Florida Department of Education

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Bailey Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Amy L. Zilbar	Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia
SAC Chair: Rebecca Thoms and Heather Knab	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Highly Qualified Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)						
Principal	Amy L. Zilbar	BS, MA	3	9		Read: (3+)	(Gains)	(Low 25%)	Math: (3+)	(Gains)	(Low25%)
					2011-2012 Grade C	56%	66pts	76%	42%	47pts	50%
					2010-2011 Grade B	73%	69%	53%	65%	60%	56%
					2009-2010 Grade B	71%	61%	44%	71%	64%	61%
Assistant Principal	Carol Mayo	BA,MA,EdS	3	6		Read: (3+)	(Gains)	(Low 25%)	Math: (3+)	(Gains)	(Low25%)
					2011-2012 Grade C	56%	66pts	76%	42%	47pts	50%
					2010-2011 Grade B	73%	69%	53%	65%	60%	56%
					2009-2010 Grade B	71%	61%	44%	71%	64%	61%

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

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

Subject	Name	Degree(s)/	Number of	Number of Years as	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/

Area		Certification(s)	Years at Current School	an Instructional Coach	Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Heather Knab	BS, MS in Reading, Certification in Elementary K-6, ESOL, Reading Endorsement	2	2	Read: (3+) (Gains) (Low 25%) Math: (3+) (Gains) (Low25%) 2011-2012 Grade C 56% 66pts 76% 42% 47pts 50% 2010-2011 Grade B 73% 69% 53% 65% 60% 56%
Math	Kelly Brocato	BS in Elementary Ed, Certification in Elementary K-6 and ESOL	2	1	Read: (3+) (Gains) (Low 25%) Math: (3+) (Gains) (Low25%) 2011-2012 Grade C 56% 66pts 76% 42% 47pts 50%

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	General Directors	June	
2. Recruitment Fairs	Quincy Bell	June	
3. Regular time for teacher collaboration	Principal	ongoing	
4. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective

There are currently seven staff members that are teaching out of field in the area of ESOL. They are all highly qualified to teach elementary education K-6.	Taking professional development classes to work towards completing ESOL Endorsement. PLCs will provide support by discussing specific strategies for ELL students during PLC meetings. ESOL Resource teacher will observe and assist when requested.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
49	6% (3)	45% (22)	43% (21)	12% (6)	6% (3)	100% (49)	4% (2)	2% (1)	86% (42)

Teacher Mentoring Program

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

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
Amanda Newman	Amber Holmberg	Ms. Newman is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Amanda Newman	Christina Hooks	Ms. Newman is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Amanda Newman	Kylie Miller	Ms. Newman is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem solving.
Amanda Newman	Aviva Baker	Ms. Newman is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem solving.

Amanda Newman	Annabelle Leon	Ms. Newman is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Amanda Newman	Lindsey Coyne	Ms. Newman is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Amanda Newman	Tara Vaughn	Ms. Newman is a Mentor with EET initiative. She has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.
Jennifer White	MaryBeth McGaha	Ms. White is a mentor with the ESE department. She has strengths in the area of leadership, differentiation of instruction, IDEAS laws, and other IEP paperwork information.	

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

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

Title I, Part A
Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school and summer programs, iii services provided by staff, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors.
Title I, Part C- Migrant
The migrant advocate provides services and support to students and parents. The advocate works with teachers and other programs to ensure that the migrant students' needs are being met.
Title I, Part D
The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice.
Title II
The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training. In addition, the funds are utilized in the Salary Differential Program at Renaissance schools.
Title III
Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners
Title X- Homeless
The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs.
Violence Prevention Programs NA
Nutrition Programs NA
Housing Programs NA
Head Start We utilize information from students in Head Start to transition into Kindergarten.
Adult Education NA
Career and Technical Education The career and technical support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations
Job Training Job training support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations

Other

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

The RtI Leadership team (Problem Solving Leadership Team – PSLT) includes:

● Principal

● Assistant Principal

● Guidance Counselor

● School Psychologist

● Social Worker

● Academic Coaches (Reading Coach, Math Resource, Technology Resource)

● ESE teacher

● Representatives from the PLCs for each grade level, K-5

● SAC Chair

● ELP Coordinator

● ELL Representative

● SES Facilitator

● OSPD Facilitator

(Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals for the meeting)

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

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

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

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

● Based on student data, recommend, coordinate and implement supplemental services (Tiers 2 and 3) that match students' non-mastery of skills through:

  o Extended Learning Programs during and after school

  o SES Tutoring Program from November 2011 through April 2012

  o Intensive Math Interventions with the Math Resource Teacher

  o Create, manage and update the school resource map

  o Designated iii reading intervention block

  o Create Common Planning times for Grade Levels K and 5, additional common planning time may be scheduled after school for grades 1-4.

● Determine scheduling needs, curriculum materials and intervention resources based on identified needs derived from data analysis

● Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals

● Review and interpret student data (academic, behavior and attendance) at the school and grade levels

● Organize and support systematic data collection as needed

● Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:

- o Implementation and support of PLCs

- o Use of school-based *Reinforcement Instructional Calendars, Mini-Lessons* and *Mini-Assessments*

- o Use of Mini Assessments (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)

- o Use of *Common Core Assessments* at the end of segments/chapters (data will be collected by PLCs and entered and compiled for analysis by members of the PSLT)

- o Implementation of research-based, scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions (e.g., Daily 5 Program, Differentiated Instruction)

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

- At the end of each nine weeks, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the nine weeks through report card review sessions.

- Assist with planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs.

- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) and F-CIM (Florida Continuous Improvement Model on specific tested benchmarks) and progress monitoring.

- Coordinate/collaborate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas), the reading coach, the math resource teacher, the ESOL resource teacher, and the ESE Specialist.

- Use intervention planning forms to communicate initiatives between the PSLT and PLCs.

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

● The Co-Chairs of SAC are members 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 2012-2013 school year.

● The Co-Chairs presented SIP Plan Data and asked for Professional Development Needs to the staff and PSLT during pre-planning in the 2012-2013 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 the strategies developed in problem solving plans by reviewing student data as well as data related to various levels of fidelity. Using data gathered from PLCs, the team will monitor the data and make progress statements on the School Improvement Plan at the end of the first, second and third nine weeks. The PSLT will use the following rubric to evaluate Strategy Fidelity of Implementation and Strategy Effectiveness:

Indicator	Strategy Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check
Not Evident	Teacher monitoring indicates strategy implementation has not begun.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing no positive effect on student achievement.

Emerging	Some (25-75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates early or preliminary stages of implementation.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing minimal or poor effect on student achievement.
Operational	Most (>75%) of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence indicates active implementation.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is mostly showing a positive effect on student achievement.
Highly Functional	Teacher monitoring indicates that all of the intended teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity. Evidence exists that the strategy is fully integrated and effectively/ consistently implemented.	Student data indicate that strategy implementation is showing a significant positive effect on student achievement.

- The PSLT will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning PSLT members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger PSLT team through the subject area PSLT representatives.

- The PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process: Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:

  o   review and analyze screening and collateral data

  o   develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers)

  o   develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses

  o   establish methods to track students' progress with appropriate progress monitoring assessments at intervals matched to the intensity of the interventions and/or enrichment

  o   develop progress monitoring goals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify interventions and/or enrichments)

- ○ review goal statements to ensure they are ambitious, time-bound and meaningful (e.g., SMART goals)

- ○ assess the fidelity of instruction/intervention implementation and other PS/RtI processes

MTSS Implementation

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

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

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released test	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach, Math Coach
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Curriculum Data Folder	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Math, Writing and Science	Scantron Achievement Series Curriculum Data Folder	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
Program Generated Assessments	Software (Waterford, iStation, Fasttmath)	Individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Curriculum Data Folder	Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Common Assessments* *(see below)* of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources	Curriculum Data Folder	Individual teachers, PSLT

Mini-Assessments on specific tested Benchmarks	Curriculum Data Folder	Individual teachers	

*A Common Assessment covers a "chunk" of instruction within the District adopted curriculum. It covers all of the skills taught within a certain time period. The purpose of the Common Assessment is to assess students' knowledge of the core curriculum. The results of the Common Assessment are used to:

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

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

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

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

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP) * *(see below)* Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials)	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/ ELP Facilitator
SES Tutoring Program	SES Department Database	Heather Knab/Reading Coach
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/ Reading Coach

Ongoing assessments within Intensive Courses	Database provided by course materials (for courses that have one), School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/PLC/Individual Teachers
Other Curriculum Based Measurement** *(see below)*	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/PLCs

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

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

- assess the same skills over time

- have multiple equivalent forms

- are sensitive to small amounts of growth over time.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
The Teacher Training Modules, as posted under the RtI Icon, were delivered to faculty members over the course of several faculty meetings during the 2010-2011 school year. PSLT members who attended the district level RtI trainings and/or the end of the 2011-2012 school year training session 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.
The Leadership Committee will be given weekly updates on the progress through PLC meetings and feedback. The Leadership Committee will also be meeting with smaller grade level groups once a month through side-line chats to answer questions on differentiation, curriculum, RTI, PLCs, and other academic related concerns that teachers may have. The Leadership Committee will also be allowing the grade levels to decide how to spend additional ELP funds in a way that would best fit their grade level needs based on intervention tiers, RTI needs, and enrichment needs for all levels of students.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

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

- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- Reading Coach
- Media Specialist
- ELL Resource Teacher
- Grade Level Representatives

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

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

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

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

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

- Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading strategies across the content areas

- Implementation and consistent use of Daily Five Reading Program, including the "I Pick" strategy for good readers

- Professional Development with a focus on Creating a Positive Classroom Environment to help in creating a safe learning environment through Conscious Discipline.

- Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas

- Data analysis (on-going)

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

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	

| 1. **FCAT 2.0:** **Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).** | 1.1.

-Not all teachers of the same course are consistently giving the same common assessment at the end of the instructional cycle.

-Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.

-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.

-Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.

- Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.

- Teachers at varying levels of implementation | 1.1.

Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specifically, 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.

Action Steps

Plan

Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson

-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)** | 1.1.

Who

-Principal

-AP

-Instruction Coaches

-Resource Teachers

-Peer and Mentor Evaluators

How

-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 | 1.1.

Teacher Level

-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 curriculum data folders.

-Teachers use the on-line curriculum data folders to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART Goal developed in their PLC.

-Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards the SMART Goal.

PLC Level

-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes.

- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.

-After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions:

1. How are we using data to inform our instruction? | 1.1.

FAIR

DRA

Running Records

Grade Level Common Assessments

Teacher Observation

Formative Reading Assessments | | |

	of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	-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: --*Does the assessment match the intended essential learnings and learning targets?(EET Rubric 1f)* --*Are we going to use an assessment from our adopted content materials? Will we use all the questions? Will we drop some of the questions? Do we need to add additional questions?* --*If using a rubric, have we come to consensus what each level of the rubric looks like?* --*How will we explain to students what they are expected to*	walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.	*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?* *7. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?* Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.			

		learn in order to demonstrate mastery on the assessment? How will we explain to students the performance standards by which their learning will be evaluated? *--How will we involve the student in self-assessment and monitoring?* *--How will we collect and track end-of-unit assessment data in order to evaluate student growth?* **(EET Rubric 1f, 4d).** -PLCs write a SMART goal for the upcoming unit of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers plan for Differentiated Instruction using data from previous assessments to guide student groupings.					

		Do/Check _Teachers in the Classroom_ -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)** **Check/Act** _Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment_ -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 and enrichment 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)** *Whole Faculty* -Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty quarterly updates of data to review our progress towards the SIP goals where teachers showcase effective C-CIM and DI strategies to continue moving towards meeting our goals.					

Reading Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Reading will increase from 56% to 73%. 1A: At the end of the year, 80% of all kindergarten students will score a level of 4 or higher on the DRA2. 1B: At the end of the year, 80% of all 1st grade students will score a level of 18 or higher on the DRA2. 1C: At the end of the year, 80% of all 2nd grade students will score a level of 28 or higher on the DRA2.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	56% (194)	73% (237)					

		1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2.	
		- Teachers at varying skill levels with the FCIM model. - Teachers' implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across language arts and reading courses. - Lack of common planning time to develop/identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring. - Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. - Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide. - Finding appropriate text to develop the lessons and assessments.	Strategy Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, teachers use on-going progress monitoring data (FCAT, district formative assessments, baseline, mid-year, nine week assessments, semester exams, curriculum assessments and daily class work) to plan and deliver mini-lessons and mini-assessments (F-CIM). — **Action Steps** **Plan** Planning/ PLCs Before the Lesson - PLCs identify essential tested skills/ standards/benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. **(EET Rubric 1b, 1c, 4a, 4d)** -Teachers discuss how to correlate mini	Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Peer and Mentor Evaluators — How -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. —	Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their mini assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards 80% mastery of skills. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress through Data Walls both visible in their classrooms, student-led, and also data to be discussed in PLC's, Math Data Folders, and other individual progress monitoring systems. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the 80% mastery data across all classes/ courses for each mini assessment. - For each class/course,	3 x per year. -FAIR — During Grading Period -Mini assessment data	

			lessons with core curriculum. - Based on the data, PLCs develop a one-two week projected timeline/calendar for teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. **(EET Rubric 1b, 1e, and 4d)** -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify (using District resources and curriculum resources) and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs will use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons and mini assessments. **(EET Rubric 1e, 1d, 1f, 4d)** -Teachers discuss strategies for teaching the mini lessons. **Do/Check** Teachers in the Classroom -Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments to the whole group or targeted		PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions: *1. Are there skills that need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class?* *2. Are there skills that need to be re-taught as mini-lessons to the entire class using a different teaching technique?* *3. Are there skills that need to re-taught to targeted students?* *4. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?* Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.		

			students.			

Check/Act

Teachers/PLCs after the Mini-Assessments

-Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. **(EET Rubric 4d)**

-Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. **(EET Rubric 4a)**

-As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the mini-lesson timeline/calendar.

-If needed Differentiated Instruction mini-lessons/assessments are given to targeted students as Tier 1 interventions.

-Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a re-teaching or enrichment schedule. **(EET Rubric 1b, 3c, 3e, 4d)**

-After the assessment, teachers provide timely

			feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. **(EET Rubric 3d)** Whole Faculty -Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews where teachers showcase effective C-CIM, F-CIM and DI strategies.				

1.3	**1.3**	**1.3**	**1.3**	**1.3**	
Teachers vary in knowledge in how to teach vocabulary in an ongoing, robust way. -Teachers vary in knowledge regarding techniques and strategies for effectively teaching vocabulary, other than look it up in the dictionary. -Teachers may not know how to identify the appropriate words to teach for a vocabulary lesson.	**Tier 1** - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' vocabulary knowledge and use will increase through use of the 5-day Vocabulary and Daily 5 program Instructional Routine which includes: -time specified daily for work on vocabulary that is embedded in text -activities that include all learning modalities -a routine that will be familiar to students, like a workshop **Action Steps** -Administer teacher training/resource needs assessment to determine support plan. -Schedule training and plan for resources. -Grade level PLCs meet and come to consensus regarding progress monitoring/ evaluation tools for measuring vocabulary.	Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Reading Resource Teacher -PLC Facilitators How Monitored -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk- throughs observing the 5-day Vocabulary Instructional Routine -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	Teacher Level PLC Level PLCs will review evaluation data at weekly PLC meetings. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem-Solving Leadership Team. The Problem-Solving Leadership Reading/ Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per grading period.	2x per year -FAIR Vocabulary Assessment, K-2 3x per year -FAIR on-going progress monitoring tool (Scaffolded Discussion Templates) During grading period -Students' written responses reflecting use of vocabulary taught -Students' writing samples reflecting use of vocabulary taught. - Increased reading comprehension percentage in FAIR	

			-Grade level PLCs meet to decide on Tier 2 words to use for the week's Vocabulary lessons. -Begin whole class implementation of the 5-day Vocabulary Instructional Routine, using Tier 2 words. -Grade level PLCs reconvene after 2 weeks to discuss progress of implementation. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss the 5-day Vocabulary Instructional Routine implementation. -Assess students with identified progress monitoring tools monthly. Bring assessment data to PLC for comparison. Identify trends and design lessons to target instruction. -PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. - Implement Daily 5 strategy into reading program through creating a structured reading experience,	observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies. - Reading Coach will model and observe Daily Five strategies being used in the classroom.			

			book bags, and opportunities for reading choice. Implement literature circles for enrichment strategies Work on reciprocal teaching stems Participate in SES Tutoring program (where applicable)				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

2. **FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1		
Reading Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grades 3-5, the percentage of standard curriculum students scoring a 4 or higher on the FCAT Reading will increase from 26% to 36%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	26% **(90)**	**36%** **(117)**					

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
		See 1.3	See 1.3	See 1.3	See 1.3	See 1.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

3. **FCAT 2.0:** Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.	3.1. See 1.1	3.1. See 1.1	3.1. See 1.1	3.1. See 1.1	3.1. See 1.1		
Reading Goal #3: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grades 3-5, the points earned from All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Reading will increase from 66 to 70.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	66	**70**					
		3.2. See 1.2	3.2. See 1.2	3.2. See 1.2	3.2. See 1.2	3.2. See 1.2	
		3.3. See 1.3	3.3. See 1.3	3.3. See 1.3	3..3. See 1.3	3.3. See 1.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

4. FCAT 2.0: **Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.**	4.1. See 1.1	4.1. See 1.1	4.1. See 1.1	4.1. See 1.1	4.1. See 1.1		
Reading Goal #4: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Reading will increase from 76% to 80%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	76% **(263)**	**80%** **(260)**				
		4.2. See 1.2	4.2. See 1.2	4.2. See 1.2	4.2. See 1.2	4.2. See 1.2	
		4.3 See 1.3	4.3. See 1.3	4.3. See 1.3	4.3. See 1.3	4.3. See 1.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	See 1.1	See 1.1	See 1.1	See1.1	See 1.1	

Reading Goal #5: — In the following subgroups, the gap of students not scoring satisfactory on their FCAT reading will decrease by 50% over the next 6 years. The below breakdown will describe what the school will work towards each year to help close this achievement gap: White: 39% x 50% = 19.5/6= 3.25% annually Black: 46% x 50% = 23/6 = 3.8% annually Hispanic: 53% x 50% = 26.5/6 = 4.4% annually Asian: NA American Indian: NA ELL: 66% x 50% = 33/6= 5.5% annually SWD: 71% x 50% = 35.5/6= 5.9% annually Econ Dis: 53% x 50%= 26.5/6= 4.4% annually						

5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5A.1. See 1.1	5A.1. See 1.1	5A.1. See 1.1	5A.1. See 1.1	5A.1. See 1.1		

Reading Goal #5A: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In 2012-2013, the percentage of students scoring a 3 or higher on FCAT Reading will increase by the following numbers: White: 64 to 65% Black: 54 to 59% Hispanic: 47 to 52% Asian: NA American Indian: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: 61% Black: 54% Hispanic: 47% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	White: 65% Black: 59% Hispanic: 52% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A					

		5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	
		See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
		See 1.3	See 1.3	See 1.3	See 1.3	See 1.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1. See 1.1	5B.1. See 1.1	5B.1. See 1.1	5B.1. See 1.1	5B.1.		

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

Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In 2012-2013, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring a 3 or higher on the FCAT Reading will increase from 47 to 52%.						
	47%	**52%**				
		5B.2. See 1.2	5B.2. See 1.2	5B.2. See 1.2	5B.2. See 1.2	5B.2.
		5B.3. See 1.3	5B.3. See 1.3	5B.3. See 1.3	5B.3. See 1.3	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | 1.1.

-Not all teachers of the same course give the same common assessment at the end of the instructional cycle.

-Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction.

-Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments.

-Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices.

- Need additional training to implement effective PLCs.

- Teachers at varying levels of implementation of | 1.1.

Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, 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.

Action Steps

Plan

Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson

- Teachers will use A+ Rise ESOL Strategies

- ESOL Strategy Checklist implemented in their daily lesson plans

-PLCs identify the | 1.1.

Who

-Principal

-AP

-Instruction Coaches

-Resource Teachers

-Subject Area Leaders/ Department Heads

-Peer and Mentor Evaluators

How

-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 | 1.1.

Teacher Level

-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 curriculum data folders.

-Teachers use the on-line curriculum data folders to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART Goal developed in their PLC.

-Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards the SMART Goal.

PLC Level

-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes.

- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.

-After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions:

1. How are we using data to inform our instruction? | • 1.1

• FAIR data

• County Reading Formative Assessments

• DRA Assessments | | |

	Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	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: --*Does the assessment match the intended essential learnings and learning targets?(EET Rubric 1f)* --*Are we going to use an assessment from our adopted content materials? Will we use all the questions? Will we drop some of the questions? Do we need to add additional questions?* --*If using a rubric,*	Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.	*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?* *7. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?* Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.		

		have we come to consensus what each level of the rubric looks like? *--How will we explain to students what they are expected to learn in order to demonstrate mastery on the assessment? How will we explain to students the performance standards by which their learning will be evaluated?* *--How will we involve the student in self-assessment and monitoring?* *--How will we collect and track end-of-unit assessment data in order to evaluate student growth?* **(EET Rubric 1f, 4d).** -PLCs write a SMART goal for the upcoming unit of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers plan					

| | | for Differentiated Instruction using data from previous assessments to guide student groupings.

Do/Check

Teachers in the Classroom

- Heritage Language strategies used to differentiate lessons and assessments

-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)** | | | | | |

		Check/Act *Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment* -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 and enrichment 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)** *Whole Faculty* -Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews where teachers showcase effective C-CIM and DI strategies.					

Reading Goal #5C: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In 2012-2013, the percentage of ELL students scoring a 3 or higher on the FCAT Reading will increase from 34 to 41%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	34%	**41%**					

		1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2.	
	–	- Teachers at varying skill levels with the FCIM model. - Teachers' implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across language arts and reading courses. - Lack of common planning time to develop/identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring. - Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. - Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide. - Finding appropriate text to develop the lessons and assessments.	<u>Strategy</u> Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, teachers use on-going progress monitoring data (FCAT, district formative assessments, baseline, mid-year, nine week assessments, semester exams, curriculum assessments and daily class work) to plan and deliver mini-lessons and mini-assessments (F-CIM). — **Action Steps** **Plan** <u>Planning/ PLCs Before the Lesson</u> - PLCs identify essential tested skills/ standards/benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. **(EET Rubric 1b, 1c, 4a, 4d)** -Teachers discuss how to correlate mini	<u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Subject Area Leaders/ Department Heads -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	<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 mini assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards 80% mastery of skills. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the 80% mastery data across all classes/ courses for each mini assessment. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions:	<u>3 x per year</u>. -FAIR — <u>During Grading Period</u> -Mini assessment data	

			lessons with core curriculum.	strategies.			
			- Based on the data, PLCs develop a one-two week projected timeline/calendar for teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. **(EET Rubric 1b, 1e, and 4d)** -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify (using District resources and curriculum resources) and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs will use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons and mini assessments. **(EET Rubric 1e, 1d, 1f, 4d)** -Teachers discuss strategies for teaching the mini lessons. **Do/Check** Teachers in the Classroom -Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments to the whole group or targeted		*1. Are there skills that need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class?* *2. Are there skills that need to be re-taught as mini-lessons to the entire class using a different teaching technique?* *3. Are there skills that need to re-taught to targeted students?* *4. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?* Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.		

			students.				

Check/Act

<u>Teachers/PLCs after the Mini-Assessments</u>

-Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. **(EET Rubric 4d)**

-Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. **(EET Rubric 4a)**

-As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the mini-lesson timeline/calendar.

-If needed Differentiated Instruction mini-lessons/assessments are given to targeted students as Tier 1 interventions.

-Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a re-teaching or enrichment schedule. **(EET Rubric 1b, 3c, 3e, 4d)**

-After the assessment, teachers provide timely

			feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. **(EET Rubric 3d)** Whole Faculty -Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews where teachers showcase effective C-CIM, F-CIM and DI strategies.				

1.3	**1.3**	**1.3**	**1.3**	**1.3**	
Teachers vary in knowledge in how to teach vocabulary in an ongoing, robust way. -Teachers vary in knowledge regarding techniques and strategies for effectively teaching vocabulary, other than look it up in the dictionary. -Teachers may not know how to identify the appropriate words to teach for a vocabulary lesson.	**Tier 1** - The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' vocabulary knowledge and use will increase through use of the 5-day Vocabulary Instructional Routine which includes: -time specified daily for work on vocabulary that is embedded in text -activities that include all learning modalities -a routine that will be familiar to students, like a workshop **Action Steps** -Administer teacher training/resource needs assessment to determine support plan. -Schedule training and plan for resources. -Grade level PLCs meet and come to consensus regarding progress monitoring/ evaluation tools for measuring vocabulary. -Grade level PLCs	Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Reading Resource Teacher -PLC Facilitators How Monitored -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Classroom walk- throughs observing the 5-day Vocabulary Instructional Routine -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	Teacher Level PLC Level PLCs will review evaluation data at weekly PLC meetings. Leadership Team Level PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem-Solving Leadership Team. The Problem-Solving Leadership Reading/ Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per grading period.	2x per year -FAIR Vocabulary Assessment, K-2 3x per year -FAIR on-going progress monitoring tool (Scaffolded Discussion Templates) During grading period -Students' written responses reflecting use of vocabulary taught -Students' writing samples reflecting use of vocabulary taught.	

			meet to decide on Tier 2 words to use for the week's Vocabulary lessons. -Begin whole class implementation of the 5-day Vocabulary Instructional Routine, using Tier 2 words. -Grade level PLCs reconvene after 2 weeks to discuss progress of implementation. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers discuss the 5-day Vocabulary Instructional Routine implementation. -Assess students with identified progress monitoring tools monthly. Bring assessment data to PLC for comparison. Identify trends and design lessons to target instruction. -PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.	observation(Admin and Peer/Mentor) -School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. 	5D.1. See 1.1	5D.1. See 1.1	5D.1. See 1.1	5D.1. See 1.1	5D.1.		

Reading Goal #5D: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In 2012-2013, the percentage of students with disabilities scoring a 3 or higher on the FCAT Reading will increase from 29 to 36%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	29%	**36%**				
		5D.2. See 1.2	5D.2. See 1.2	5D.2. See 1.2	5D.2. See 1.2	5D.2.

		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	
		See 1.3	See 1.3	See 1.3	See 1.3		

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates and Schedules	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
and/or PLC Focus		and/or PLC Leader	(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)		
Running Records	K-5	Heather Knab	Professional Development	September 2012	Observations	Heather Knab
DRA Training	K-5	Heather Knab	Professional Development	October 2012	Observations	Heather Knab
Text Complexity	K-5	Heather Knab	Faculty Meeting	September 2012	Observations	Heather Knab
Data Chats	K-5	Heather Knab	PLC	Once every 6 days	iii groups and interventions	Administration
Daily Five	K-5	Heather Knab	School-Wide	Book Study	Book Study	Heather Knab
Heritage Language Dictionary Training	3-5	Christina Silva	School-Wide	Staff Meetings	Feedback from teachers	Christina Silva
ESOL Reading Strategies in Content Area	K-5	Christina Silva	School- Wide	After School PD	Feedback from Teachers	Christina Silva

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1.		
	-Not all teachers of the same course give the same common assessment at the end of the instructional cycle. -Lack of consistent common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of PLC time in math to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of	Strategy Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, 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 master of essential skills. Participate in after school SES tutoring program where applicable. Work with Math Resource Teacher to gain additional strategies in the classroom. **Action Steps** **Plan** *Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson*	Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Resource Teachers -Peer and Mentor Evaluators How -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)	Teacher Level -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 curriculum data folders. -Teachers use the on-line curriculum data folders to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART Goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards the SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions: *1. How are we using data to inform our instruction?*	2-3x Per Year FCAT Practice Test Formative B District Test Purple Data Folders During Grading Period End of unit assessments		

	Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students). - 44% of teachers in grades 3-5 are new to teaching grade level mathematics instruction.	-Grade Level Planning Time used to 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)** -Grade Level Planning time to identify the common assessment for the upcoming unit of instruction. Teachers answering the question, "How do we know if they have learned it?" Specifically, PLCs reflect on the following questions: --*Does the assessment match the intended essential learnings and learning targets?(EET Rubric 1f)* --*Are we going to use an assessment from our adopted content materials? Will we use all the questions? Will we drop some of*	-School-based informal walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.	*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?* *7. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?* Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction. **Ideas for K-2** (Elementary grades K-2 Only) Team leader for grades 1-3 will collect from each teacher a Running			

		the questions? Do we need to add additional questions? *--If using a rubric, have we come to consensus what each level of the rubric looks like?* *--How will we explain to students what they are expected to learn in order to demonstrate mastery on the assessment? How will we explain to students the performance standards by which their learning will be evaluated?* *--How will we involve the student in self-assessment and monitoring?* *--How will we collect and track end-of-unit assessment data in order to evaluate student growth?* **(EET Rubric 1f, 4d).** -PLCs write a SMART goal for the upcoming unit		Record or DRA2 list of where each 1-3 student is reading on an instructional level monthly. Kindergarten will begin collecting the same data in December.			

		of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers plan for Differentiated Instruction using data from previous assessments to guide student groupings. **Do/Check** *Teachers in the Classroom* -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)**					

		Check/Act				
		Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment				
		- Reflect on teaching.				
		-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 and enrichment 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)** *Whole Faculty* -Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews where teachers showcase effective C-CIM and DI strategies.					

Mathematics Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grades 3-5, the percentage of students scoring 3 or higher on FCAT Math will increase from 42% to 65%.							
	42% (145)	**65%** (211)					

		1.2	**1.2**	**1.2**	**1.2**	1.2.	
		- Teachers at varying skill levels with the FCIM model. - Teachers' implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across language arts and reading courses. - Lack of common planning time to develop/identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring. - Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. - Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide. - Finding appropriate text to develop the lessons and assessments.	<u>Strategy</u> Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, teachers use on-going progress monitoring data (FCAT, district formative assessments, baseline, mid-year, nine week assessments, semester exams, curriculum assessments and daily class work) to plan and deliver **mini-lessons and mini-assessments (F-CIM).** **Action Steps** **Plan** *Planning/ PLCs Before the Lesson* - PLCs identify essential tested skills/ standards/benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. **(EET Rubric 1b, 1c, 4a, 4d)** -Teachers discuss how to correlate mini	<u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -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 mini assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards 80% mastery of skills. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the 80% mastery data across all classes/ courses for each mini assessment. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions:	Math Formative Assessments	

			lessons with core curriculum. - Based on the data, PLCs develop a one-two week projected timeline/calendar for teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. **(EET Rubric 1b, 1e, and 4d)** -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify (using District resources and curriculum resources) and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs will use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons and mini assessments. **(EET Rubric 1e, 1d, 1f, 4d)** -Teachers discuss strategies for teaching the mini lessons. **Do/Check** *Teachers in the Classroom* -Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments to the whole group or targeted		*1. Are there skills that need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class?* *2. Are there skills that need to be re-taught as mini-lessons to the entire class using a different teaching technique?* *3. Are there skills that need to re-taught to targeted students?* *4. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?* Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.		

			students. **Check/Act** _Teachers/PLCs after the Mini-Assessments_ -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. **(EET Rubric 4d)** -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. **(EET Rubric 4a)** -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the mini-lesson timeline/calendar. -If needed Differentiated Instruction mini-lessons/assessments are given to targeted students as Tier 1 interventions. -Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a re-teaching or enrichment schedule. **(EET Rubric 1b, 3c, 3e, 4d)** -After the assessment, teachers provide timely				

			feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. **(EET Rubric 3d)** *Whole Faculty* -Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews where teachers showcase effective C-CIM, F-CIM and DI strategies				

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
			Strategy:	Who	Teacher Level	Math Formative Assessments	
			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:	-Principal -AP -Instructional Coach(es) -Peer and Mentor Evaluators ___ How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.	-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.	Administrative Walk Thrus and Observations	
			-Homogeneous/Cluster/ Ability Grouping -Heterogeneous/Mixed Ability Grouping -Individualized Work/ Independent Study -Whole Class Instruction -Pairs or Partners **Action Steps** **Plan**	-Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk-throughs. -Administration walkthroughs where students are asked to explain what they are learning. -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	-Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards mastery. PLC Level -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 communication with student strategies for		

			Teacher PD -As a professional development activity, teachers participate in a school-wide professional development in the Differentiated Classroom. **(EET Rubric 4d, 4e)** *Teacher Planning* -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. Specifically, PLCs use the checklist/ self-assessment from *Successful Teaching in The Differentiated Classroom* to plan their lessons (See Appendix for checklist): **Do I give my students:** --Different ways to take in information --Different amounts of time to complete the work	walk-through form which includes the school's SIP strategies.	future lessons. Leadership Team Level -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.		

			--Different assignments depending on ability, readiness, comprehension level, learning preferences/ styles, and interests. -Different types of assessments **For all students, do I:** --Use data to drive instruction before beginning a unit of study, during the unit of study and at the end of unit of study. --Create a variety of activities and tasks that allows students to explore concepts and standards in different ways. -Give students choices in some of their learning activities. **For High Performing, Gifted, Honors and Advanced Students, do I:** --Make modifications to ensure students are challenged with higher-level thinking activities. -Use curriculum compacting, independent study, and extension activities				

			where appropriate **For Lower Ability and Students with Learning Difficulties:** -Assess specific skills and knowledge that need remediation and utilize a variety of strategies to help students in these areas. **For English Language Learners:** --Use gestures, visuals and graphic organizers when explaining concepts -Specifically pinpoint and teach the academic language these students need to learn in order to complete a task. -Recognize cultural/ experiential differences, and when feasible includes these in units and examples. **(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)**				
			-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?"				
			Do/Check				
			Teachers in the Classroom				
			-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)**				

			Check/Act _Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment_ -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.

 —

 Administrators/ Leadership Team

 -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/ Subject Area Leaders/ Department Heads 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 barriers and how they | | | | |

			can be overcome. *Whole Faculty* -Throughout the school year, teachers will participate in faculty SIP Reviews where teachers showcase Differentiated Instruction strategies and techniques.				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1		

Mathematics Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grades 3-5, the percentage of students scoring a 4 or higher on FCAT Math will increase from 16% to 32%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	16% (55)	**32% (103)**				
		2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2
		2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.	3.1. See 1.1	3.1. See 1.1	3.1. See 1.1	3.1. See 1.1	3.1. See 1.1		
Mathematics Goal #3: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* In grades 3-5, the points earned from All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math will increase from 47 to 60.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	47 **60**					
		3.2. See 1.2	3.2. See 1.2	3.2. See 1.2	3.2. See 1.2	3.2. See 1.2
		3.3. See 1.3	3.3. See 1.3	3.3. See 1.3	3..3. See 1.3	3.3. See 1.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4.1. See 1.1	4.1. See 1.1	4.1. See 1.1	4.1. See 1.1	4.1. See 1.1		
Mathematics Goal #4: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grades 3-5, the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics FCAT will increase from 50% to 56%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	50% **(27)**	**56%** **(32)**				
		4.2. See 1.2	4.2. See 1.2	4.2. See 1.2	4.2. See 1.2	4.2. See 1.2
		4.3 See 1.3	4.3. See 1.3	4.3. See 1.3	4.3. See 1.3	4.3. See 1.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.						

<u>Math Goal #5:</u> In the following subgroups, the gap of students not scoring satisfactory on their FCAT Math will decrease by 50% over the next 6 years. The below breakdown will describe what the school will work towards each year to help close this achievement gap: White: 53% x 50% = 26.5/6= 4.4% annually Black: 65% x 50% = 32.5/6 = 5.4% annually Hispanic: 66% x 50% = 33/6 = 5.5% annually Asian: NA American Indian: NA ELL: 76% x 50% = 38/6= 6.3% annually SWD: 69% x 50% = 34.5/6= 5.75% annually Econ Dis: 67% x 50%= 33.5/6= 5.6% annually							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics**	5A.1. See 1.1	5A.1. See 1.1	5A.1. See 1.1	5A.1. See 1.1	5A.1.		

Mathematics Goal #5A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In 2012-2013, the percentage of students within each subgroup scoring a level 3 or higher on the math FCAT will increase at the rates shown below: White: 47 to 52% Black: 35 to 38% Hispanic: 34 to 41% Asian: NA American Indian: NA						
	White: 47% Black: 35% Hispanic: 34% Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: 52% Black: 38% Hispanic: 41% Asian: NA American Indian: NA				

		5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	
		See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2		
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
		See 1.3	See 1.3	See 1.3	See 1.3		
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. See 1.1	5B.1. See 1.1	5B.1. See 1.1	5B.1. See 1.1	5B.1.		

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

Mathematics Goal #5B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In 2012-2013, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring a level 3 or higher on the math FCAT will increase from 33% to 40%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	33%	**40%**				
		5B.1. See 1.2	5B.1. See 1.2	5B.1. See 1.2	5B.1. See 1.2	5B.1.
		5B.3. See 1.3	5B.3. See 1.3	5B.3. See 1.3	5B.3. See 1.3	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. See 1.1	5C.1. See 1.1	5C.1. See 1.1	5C.1. See 1.1	5C.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5C: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In 2012-2013, the percentage of ELL students scoring a level 3 or higher on the math FCAT will increase from 24% to 32%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	24%	**32%**					

		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2	See 1.2		
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
		See 1.3	See 1.3	See 1.3	See 1.3		
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

| 5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 5D.1.

See 1.1 | 5D.1.

See 1.1 | 5D.1.

See 1.1 | 5D.1.

See 1.1 | 5D.1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal #5D:

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.

In 2012-2013, the percentage of students with disabilities scoring a level 3 or higher on the math FCAT will increase from 31% to 38%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

	31%	**38%**					
		5D.2. See 1.2	5D.2. See 1.2	5D.2. See 1.2	5D.2. See 1.2	5D.2.	
		5D.3 See 1.3	5D.3 See 1.3	5D.3 See 1.3	5D.3 See 1.3	5D.3	

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Data Chats	K-5	Kelly Brocato	PLC and grade levels	Bi-Annually	Observations	Math Resource Teacher/Admin
Math Norm Training	K-5	Kelly Brocato	School-Wide	September 2012	Observations	Mat h Resource Teacher/Admin
Think Central	K-5	Kelly Broacto	Grade Level	September/October 2012	Planning, Think Central Usage	Math Resource Teacher/Instructional Teacher
Powerful Planning	K-5	District Trainer	School-Wide	October 2012	Grade Level Planning Meeting	Math Resource Teacher

| First in Math Training | K-5 | Kelly Brocato and Amber Holmberg | School-Wide | November 2012 | Usage Reports |

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

1. **FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.**	**1.1**	**1.1**	**1.1**	**1.1**	1.1.		
	-Not all teachers of the same course give the same common assessment at the end of the instructional cycle.	Strategy Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, 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.	Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Resource Teachers -Peer and Mentor Evaluators	Teacher Level -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 curriculum data folders.	2-3x Per Year Formative Science Tests (5th Grade) Chapter Assessments Spectrum Lab Assessments		
	-Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation		How -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	-Teachers use the on-line curriculum data folders to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART Goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards the SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions: *1. How are we using data to inform our instruction?* *2. What barriers to implementation are we facing*			
		Action Steps **Plan** *Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson* -PLCs identify the essential skills and					

of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	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: --*Does the assessment match the intended essential learnings and learning targets?(EET Rubric 1f)* --*Are we going to use an assessment from our adopted content*	strategies.	*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?* *7. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?* Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction. **Ideas for K-2** (Elementary grades K-2 Only) Team leader for grades 1-3 will collect from each teacher a Running Record or DRA2 list of where each 1-3 student is reading on an			

		materials? Will we use all the questions? Will we drop some of the questions? Do we need to add additional questions? *--If using a rubric, have we come to consensus what each level of the rubric looks like?* *--How will we explain to students what they are expected to learn in order to demonstrate mastery on the assessment? How will we explain to students the performance standards by which their learning will be evaluated?* *--How will we involve the student in self-assessment and monitoring?* *--How will we collect and track end-of-*		instructional level monthly. Kindergarten will begin collecting the same data in December.		

		unit assessment data in order to evaluate student growth? **(EET Rubric 1f, 4d).**				
		-PLCs write a SMART goal for the upcoming unit of instruction.				
		-As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers plan for Differentiated Instruction using data from previous assessments to guide student groupings.				
		Do/Check				
		<u>*Teachers in the Classroom*</u>				
		- Use of STEMS lab				
		- Use of Science FCAT Explorer				
		-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)** **Check/Act** _Teachers/ PLCs after the Common Assessment_ -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 and enrichment 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)**

Whole Faculty

-Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews where teachers showcase effective C-CIM and DI strategies. | | | | | |

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

Science Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grade 5, the percentage of students scoring 3 or higher on the FCAT Science test will increase from 46% to 50%.							
	46% **(49)**	**50%** **(58)**					

		1.2	**1.2**	**1.2**	**1.2**	1.2.	
		- Teachers at varying skill levels with the FCIM model. - Teachers' implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across language arts and reading courses. - Lack of common planning time to develop/ identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring. - Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. - Lack of understanding of when	<u>Strategy</u> Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, teachers use on-going progress monitoring data (FCAT, district formative assessments, baseline, mid-year, nine week assessments, semester exams, curriculum assessments and daily class work) to plan and deliver **mini-lessons and mini-assessments (F-CIM).** **Action Steps** **Plan** *Planning/ PLCs Before the Lesson* - PLCs identify essential tested skills/standards/ benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. **(EET Rubric 1b, 1c, 4a, 4d)** - Teachers discuss how to correlate mini lessons with core curriculum. - Based on the data,	<u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -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 mini assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards 80% mastery of skills. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the 80% mastery data across all classes/courses for each mini assessment. - For each class/ course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.	Science Formative Chapter Assessments	

		and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide. - Finding appropriate text to develop the lessons and assessments.	PLCs develop a one-two week projected timeline/calendar for teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. **(EET Rubric 1b, 1e, and 4d)** -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify (using District resources and curriculum resources) and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs will use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons and mini assessments. **(EET Rubric 1e, 1d, 1f, 4d)** -Teachers discuss strategies for teaching the mini lessons. **Do/Check** _Teachers in the Classroom_ -Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments to the whole group or targeted students. **Check/Act** _Teachers/PLCs after the Mini-Assessments_		-After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions: _1. Are there skills that need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class?_ _2. Are there skills that need to be re-taught as mini-lessons to the entire class using a different teaching technique?_ _3. Are there skills that need to re-taught to targeted students?_ _4. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?_ Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.		

			-Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. **(EET Rubric 4d)** -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. **(EET Rubric 4a)** -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the mini-lesson timeline/calendar. -If needed Differentiated Instruction mini-lessons/ assessments are given to targeted students as Tier 1 interventions. -Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a re-teaching or enrichment schedule. **(EET Rubric 1b, 3c, 3e, 4d)** -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. **(EET Rubric 3d)** _Whole Faculty_ -Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews where teachers showcase				

			effective C-CIM, F-CIM and DI strategies.				

1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	
-Not all teachers know how to identify misconceptions and depth of student knowledge of science concepts. -Not all teachers are able to attend available science trainings on dates available by the district. -Not all teachers are knowledgeable of the strategies of inquiry based instruction such as engaging the students, explore time, accountable talk, higher order questioning, etc. -Not all PLC meetings include regular discussion of student data and/or the implementation	**Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students will develop problem-solving and creative thinking skills while constructing new knowledge. To achieve this goal, science teachers will increase the number of **inquiry based instruction** (such as student engagement, explore time, accountable talk and higher order questioning) per unit of instruction. **Action Steps** -Teachers will attend District Science training and share information with their PLCs. -PLCs write SMART goals based on each Grading Period of material. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 75% of the students will score an 80% or above on each unit of instruction.) -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling	Who Teacher Principal AP Science Resource Teacher/ Contact District Science Team Generalist How Monitored -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. - Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administrative walk-throughs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing inquiry based instruction. -Elementary Science Classroom Walk-Through form *(available from Elementary Science Department.)* -EET Pop-Ins (Admin and Peer/Mentor)	Science Resource PLC Meetings- Data Chats (Elementary) District Science Team – 5th grade Area Data Chats PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per Grading Period.	2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests During the Grading Period - Mini Assessments -Unit assessments	

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

		of the inquiry model. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with the use of achievement series to accurately analyze student data.	inquiry based instruction strategies. -PLC teachers instruct students using the core curriculum and inquiry based instruction strategies. - At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers discuss inquiry based instruction strategies that were effective. -Based on data, PLCs use the problem-solving process to determine next steps of planning inquiry based instruction strategies. - PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.	-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.		
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**	

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012   116

2. **FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1	2.1. See 1.1		
Science Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grade 5, the percentage of students scoring a 4 or higher on the FCAT Science test will increase from 9% to 17%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					

	9% **(10)**	**17%** **(20)**					
		2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2. See 1.2	2.2.	
		2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3	2.3 See 1.3	2.3	

Science Professional Development

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

Science Committee   K-5   Kailey Mires   School Wide and Grade Level   Quarterly Meetings   Email communication to staff

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

Writing/ Language Arts Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1.		
	-Not all teachers of the same course give the same common assessment at the end of the instructional cycle. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).	Strategy Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, 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. **Action Steps** **Plan** *Planning/PLCs Before the Lesson* -PLCs identify the essential skills and learning targets for the upcoming unit of instruction.	Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Resource Teachers -Peer and Mentor Evaluators How -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	Teacher Level -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 curriculum data folders. -Teachers use the on-line curriculum data folders to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART Goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress towards the SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions: *1. How are we using data to inform our instruction?* *2. What barriers to*	Bailey Writes (Monthly)		

		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: --*Does the assessment match the intended essential learnings and learning targets? (EET Rubric 1f)* --*Are we going to use an assessment from our adopted content materials? Will we use all the questions? Will we drop some of the questions? Do we need to add additional questions?* --*If using a rubric, have*	strategies.	*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?* *7. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?* Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator shares data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction. — **Ideas for K-2** (Elementary grades K-2 Only) Team leader for grades 1-3 will collect from each			

		we come to consensus what each level of the rubric looks like? *--How will we explain to students what they are expected to learn in order to demonstrate mastery on the assessment? How will we explain to students the performance standards by which their learning will be evaluated?* *--How will we involve the student in self-assessment and monitoring?* *--How will we collect and track end-of-unit assessment data in order to evaluate student growth?* **(EET Rubric 1f, 4d).** -PLCs write a SMART goal for the upcoming unit of instruction -As a		teacher a Running Record or DRA2 list of where each 1-3 student is reading on an instructional level monthly. Kindergarten will begin collecting the same data in December.		

		Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers plan for Differentiated Instruction using data from previous assessments to guide student groupings. **Do/Check** _Teachers in the Classroom_ - Holding writing conferences to improve writing Work with ELL students with the use of the Heritage Language Dictionary to assist in writing and reading - ESE students will practice with their accommodations throughout the year. -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)** **Check/Act** _Teachers/PLCs after the Common Assessment_ -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 and enrichment 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)** *Whole Faculty* -Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews where teachers showcase effective C-CIM and DI strategies.				
Writing/LA Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grade 4, the percentage of students scoring a 3 or higher on the FCAT Writes will increase from 78% to 90%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				

	78% **(84)**	**90%** **(102)**					

		1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2.	
		- Teachers at varying skill levels with the FCIM model. - Teachers' implementation of the FCIM model is not consistent across language arts and reading courses. - Lack of common planning time to develop/ identify PLC based mini lessons and mini assessments (using curriculum based materials) geared toward on-going progress monitoring. - Lack of common planning time to analyze mini lesson data. - Lack of understanding of when and how to implement the mini lessons within the District pacing guide. - Finding appropriate text to develop	Strategy Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, teachers use on-going progress monitoring data (FCAT, district formative assessments, baseline, mid-year, nine week assessments, semester exams, curriculum assessments and daily class work) to plan and deliver **mini-lessons and mini-assessments (F-CIM).** **Action Steps** **Plan** *Planning/ PLCs Before the Lesson* - PLCs identify essential tested skills/standards/ benchmarks for their students that need reinforcement and/or remediation. **(EET Rubric 1b, 1c, 4a, 4d**) -Teachers discuss how to correlate mini lessons with core curriculum. - Based on the data, PLCs develop a one-two week	Who -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Peer and Mentor Evaluators How -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.	Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their mini assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards 80% mastery of skills. -Teachers chart their students' individual progress. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the 80% mastery data across all classes/courses for each mini assessment. - For each class/ course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.	Bailey Writes Teacher Observation	

| | | the lessons and assessments. | projected timeline/calendar for teaching the essential skills and/or standards covered in the core curriculum. **(EET Rubric 1b, 1e, and 4d)**

-As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers identify (using District resources and curriculum resources) and/or develop mini lessons and mini assessments for benchmarks. PLCs will use a combination of District and school-generated mini lessons and mini assessments. **(EET Rubric 1e, 1d, 1f, 4d)**

-Teachers discuss strategies for teaching the mini lessons.

Do/Check

Teachers in the Classroom

-Teachers implement the mini lessons and mini assessments to the whole group or targeted students.

Check/Act

Teachers/PLCs after the Mini-Assessments | | -After each assessment, PLCs will ask the following questions:

1. Are there skills that need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class?

2. Are there skills that need to be re-taught as mini-lessons to the entire class using a different teaching technique?

3. Are there skills that need to re-taught to targeted students?

4. How do we report and share our results with the Leadership Team?

Leadership Team Level

-PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. | | |

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

			-Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. **(EET Rubric 4d)** -Based on the data, teachers reflect on their own teaching. **(EET Rubric 4a)** -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers use the mini assessment data and classroom assessments to adjust the mini-lesson timeline/calendar. -If needed Differentiated Instruction mini-lessons/ assessments are given to targeted students as Tier 1 interventions. -Based on mini assessment data, skills are moved to a re-teaching or enrichment schedule. **(EET Rubric 1b, 3c, 3e, 4d)** -After the assessment, teachers provide timely feedback and students use the feedback to enhance their learning. **(EET Rubric 3d)** _Whole Faculty_ -Throughout the school year, teachers participate in faculty SIP Reviews where teachers showcase effective C-CIM, F-CIM and DI				

			strategies.				

1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	
-Not all teachers know how to identify student needs from demand writes and/or ask higher order/open-ended questions during one-on-one/ Star Interview conferences. -Not all teachers are able to attend writing trainings on dates available by the district.	**Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' use of elaboration will improve through the teachers use of daily Writers' Workshop lessons focused on craft through elaboration and one-on-one conferencing to support differentiated instruction. **Action Steps** -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.) -As a Professional Development activity, PLC discussions draw teachers to a consensus regarding student trends, needs, and scores based on connecting student writing with state anchors. -Based on student writing reviews and PLC discussions regarding trends and needs, teachers create monthly writing menus for craft, elaboration, and genres as a list of essential teaching points for the month ahead.	Who Teacher Principal AP Writing Resource/Contact District Writing Team Generalist How Monitored -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. -Administrator Writers' Workshop Walk-through Checklist for HCPS	PLCs – Monthly demand writes, daily drafts, and conferencing notes are reviewed to determine the number of students demonstrating proficiency in writing through scoring data and benchmark attainment. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per Grading Period. District Writing Team-Monthly demand write scores provided through email to Writing Supervisor followed by fourth-grade writing review meetings and support pieces provided at monthly resource/ contact meetings.	Student monthly demand writes, student daily drafts, conferencing notes	

			-As a Professional Development activity, teachers complete the online MOODLE course, *Write on Target: Best Practice in Elementary Writing* and return to this professional development course when needing to refresh knowledge. -As a Professional Development activity, PLCs reconvene to discuss ideas/lessons from the online MOODLE course and share monthly writing resource/contact meeting information. -Teachers implement the ideas based on specific student needs. -As a Professional Development activity, PLCs examine student conference notes, daily drafts; monthly demand writes and adjusts the monthly writing menu of teaching points in order to share ideas to grow students through daily Writers' Workshops. -PLCs review nine-week data and set a new goal for the following Grading Period. -PLCs record their work in the PLC logs.				

Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
	K-5	Writing Contact	Faculty Meetings	Quarterly	Observations	Administration and Grade Level Teachers
Writing Updates	3-5	Moodle Course	3-5th Grade	December-January 2012/2013	Writing Scores	
Writing Rubric Training						

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	-Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance. -Lack of time to focus on attendance -Lack of staff to focus on attendance	The Administration Team along with other appropriate staff will meet every 20 days to review the school's Attendance Plan to 1) ensure that all steps are being implemented with fidelity and 2) discuss targeted students. A data base will be maintained for students with excessive unexcused absences and tardies. This data base will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of attendance interventions and to identify students in need of support beyond school wide attendance initiatives	Guidance Counselor will run Attendance/Tardy meetings every 20 days with appropriate reports Guidance Counselor will maintain data base Social Worker Migrant Advocate	Administration Team and subset of PSLT will examine data monthly Guidance Counselor tracks data from after school program Weekly Attendance Trophies Social Worker follows up with letters and phone calls for excessive absences and tardies.	Attendance Report Tardy Report Attendance Plan After School Program		

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

Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grades K-5, the attendance rate will increase from 95.78% to 96%. In grades K-5, the number of students with more than 10 unexcused absences will decrease from 71 students to 64 In grades k-5, the number of students with more than 10 unexcused tardies will decrease from 51 to 46.							
	95.78%	**96%**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					

	71	**64**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	51	**46**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	Teachers need to have common school-wide expectations and rules and provide explicit instruction to students on the expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	PSLT will assign a subgroup to develop school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey and discussion, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations. -School-wide implementation of Conscious Discipline program	PSLT "Managing and Motivating" subgroup	PSLT "Managing and Motivating" subgroup will review data on Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) and out of school suspensions monthly.	1.1. Actual Suspension Rates on a Quarterly Basis to Review		

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

Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box. The total number of in-school suspensions will decrease from 4 to 3 in the 2012-2013 year. The number of students receiving in-school suspension will decrease from 3 to 2 in the 2012-2013 year. The total number of out of school suspensions will decrease from 9 to 7 in the 2012-2013 school year. The total number of students receiving out-of-school suspensions will decrease from 8 to 6 in the 2012-2013 school year.							
	4	**3**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	3	**2**					

	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	9	**7**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	8	**6**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

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

Character Education	All grades	Guidance Counselor	Grade level	1 x every 6 days	Observation	Administration

End of Suspension Goals

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

See PIP Contact

Parent Involvement Professional Development

See PIP Contact

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. **Health and Fitness Goal**	1. Kids leaving throughout the year 2. Children making healthy choices at school and unhealthy choices when not monitored at home.	3. Students will engage in the equivalent of one class period per day of physical education for one semester of each year in grades K through 5. 4. Implementing health into the classroom	1. PE Teacher Principal Guidance Counselors APC	1. Student schedules Master schedule	1. **Score on Healthy Fitness Zone Test**		
Health and Fitness Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. The number of students that will score in the "healthy fitness zone" on the Pacer for assessing aerobic activity and cardiovascular health will increase from 60% to 70%.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					

	60%	**70%**					
	2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	**2.** PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health	1.2. **2.** Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the school's H.E.A.R.T. team. *Schools can personalize this objective by listing initiatives that the HEART team will implement*	1.2. PE Teacher Principal Guidance Counselors APC	1.2. Student schedules Master schedule	1.2. **Score on Healthy Fitness Zone Test**	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Continuous Improvement Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	- PLCs do not always have a clear focus - PLCs not sure what they should be doing in the meetings. - Lack of teacher motivation	- Administration sitting on PLC's to address any concerns - Sideline chats to include time with administration to address additional concerns - PLC log templates will be created that include the SIP's goals. - PLCs will use the Action Steps of the Goals as a guide for PLC discussion and PLC work. - Resource teachers to assist in planning throughout the year - Professional Development trainings to assist in subject area knowledge - Change in faculty	- Administration - Team Members	- PLC pulse checks throughout the year. - Increase in score will show that teachers are building more trust in the level of rigor being presented in the classroom.	SCIP Survey results for the 2012-2013 school year		

		meetings to better target grade level needs					
Continuous Improvement Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. The percentage of **teachers** who strongly agree with the indicator that **"the teachers that I work with support effective instruction by providing a curriculum that is rigorous and relevant."** will increase from 17.1% to 34%.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	17%	**34%**					

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with

Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)c

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**

C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1. See Reading 1.1 See Subgroup ELL 1.1	1.1. See Reading 1.1 See Subgroup ELL 1.1	1.1. See Reading 1.1 See Subgroup ELL 1.1	1.1. See Reading 1.1 See Subgroup ELL 1.1	1.1. See Reading 1.1 See Subgroup ELL 1.1	
CELLA Goal #C: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grades K-5, the percentage of students scoring proficient in the listening/speaking section of CELLA will increase from 35% to 40%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: **35%**					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	

D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1. See Reading 2.1 See Subgroup ELL 2.1	2.1. See Reading 2.1 See Subgroup ELL 2.1	2.1. See Reading 2.1 See Subgroup ELL 2.1	2.1. See Reading 2.1 See Subgroup ELL 2.1	2.1. See Reading 2.1 See Subgroup ELL 2.1	

CELLA Goal #D: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grades K-5, the percentage of students scoring proficient in the reading section of CELLA will increase from 27% to 32%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : 27%.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	

E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1. See Reading 2.1 See Subgroup ELL 2.1	2.1. See Reading 2.1 See Subgroup ELL 2.1	2.1. See Reading 2.1 See Subgroup ELL 2.1	2.1. See Reading 2.1 See Subgroup ELL 2.1	2.1. See Reading 2.1 See Subgroup ELL 2.1	
CELLA Goal #E: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grades K-5, the percentage of students scoring proficient in the writing section of CELLA will increase from 21% to 26%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 21%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
STEM Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grades 3-4, the number of classes that will use the Spectrum Lab once every 5 weeks will increase from 2 classes to 9 classes in the 2012-2013 school year.	1.1. • Scheduling of classes to fit with science blocks. • Ensuring classes are able to attend all 5 days per session • Lack of confidence in using the lab	1.1. - Convenient scheduling posted on the door - Including make-up sessions each month for those missed - Training prior to Spectrum Lab usage for all 3rd and 4th grade teachers.	1.1. - Principal AP Team Leaders Spectrum Lab Leaders	1.1. - End of session assessments can be used to drive science instruction during the month.	1.1. • Pre and Post session assessments • Beginning and End of the Year 3rd-4th grade district science tests.
	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A
	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Spectrum Lab Training	3-4 Grades	Brocato and Thoms	Grade Level	October 2012	Usage of science lab	Brocato and Thoms

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

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

CTE Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. In grades K-5, the number of careers represented at Great American Teach-In will increase from 19 to 25.	1.1. ● Not enough speakers interested in joining the Great American Teach-In	1.1. - Begin advertising and recruiting well in advance - Make personal contacts to ensure the widest variety of careers has been represented.	1.1. - Who: Administration, Guidance Counselor and ESOL Resource Teacher How: Updated spreadsheet listing participating careers	1.1. - Keeping a tally of the careers represented and working to include more variety when necessary	1.1. -Great American Teach-In turn-out.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning

Community (PLC)
or PD Activity

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
Priority	Focus	Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

☐ Yes   No

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

Describe the use of SAC funds.			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount

This will be reflected in all major academic goals (including progress for Reading, Math, Science, and Writing), attendance goals, and the parental involvement plan.	The SAC Committee will use the initial funds to provide communication agendas for the upcoming 2013-2014 school year to assist with increasing communication between students, staff, and parents on academics, attendance, etc. This was voted on and unanimously approved by the SAC Committee	$1,849.50	$1,394.00
This will be reflected in all goals as it increases parental communication.	The SAC Committee will use the additional funds to purchase Parent Communication folders (Take Home Tuesday folders) for approximately 733 students. Any remaining need will be covered through the PTA. This was approved unanimously through the SAC committee on 2/13/13.	$455.50	$455.50
Final Amount Spent	$1849.50		