruction binders (provided by the ELL Department) in math. -PLCs generate SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs/teachers plan for upcoming lessons/units using targeted CALLA, A+ Rise strategies and Differentiated Instruction strategies based on ELLs needs. -PLCs math teachers plan for accommodations for core curriculum content and assessment. -When conducting data analysis on core curriculum assessments, PLCs aggregate the ELL data. -Based on the data, PLCs/teachers plan interventions for targeted ELL students using the resources from CALLA, A+ Rise, and Differentiated Instruction binders. 		<p>SMART goal data across all classes/courses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Math PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RTI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) 						
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	Strategy Data Check						
5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5D.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the AP will put a system in place for this school year.	5D.1. Strategy SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals , strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs)	5D.1. Who Principal and Assistance Principal How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by AP	5D.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal.						
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Mathematics Goal #5D:</td> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance:</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math</td> <td>31%</td> <td>38%</td> </tr> </table>	Mathematics Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:	The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math	31%	38%					
Mathematics Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:									
The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math	31%	38%									

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>will increase from 31% to 38%.</p>				<p>work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.</p>		<p><u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>
			<p>5D.2. -Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. -General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time.</p>	<p>5D.2. <u>Strategy/Task</u> SWD student achievement improves through teachers' implementation of the <u>Plan-Do-Check-Act model</u> in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications. <u>Actions</u> <u>Plan</u> For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our SWD need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD?</p>	<p>5D.2. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration/coaches. Administration/coaches provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team</p>	<p>5D.2. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SWD SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.</p>

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p><i>Plan for the “Do”</i> What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal? -What resources do we need? -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD? -What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our SWD? -What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help SWD learn? -Specifically how will we implement the _____strategy during the lesson? -What are teachers going to do during the lesson for SWD? -What are SWD student going to do during the lesson to maximize learning?</p> <p><i>Reflect on the “Do”/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work <u>during</u> the unit.</i> For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers reflect and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD: -What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? -What didn’t work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next? -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what worked? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons? -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what didn’t work? Why? What are we going to do next? -What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding? And/or analysis of student performance? -How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons?</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			<p>Reflect/Check – Analyze Data Discuss one or more of the following: -What is the SWD data? -What is the data telling us as individual teachers? -What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department? -What are SWD not learning? Why is this occurring? -Which SWD are learning?</p> <p>Act on the Data After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data. -What are we going to do about SWD not learning? -What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions (either to individual SWD or small groups)? -How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? -How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working?</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

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
Higher Order Thinking	K-5	PLC facilitators	Math	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team
Technology, IPT and Dashboard Training	K-5	-Course specific PLC facilitators	Math	PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team

End of Mathematics Goals

Science Goals

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance (Level 3-5) in science.				
Science Goal #1:		2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 44% to 47%.		44%	47%	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>-Not all teachers of the same course give the same common assessment at the end of the instructional cycle.</p> <p>- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).</p>	<p>1.1 <u>Strategy</u> The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the science core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Teachers use C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) with core curriculum and provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to ensure the mastery of essential skills.</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u> Plan <i>Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson</i> -PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question, "What do we want students to learn?" (EET Rubric 1e, 4d) -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?" Specifically, PLCs reflect on the following questions: -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers plan for Differentiated Instruction using data from previous assessments to guide student groupings.</p>	<p><u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Science Contacts -Peer and Mentor Evaluators</p> <p><u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p><u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning 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 SMART Goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards the SMART Goal.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. - For each class/course, PLCs</p>	<p>2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>Do/Check <u>Teachers in the Classroom</u> -PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum, incorporating effective strategies and Differentiated Instruction activities discussed at their PLC meetings. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>Check/Act <u>Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment</u> -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. (EET Rubric 3d, 4d) -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a) -Based on the data, teachers discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies that were effective. (EET Rubric 4a, 4d) -Based on the data, teachers a) decide what skills need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class, b) decide what skills need to be moved to mini-lessons for the entire class and c) decide what skills need to re-taught to targeted students. (EET Rubric 1b and 1c) -PLCs discuss Differentiated Instruction strategies for re-teaching of essential skills. -PLCs discuss how the data will be used to Differentiate Instruction during the initial teaching of the upcoming lesson. -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d)</p>		<p>chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions: 1. <i>How are we using data to inform our instruction?</i> 2. <i>What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?</i> 3. <i>To what degree are we making progress towards our SMART goal?</i> 4. <i>Are there skills that need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class?</i> 5. <i>Are there skills that need to be re-taught as mini-lessons to the entire class?</i> 6. <i>Are there skills that need to re-taught to targeted students?</i> 7. <i>How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?</i></p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.</p>	
<p>1.2. -Teachers are at varying levels of using collaborative structures</p>	<p>1.2 <u>Strategy</u> The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the science core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content/standards increase through appropriate engagement lab, tools and activities based on skill need to ensure students are highly engaged in significant learning. The degree of <u>student engagement</u> is revealed through teacher analysis of students' level of engagement during a coherent well-designed lesson using the <i>Student Engagement Rubric (EET 3c)</i> This strategy focuses on the following components in engagement:</p>	<p><u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Science Contacts</p> <p><u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers'</p>	<p><u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning 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 the</p>	<p><u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>-Activities and assignments: --are the centerpiece of learning and promote higher order thinking. --emphasize depth over breath. --are highly intellectual and promote significant learning.</p> <p>-Grouping of students are: -- productive and fully appropriate to the students or to the instructional purposes of the lesson. --influenced by the students information or adjustment.</p> <p>-Instructional Materials and resources are: --suitable to the instructional purposes and engage students mentally. --initiated by student choice, adaptation, or creation of materials to enhance their learning. --supplemented when better suited to engaging students in deep learning.</p> <p>-Structure and pacing are: --highly coherent and allows for reflection and closure. --ideal for keeping momentum. --organized with a structure or an agenda, but with flexible time frames, to ensure appropriate time for all facets of the lesson.</p> <p>Action Steps: Plan <u>Teacher PD</u> -Teachers attend school-based professional development activities on engagement and apply those strategies in the classroom.</p> <p><u>PLCs Before the Lesson</u> -PLCs discuss best practices for student engagement outlined in this strategy and on the rubric. -PLCs discuss how to use the student engagement rubric. -Within PLCs, teachers discuss resources to use for engaging students in learning. (e.g., lbsd, manipulatives, technology, supplemental reading, speakers, real world connections) -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?" (EET Rubric 1f, 4d)</p> <p>Do/Check <u>Teachers in the Classroom</u> - Teachers use engagement tools in the classroom to enhance deep learning. -Teachers recognize the critical distinction between a classroom in which students are compliant and busy. -Teachers ensure students are developing their understanding through what they</p>	<p>lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.</p>	<p>average unit assessment score for all their students per class/course. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery.</p> <p><u>PLC Level</u> -PLCs calculate the average unit assessment score for all their students across the PLC per class/course. -PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to identify effective activities in future lessons.</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> -Leadership Team determines what specific data will be reported to the Leadership Team- -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers.</p>	<p>Science Investigation Rubric</p>
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>do, and they are asked to think, to make connections, to formulate and test hypotheses, and draw conclusions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers will encourage students to participate in the Science Olympics. -Teachers provide students choices in a range of task from a large range, but the choices are designed to further understanding. -Teachers reflect on students' engagement by utilizing the Student Engagement Rubric (on School Improvement Icon on IDEAS) on a regular basis. -At the end of the unit, teachers administer the common assessment. -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d) <p>Check/Act <i>PLCs After the Common Assessment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers bring their Engagement Rubrics back to the PLCs for discussion. -Teachers bring their common assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data (Engagement Rubric and common assessment), teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a) -Using the data, effective student engagement strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e) <p><i>Administrators/Leadership Team</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Through walkthroughs teachers are identified that excel in student engagement in order to set up demonstration classrooms. (EET 4d, 4e). 			
<p>-Teachers at varying levels of skill expertise in using checks for understanding techniques</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLCs need to spend time planning for checks for understanding within lessons. 	<p>1.3 <u>Strategy</u> The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the science core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content improves by participation in regular <u>Checks for Understanding</u> during and at the close of the lesson. (EET Rubric 3b and 3e)</p> <p><u>Action Steps</u> Plan <i>Teacher Planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question, "What do we want students to learn?" (EET Rubric 1e, 4d) - With PLCs, teachers plan ways to check for understanding throughout the lesson (not just at the end of the lesson). (EET Rubric 1a, 3b, 4d) -With PLCs teachers plan to incorporate into their lessons specific strategies to 	<p><u>Who</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Principal -AP -Science Coach -Peer and Mentor Evaluators <p><u>How</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) 	<p><u>Teacher Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning 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 the average unit assessment score for all their students per class/course. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery. 	<p><u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><u>During the Grading Period</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) <p>Science Investigation Rubric</p>

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>check for understanding during and at the close of the lesson such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Think-Pair-Share --Think and Write --3-2-1 Wrap-up --Break it Down (<i>Teach Like a Champion</i>) --Exit Tickets (<i>Teach Like a Champion</i>) --Check for Understanding (<i>Teach Like a Champion</i>) <p>(EET Rubric 1a, 3b, 4d)</p> <p>-PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?"</p> <p>Do/Check <u>Teachers in the Classroom.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -During the lesson, teachers consistently implement checks for understanding strategies effectively. (EET Rubric 3b) -Teachers involve enough students in this technique to get an accurate pulse of the students' understanding in order to adjust instruction if needed. (EET Rubric 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e) -Based on the checks for understanding data, teachers persist in seeking effective approaches for students needing help and draw on a broad/extensive repertoire of strategies such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --When students have difficulty with the lesson, the teacher probes them for additional information so that the lesson adjustment accurately addresses the problem. --Offering an alternative explanation, approach, style of questioning or student activity. --Implementing a collaborative structure activity. --Significantly modifying the activity. --Changing the pace. --Teachers revealing to students the reasons for making a major lesson change and get their feedback about its success. --If needed, teachers identifying likely content and activity challenges in the original lesson and designing a second lesson that avoids those challenges. <p>(EET Rubric 3e)</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>Check/Act <u>Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers bring their common assessment data to their PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies. 	<p><u>PLC Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to identify effective activities in future lessons. <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Leadership Team determines what specific data will be reported to the Leadership Team -PLC facilitator share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers. 	<p>Interactive Notebooks</p>
--	--	--	---	------------------------------

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>-In PLCs teachers discuss the outcomes of checking for understanding strategies and techniques during their lessons. (EET Rubric 4a, 4d)</p> <p>-Using the data, effective checking for understanding strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e)</p> <p>-After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>-Building communication between families and school to familiarize families with websites that can be used at home such as: MYON Brainpop Hillsborough County Public Library Consortium(online checkout</p> <p>-Initiate afterschool clubs</p> <p>Scientific Process <i>Internet Research</i></p> <p>-Curriculum Integration through the use of leveled readers <i>Pathways</i> <i>Pioneers</i> <i>National Geographic Magazine</i> <i>Harcourt (passed series)</i></p>			
--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.		
Science Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 11% to 14%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
	11%	14%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2.1. - Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. - PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.	2.1 <u>Strategy</u> The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the math core curriculum. Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through participation in higher order thinking questioning techniques to promote critical thinking and problem-solving skills . This strategy will be implemented across all content areas. For this strategy, teachers implement a variety or series of questions/prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote meta-cognition. (EET Rubric 1e, 3b) <u>Action Steps</u> Plan <i>Teacher PD for General Higher Order</i> -Teachers attend school-based professional development activities on higher order questioning strategies and apply those strategies in the classroom. <i>Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson</i> -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question "How do we know if they have learned it?" (EET Rubric 1f, 4d) -Within PLCs, teachers discuss how to scaffold questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students for upcoming lessons. -Teachers design higher order questions to increase rigor in lesson plans and promote student accountable talk. (EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1c, 1f, 3b, 4a, 4d) -Within PLCs, teachers plan and write for higher order questions in upcoming lessons. (EET Rubric 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 3b, 4d)	<u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Science Contacts -Peer and Mentor Evaluators <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -EET formal evaluations -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.	<u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning 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 the average unit assessment score for all their students per class/course. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery. <u>PLC Level</u> -PLCs discuss how to report and share the data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to identify effective activities in future lessons. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -Leadership Team determines what specific data will be	<u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing <u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) Science Investigation Rubric

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>Do/Check <u>Teachers in the Classroom</u> -During the lesson, teachers frequently ask higher order questions. The teacher responds to students' correct answers by probing for higher-level understanding in an effective manner. (EET Rubric 1b, 3b, 3e) -During the lesson, teachers successfully engage all students in the discussion. (EET Rubric 1b, 3b, 3e) -Students formulate many of the high-level questions and ensure that all voices are heard. (EET Rubric 3b) -Students are provided with opportunities to reflect on classroom discussion and discourse to increase understanding of learning objective. (EET Rubric 1c, 3a, 3b, 3c) -At the end of the unit, teachers administer the common assessment.</p> <p>Check/Act <u>PLCs After the Common Assessment</u> -Teachers bring their common assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a) -Using the data, effective higher order strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e) -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d)</p>		<p>reported to the Leadership Team. -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -PSLT uses data to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy implementation, supplemental instruction for targeted students and future professional development for teachers.</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

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
Identification of common assessments	K-5	- PLC facilitators	Science	PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team
Student Engagement	K-5	- PLC facilitators	Science	-PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms -Book Study on <i>Teach</i>	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

				<i>Like A Champion</i>		
Checks for understanding	K-5	-Course specific PLC facilitators	Science	PLCs: On-going	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team
Reciprocal Teaching	K-5	Science Contact	Science	During Preplanning	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team

End of Science Goals

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Writing Goals

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.				
<u>Writing/LA Goal #1:</u>		<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	
The percentage of students scoring Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 86% to 89%.		86%	89%	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

<p>-Spelling -Conventions Grade Level Rubric Training</p>	<p>1.1 Strategy: The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the spelling and conventions. Students' comprehension of course content improves by participation in consistent, effective and appropriate Differentiated Instruction strategies. Differentiated Instruction is based on: acceleration, enrichment, extensions and remediation. This strategy focuses on the following types of flexible grouping: -Homogeneous/Cluster/Ability Grouping -Heterogeneous/Mixed Ability Grouping -Individualized Work/Independent Study -Whole Class Instruction -Pairs or Partners -conference -students will be exposed to a variety of genres in read alouds and modeled writing. Action Steps Plan <u>Teacher Planning</u> -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons.</p>	<p><u>Who</u> Principal</p> <p><u>How Monitored</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. Through Observation Form -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -EET informal observation (Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the</p>	<p>PLCs will identify trends (deficiencies and growth) in student writing performance and collaborate to modify the instructional calendar to provide differentiated instruction as appropriate.</p> <p>PLCs - Review of monthly formative writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric. PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching 4.0 or above on the monthly writing prompt.</p> <p>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will</p>	<p>Student monthly demand writes, student daily drafts, student conferencing notes</p> <p>STAR Interview</p>
---	--	--	--	--

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>(EET Rubric 4d, 4e) -Teachers use student data (formative assessments, common assessments, daily work, etc.), student interests, and student learning styles to plan appropriate Differentiated Instruction lessons that meet the individual needs of all students in the classroom. (EET Rubric 1b)</p> <p>-PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs answer the question, “What do we want students to learn?” (EET Rubric 1e, 4d) -PLCs identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. PLCs are answering the question, “How do we know if they have learned it?”</p> <p>Do/Check <u>Teachers in the Classroom</u> -Teachers implement lessons using Differentiated Instruction activities and student will participate in the Tropicana Speech Contest. (EET Rubric 3e) -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. (EET Rubric 3d)</p> <p>Check/Act <u>Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment</u> -Teachers bring their common assessment data to their PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. (EET Rubric 4a) -PLCs teachers discuss the outcomes of their DI lessons and share the effectiveness of their lessons. -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. (EET Rubric 3d) -Using the data, effective Differentiated Instruction strategies and techniques are identified, discussed, and modeled in order to implement techniques in future lessons. (EET 1c, 1f, 4a, 4d, 4e) -Based on the data, teachers plan future Differentiated Instruction lessons (either as a whole lesson or mini lesson) to the whole class or targeted students.</p> <p><u>Administrators/Leadership Team</u> -Through walkthroughs teachers are identified that excel in Differentiated Instruction strategies and techniques in order to set up demonstration classrooms. (EET 4d, 4e) -Classroom coverage is provided for teachers to attend demonstration classrooms. (EET 4e) -PLC Facilitators put Differentiated Instruction strategies and techniques on every agenda, allowing teachers to share successes and challenges. - Differentiated Instruction strategies and techniques are on the Leadership Team’s agenda in order to discuss strategy implementation, concentrating on</p>	<p>school’s SIP strategies.</p>	<p>review assessment data for trends in growth and decline. PSLT will develop strategies to support students who show lack of progress.</p>	
--	---	---------------------------------	---	--

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	barriers and how they can be overcome.			
--	--	--	--	--

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 Strategies	K-5	PLC Facilitators	Teachers	PLCs: On-going -Demonstration Classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team
Rubric Training for Embedded Assessments	K-5	PLC Facilitators	Teachers	Ongoing	Shared scoring among PLC	Administration Team
Holistic Scoring Training	K-5	District Trainers	Teachers	Ongoing	Shared scoring among PLC	Administration Team

Engagement Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

ATTENDANCE and TARDY GOAL(S)		
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:		
1. Attendance and Tardies		
<u>Attendance and Tardy Goal #1:</u>		
1. The attendance rate will increase to 96% in 2012-2013. 2. The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease from by 10% (in 2011 to in 2012) 3. The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. (in 2011 to in 2012)	2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
	95.15%	96%
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more unexcused)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more unexcused)
	72	64
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies to School (10 or more unexcused)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies to School (10 or more unexcused)
0	0	

Problem Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barriers	Strategies	Fidelity Check 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
Communication to parents and teachers about the goal.	The school's PBS/Attendance committee comprised of administrator, guidance counselor, teachers and other relevant personnel will review the schools attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. Will use utilize the IRIS system to communicate with parents about attendance issues.	PBS/Attendance committee will review monthly attendance data, the tardy report and the attendance report.	Students with high number of tardies/absences will be placed on individual intervention plan.	Students will be engaged and their attendance and tardy rate will improve.

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Lack of incentives	Traveling trophies for high percentages of attendance kindergarten, primary, and intermediate. Also, daily recognition for on-time students through the in your seat program.	PBS/Attendance committee will review monthly attendance data, the tardy report and the attendance report.	Monthly data review.	Students will be engaged and their attendance and tardy rate will improve.
--------------------	---	---	----------------------	--

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 or Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Positive Behavior Support (PBS)	K-5	Guidance Counselor	PBS/Attendance Committee Whole Faculty	Two faculty presentations on PBS/Attendance programs for the year. One in the fall and spring.	Committee members will meet monthly with grade level PLC teams communicating trends, data, program changes and new interventions.	Principal PSLT

Suspension Goal(s)

Please refer to questions below to guide your responses when completing the goal chart. Specific responses are not required for each question on the template.

Guiding Questions to Inform the Problem-Solving Process

- What was the total number of in-school suspensions for 2009-2010?
- What was the total number of out-of school suspensions for 2009-2010?
- What was the total number of students suspended in school in 2009-2010?
- What was the total number of students suspended out of school in 2009-2010?
- What are the anticipated barriers to decreasing the number of suspensions?
- What are the anticipated barriers to decreasing the number of students suspended?
- What strategies and interventions will be utilized to decrease the number of suspensions for 2010-2011?
- What strategies and interventions will be utilized to decrease the number of students suspended for 2010-2011?

SUSPENSION GOAL(S)

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Suspension

Suspension Goal #1:

<p>Goals</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. The total number of Out-of-Suspensions will decrease by 10%. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. 	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
	14	12
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
	13	11
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
	30	27
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
18	16	

Problem solving Process to Decrease Suspension

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No alternative to ISS/OSS	The school's PBS/Attendance committee comprised of administrator, guidance counselor, teachers and other relevant personnel will develop and implement an alternative to ISS/OSS.	PBS/Attendance committee	Review of monthly RTIB data.	RTIB

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Positive Behavior Support (PBS)	K-5	Guidance Counselor	PBS Committee/Whole Faculty	Faculty presentation on alternative to ISS/OSS.	Monthly data review.	PBS Committee

Suspension Budget

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s)

Health and Fitness

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal Additional 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 39% on the Pretest to 49% on the Posttest. <i>Schools will enter the data after the Pretest and Posttest. Make sure the Posttest represents a minimum of a 10% increase.</i>				1. Elementary students will engage in 150 minutes of physical education per week in grades kindergarten through 5.	1. Principal The Physical Education teachers' schedules reflect sixty (60) minutes of the mandated 150 Minutes of Elementary Phys. Ed. The Classroom teachers' document in their lesson plans the remaining ninety (90) minutes of “Supplemental” physical education that students have per week. This is also reflected in the Master Schedule.	1. Classroom walk-throughs Class schedules	1. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.
	2012 Current Level:	2013 Expected Level:					
	39%	49%		2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the school’s H.E.A.R.T. team or principals’ designee.	2. H.E.A.R.T. team.	2. H.E.A.R.T. team or principals’ designee notes/agendas	2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.
				3. Use of the playground or fitness course equipment; walk/jog/run activities in designated areas; and exercising to the outdoor activities such as the ones provided in the <i>150 Minutes</i>	3. Physical Education Teacher	3. Lesson plans of Physical Education Teacher	3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			of Elem. Physical Education "Resources" folder on IDEAS.			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Continuous Improvement

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

Continuous Improvement Goal			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?	Evaluation Tool
1. Continuous Improvement Goal			1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Continuous Improvement Goal #1:			Meeting times with parents	Provide a variety of days and times for parents to volunteer during the school year.	Who Administration How - Schedule and attendance logs.	Administration will examine the logs to determine next steps.	Administration will provide feedback to faculty and staff.
Based on the <i>School Climate and Perception Survey for Parents</i> , the percentage of parents who strongly agree with the indicators under Community Collaboration will increase from 72% to 75% in 2013	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*	Some parents cannot attend nightly school academic nights				
	72%	75%					
			1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
			Not all students take home and/or bring school information back. Not all parents have working phone numbers.	Parent Link system will notify parents of school events. Teachers will try to obtain current phone numbers as needed and post school events on the whiteboard in the classroom.	Who Principal Teachers How - Schedule and attendance logs.	Administration will examine the logs to determine next steps	Administration will provide feedback to faculty and staff.

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in reading (Levels 4-9). Reading Goal A:			A.1.	A.1.	Less than 10 students	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.	
			2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
			N/A	N/A					
						A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.
B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal B:			A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	
			2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
			N/A	N/A					
					B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.
			B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	
			B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	
					B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.
					B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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/satisfactory performance in Listening/Speaking. CELLA Goal #C: 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 52% to 55%.	1.1.	1.1. See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
D. Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in Reading.	2.1.	2.1. See Reading ELL	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 24% to 27%.</p>	<p>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</p> <p>24</p>	<p>Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4</p>				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
<p>Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</p>		<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?</p>	<p>Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?</p>	<p>Student Evaluation Tool</p>
<p>E. Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in Writing.</p> <p>CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 27% to 30%.</p>	<p>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</p> <p>27</p>	<p>See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4</p>				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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

Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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
F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).			F.1.	Less than 10 students	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.
Mathematics Goal F:	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance					
	N/A	N/A					
			F.2.		F.2.	F.2.	F.2.
		F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	
G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.			G.1.		G.1.	G.1.	G.1.
Mathematics Goal G:	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance					
	N/A	N/A					
			G.3.		G.3.	G.3.	G.3.

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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
<p>STEM Goal #1:</p> <p>Increase the number of and participation in STEM competitions and events, including STEM Fair, Math Bowl, Science Bowl, Mu Alpha, Science Olympics, etc</p>	<p>1.1 Students are not able to participate in science and math competitions outside of math and science instruction.</p>	<p>1.1 -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established. . -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.</p>	<p>1.1 PLC or grade level lead -Subject Area Leaders</p>	<p>1.1 Administrative walk-throughs</p>	<p>1.1 Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM elective per nine week. Share data with teachers.</p>

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
<p><u>CTE Goal #1:</u></p> <p>Sustain/Increase the number of Career Technical Student Organization chapters from 2 in 2011-2012 to 3 in 2012-2013.</p>	<p>1.1. Students are unable to attend CTE activities and events</p>	<p>1.1. Increase student participation in CTSO activities/events.</p>	<p>1.1. CTE Teachers</p>	<p>1.1. Aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop next steps</p>	<p>1.1. Log of number of CTSO events Log of number of students who attend CTSO events</p>

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Establishing or growing a CTSO.	K-5	District	School-Wide	Monthly	Log of events and attendance	Guidance Counselor

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prevent

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

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (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 citizens 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 **X**

No _____

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

All SAC funds must correlate back to specific SIP goals, strategies, action steps and/or professional development.

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 Goals	To Be Determined and updated as funds are spent	279.90	
Math Goals	To Be Determined and updated as funds are spent	279.90	
Science Goals	To Be Determined and updated as funds are spent	279.90	
Writing Goals	To Be Determined and updated as funds are spent	279.90	
Attendance/Suspension Goals	To Be Determined and updated as funds are spent	279.90	
Health and Fitness Goals	To Be Determined and updated as funds are spent	279.90	
Final Amount Spent			