# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



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

**2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

# PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|---|---|
| School Name: Ferrell Girls Preparatory Academy | District Name: Hillsborough County |
| Principal: Karen French | Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia |
| SAC Chair: Ellen Truskowski | 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 | Karen French | BS in Education Behavior Disorders MA Ed. Ed. Leadership | 2 | 15 | 2012: C- at Ferrell Girls Preparatory Academy 2011: C- 72% AYP Met at Franklin Middle School 2010: C- 82% AYP Met at Franklin Middle School 2009: B-69% AYP met at Memorial Middle School 2008: A-85% AYP met at Burnett Middle |
| Assistant Principal | Cinzia Delange | Ed.D. Ed Leadership | 6 | 6 | 2012: C- at Ferrell Girls Preparatory Academy 2011: C-85% AYP Met at  Ferrell Middle 2010: C- 85% AYP Met at  Ferrell Middle 2009: C-85% AYP Met at  Ferrell Middle 2008: C-92% AYP Met at  Ferrell Middle |

| Assistant Principal | Carla White | BA- Business Education MA Ed. Ed. Leadership | 2 | 4 | 2012: C at Ferrell Girls Preparatory Academy<br>2011: C-72% AYP Met at Franklin Middle School<br>2010: C- 82% AYP met at Franklin Middle School<br>2009:C-74% AYP met at Franklin Middle School |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

## **Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches**

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

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | Rebecca Bodinski | English 6-12, Reading Endorsed ESOL Endorsed MA in Secondary English Ed. | 2 | 2 | 2012-C: at Ferrell Girls Preparatory Academy<br>2011-A- 74% AYP Met at Blake High School<br>2010-A- 74% AYP Met at Blake High School<br>2009-A- 82% AYP Met at Liberty Middle School<br>2008-A- 90% AYP Met at Liberty Middle School |
| Math | Jackie Cruse | BA Elem. Ed, MA Special Ed. Cert. Math 5-9, Spec. Ed K-12 | 2 | 6 | 2012-C: at Ferrell Girls Preparatory Academy<br>2011: C-72% of AYP Met at Franklin Middle School<br>2010: C- 82% of AYP Met at Franklin Middle School<br>2009: B-72% of AYP met at Buchanan Middle School<br>2008: B-77% of AYP met at Buchanan Middle School |
| Science | Cheryl Walters | BA Ed., MA Curriculum and Instruction, Cert. Middle Science (5-9) and Biology(6-12) | 2 | 4 | 2012-C: at Ferrell Girls Preparatory Academy<br>2011: C-72% of AYP Met at Franklin Middle School<br>2010: C- 82% of AYP Met at Franklin Middle School<br>Retired 2002, worked at Greco MS as SAL. Contributed to school moving from a C to an A in 2001-2002. Since joining Franklin fulltime in January 2010 she mentored and worked with various science departments throughout the district. |

## Highly Qualified Teachers

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Teacher Interview Day | District staff | June | |
| 2. Salary Differential (Renaissance Schools) | General of Federal Programs | ongoing | |
| 3. District Mentor Program | District Mentors | ongoing | |
| 4. District Peer Program | District Peers | ongoing | |
| 5. School-based teacher recognition system | Principal | ongoing | |
| 6. Opportunities for teacher leadership | Principal | ongoing | |

## Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly qualified. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| 3 | Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented. <br><br> **Administrators** <br> Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on: <br> • Completing classes need for certification <br><br> **Academic Coach** <br> • The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis <br><br> **Subject Area Leader/PLC** <br> • The teacher attends PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all. |

## Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Qualified Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | 2.9% | 38.2% | 32.3% | 26.4% | 52.9% | 97.1% | 20.5% | 11.7% | 26.5% |

## Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|---|---|---|---|
| Barb Miraglia | Julian Maguregui - First Year Teacher<br><br>Rachel Leder- Second Year Teacher | The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative.  The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement. | Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving. |
| Ellen Truskowski | Julian Maguregui | Ms. Truskowski is the Social Studies Subject Area Leader. | Bi-monthly co-planning in PLCs |
| Mandy Leathers | Rachel Leder | Ms. Leathers is the Language Arts Subject Area Leader. | Bi-monthly co-planning in PLCs |
| Rebecca Bodinski | Julian Maguregui<br><br>Rachel Leder | Ms. Bodinski is the school's reading coach. | On-going co-planning, modeling of lessons and observation with feedback. |

## Additional Requirements

# Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

| |
|---|
| **Title I, Part A**<br>Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school and summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors. |
| **Title I, Part C- Migrant**<br>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**<br>The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice. |
| **Title II**<br>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**<br>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**<br>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)**<br>SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs. |
| **Violence Prevention Programs**<br>NA |
| **Nutrition Programs**<br>NA |
| **Housing Programs**<br>N/A |
| **Head Start**<br>We utilize information from students in Head Start to transition into Kindergarten. |
| **Adult Education**<br>N/A |

| |
|---|
| **Career and Technical Education**<br>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**<br>Job training support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations |
| **Other**<br>NA |

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

| **School-Based MTSS/RtI Team** |
|---|
| Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.<br> The Leadership team includes:<br>• Principal<br>• Assistant Principal for Curriculum<br>• Assistant Principal for Administration<br>• Guidance Counselor<br>• School Psychologist<br>• Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative<br>• Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, Science),<br>• ESE teacher<br>• Subject Area Leaders<br>• House Leaders<br>• SAC Chair<br>• ELL Representative<br>(Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals and purpose 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?<br>The Leadership team meets regularly bi-weekly.  Specific responsibilities include:<br>• Oversee the multi-layered model of instructional delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)<br>• Create, manage and update the school resource map<br>• Ensure the master schedule incorporates allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels.<br>• Determine scheduling needs, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers2/3<br>• Facilitate the implementation of specific programs (e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school; Saturday Academies) that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/chats conducted by the PLCs. |

- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Organize and support systematic data collection
- Assist and monitor teacher use of SMART goals per unit of instruction.  Data will be collected and analyzed by House and Department  PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT.
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum)  instruction through the:
  o Implementation and support of PLCs
  o Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding. Data will be collected and analyzed by department PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT.
  o Use of Common Core Assessments by teachers teaching the same grade/subject area/course. Data will be collected and analyzed by department PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT.
  o Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions.
  o Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences.
- On a monthly basis, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the month by having a representative at each PLC.
- Support the planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs and Specialty PSLT.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) on core curriculum material.
- Coordinate/collaborate/integrate 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).

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

- The Chair of SAC is a member of the Leadership Team/PSLT.
- The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related 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 Leadership Team/PLST monitors the effectiveness of instruction and intervention by reviewing student data as well as data related to implementation fidelity (teacher walk-through data).
- The Leadership Team/PSLT communicates with and supports the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by distributing Leadership Team members across the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, the Leadership Team members who are part of the PLCs regularly report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger Leadership Team/PSLT.
- The Leadership Team/PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation  to:
  o Use the problem-solving model when analyzing data:
    1. What is the problem? (Problem Identification)
    2. Why is it occurring? (Problem Analysis and Barrier Identification)
    3. What are we going to do about it? (Action Plan Design and Implementation)
    4. Is it working? (Monitor Progress and Evaluate Action Plan Effectiveness)
  o Identify the problem (based on an analysis of the data disaggregated via data sorts) in multiple areas – curriculum content, behavior, and attendance
  o Develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers).
  o Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.

- o Identify appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at regular intervals matched to the intensity of the level of instructional/intervention support provided.
- o Develop grading period or units of instruction//intervention goals that are ambitious, time-bound, and measureable.
- o Review progress monitoring data at regular intervals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify intervention and/or enrichment support).
- o Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring.
- o Assess the implementation of the strategies on the SIP using the following questions:
    1. Does the data show implementation of strategies are resulting in positive student growth?
    2. To what extent are we making progress toward the school's SIP goals?
    3. If we are making progress, what can we do to sustain what is working?
    4. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?
    5. What should we do next?  What should be our plan of action?

| **MTSS Implementation** |
|---|

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

**Core Curriculum (Tier 1)**

| **Data Source** | **Database** | **Person (s) Responsible** |
|---|---|---|
| FCAT released tests | School Generated Excel Database | Reading Coach/Math Coach/Science Coach/ AP |
| Baseline and Midyear District Assessments | Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall | Leadership Team, PLCs,  individual teachers |
| District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability: Science and Math Formatives, Writing Baseline, Content Area Semester Exams, | Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall | Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers |
| Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science | Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall PLC Logs | Leadership Team,  PLCs, individual teachers |
| FAIR | Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall | Reading Coach/ Reading Resource Teacher |
| CELLA | Sagebrush (IPT) | ELL PSLT Representative |
| Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. | Ed-Line PLC Database PLC logs | Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/Leadership Team Member |
| DRA-2 | School Generated Excel Database | Individual Teacher |
| *Reports on Demand/Crystal Reports* | *District Generated Database* | *Leadership Team/Specialty PSLT* |

**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) All ELP offerings will have a pre- and post- test. | School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/ ELP Facilitator |
| Differentiated mini assessments based on core curriculum assessments. | Individual teacher data base PLC/Department data base | Individual Teachers/PLCs |
| FAIR OPM | School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/Reading Coach |
| Ongoing assessments within Intensive Courses | Database provided by course materials (for courses that have one), School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/PLC/Individual Teachers |
| Other Curriculum Based Measurement | School Generated Database in Excel | Leadership Team/PLCs/Individual Teachers |
| Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs | Assessments included in computer-based programs | PLCs/Individual Teachers |

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Leadership Team/will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District's RtI Committee/RtI Facilitators develop(s) resources and staff development trainings on PS/RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions, as identified by teacher needs assessment and/or EET evaluation data, will occur during faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. The Leadership Team will send school team representatives to ongoing PS/RtI trainings/support sessions that are offered district-wide. Our school will invite our area RtI Facilitator to visit as needed to review our progress in implementation of PS/RtI and provide on-site coaching and support to our Leadership Teams/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI as they become available.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

Response to Intervention (RtI) has also been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions. In order to support MTSS in our schools, we will:
- Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).
- Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.
- Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

| **School-Based Literacy Leadership Team** |
|---|
| Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).<br>The Literacy Leadership Team serves as the school's literacy Professional Learning Community.  The team is comprised of:<br>• 	Principal<br>• 	Assistant Principal for Curriculum<br>• 	Reading Coach<br>• 	Reading Teachers<br>• 	Media Specialist<br>• 	Teachers across content areas (Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies and Electives) who have demonstrated effective reading instruction as reflected through positive student reading gains<br>• 	Language Arts Subject Area Leader |
| Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).<br>The LLT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership Team.  The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading strategies goals and strategies identified on the SIP.<br><br>The principal is the LLT chairperson.  The reading coach is a member of the team and provides extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions.  The reading coach and principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instructional support is provided to all teachers.<br><br>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?<br>• 	Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading goals/strategies across the content areas<br>• 	Professional Development<br>• 	Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas<br>• 	Data analysis (on-going)<br>• 	Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan |

### NCLB Public School Choice

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

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

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

| |
|---|
| Project CRISS, Level 1 training, which is a 12 hour initial training, is offered annually by the reading coach at each school site through district-provided training.  Mandatory follow-up is provided at the school site by the reading coach.  Complementing the Project CRISS initiative is the inclusion of close reading lessons in the ELA, reading, and content area classrooms.<br><br>The reading coach is required as a part of his/her job description to provide on-site support of the implementation of the Project CRISS Strategic Lesson Plan |

model  and the design and delivery of close reading lessons through professional development opportunities, as well as, coaching opportunities.  A yearly action plan is created by the reading coach that outlines what Project CRISS and close reading model lesson professional development will be offered.  A monthly written update allows the reading supervisor to monitor the progress of each coach's action plan.

Content-specific (mathematics, social studies, science and language arts) Project CRISS close reading model lesson follow-up trainings are offered on request at school sites and as district-offered trainings throughout the school year.

Demonstration classroom opportunities focusing on the implementation of content-based literacy strategies are mandated by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan at each site.  The reading coach is responsible for scheduling and facilitating pre-observation, during observation, and post-observation activities and discussion.

A Reading Leadership Team is mandated by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan at each site.  The principal is the chairperson of the committee and the reading coach is an integral member, guiding the data review, creation of an action plan, progress monitoring of the plan and evaluation of the plan each school year.  The RLT should have representation from each content area and is responsible for reporting back to the school their findings and instructional decisions.

Each PLC is responsible for reviewing their students' literacy data and creating lessons that are responsive to identified student needs.  PLCs are responsible for the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model (Plan-Do-Check-Act) with their core curriculum and acting on the data by providing additional instruction where needed.  Common assessments on chapter tests are used to identify effective reading strategies and guide instruction for re-teach or enrichment.

Reading coaches are responsible for assisting content teachers with the integration of differentiated instruction strategies into their content area classrooms.

All costs incurred for reading professional development at the school sites (stipends, consultant contracts, substitutes, materials) are paid for by the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan funds.

# 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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>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).**<br><br>Reading Goal #1:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 48% to 51%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**48%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**51%** | 1.1.<br>-Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13.<br>-Training all content area teachers | 1.1.<br>**Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas**<br>Reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in grappling with complex text. Teachers need to understand how to select/identify complex text, shift the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and share complex texts with all students. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans. | 1.1.<br>Who<br>-Principal<br>-AP<br>-Instruction Coaches<br>-Subject Area Leaders<br>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses<br><br>How<br>-Reading PLC Logs<br>-Language Arts PLC Logs<br>-Social Studies PLC Logs<br>-Elective PLC Logs<br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.<br>-Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion.<br>-Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a | 1.1.<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership | 1.1.<br>3x per year<br>- FAIR<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks) |

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

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

| | | | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | on grade level/content area PLC action plans. | -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation. | Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4 | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Reading Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 23 % to 26%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* **23%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **26%** | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.** | | | 3.1. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, | 3.1. **Strategy** Student achievement improves through **teachers working collaboratively** to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act** | 3.1. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or | 3.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team. | 3.1. 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, |
| Reading Goal #3: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* **65** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **67** | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log. | model and log to structure their way of work.  Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:<br>1.  What is it we expect them to learn?<br>2.  How will we if they have learned it?<br>3.  How will we respond if they don't learn?<br>4.  How will we respond if they already know it?<br><br>**Actions/Details**<br>-Grade level/like-course PLCs use a **Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log** to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log.<br>-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans. | like courses<br><br><u>How</u><br>PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.<br>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs.<br>-Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings<br>-Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team<br>-Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis. | | section, end of unit) |
| | | | 3.2.<br>-Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is | 3.2.<br>**Strategy/Task**<br>Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to **differentiate instruction**.<br><br>**Actions/Details** | 3.2.<br><u>Who</u><br>-Principal<br>-AP<br>-Instruction Coaches<br>-Subject Area Leaders<br>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or | 3.2.<br><u>Teacher Level</u><br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. | 3.2.<br><u>3x per year</u><br> FAIR<br><br><br><u>During the Grading Period</u><br> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, |

| | | presented.<br>-Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies.<br>-Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc. | ***Within PLCs <u>Before</u> Instruction and <u>During</u> Instruction of New Content***<br>**-**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.<br>***In the classroom***<br>-During the lessons, **students** are involved in flexible grouping techniques<br>***PLCs <u>After</u> Instruction***<br>-Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons.<br>-Teachers use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation.<br>-Teachers, using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided.<br>-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLCs. | like courses<br><br><u>How</u><br>-PLC logs turned into administration, SAL and/or coaches.<br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.<br>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs.<br>-Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings<br>-Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team.<br>-Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. | -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal.<br><u>PLC Level</u><br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.<br><u>Leadership Team Level</u><br>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | section, end of unit) |

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

| | | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3..3. | 3.3. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **4. FCAT 2.0:** **Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.** | | | 4.1. -Scheduling time for the principal/APC to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis. -Teachers willingness to accept support from the coach. | 4.1. **Strategy Across all Content Areas** **Strategy/Task** Student achievement improves through **teachers' collaboration with the academic coach** in all content areas. **Actions/Details** *Academic Coach* -The academic coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the teacher's student past and/or present data. -The academic coach rotates through all subjects' PLCs to: --Facilitate lesson planning that embeds rigorous tasks --Facilitate development, writing, selection of higher-order, text-dependent questions/activities, with an emphasis on Webb's Depth of Knowledge question hierarchy --Facilitate the | 4.1. Who Administration How- -Review of coach's log -Review of coach's log of support to targeted teachers. -Administrative walk-throughs of coaches working with teachers (either in classrooms, PLCs or planning sessions) | 4.1. -Tracking of coach's participation in PLCs. -Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, de-debriefing, professional development, and walk throughs) -Administrator-Instructional Coach meetings to review log and discuss action plan for coach for the upcoming two weeks | 4.1. 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) |
| Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 62 points to 65 points | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* **62** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **65** | | | | | |

| | | | | identification, selection, development of rigorous core curriculum common assessments | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | --Facilitate core curriculum assessment data analysis | | | |
| | | | | --Facilitate the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students. | | | |
| | | | | -Using walk-through data, the academic coach and administration identify teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing. | | | |
| | | | | -The academic coach trains each subject area PLC on how to facilitate their own PLC using structured protocols. | | | |
| | | | | -Throughout the school year, the academic coach/administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This data is used for future professional development, both individually and as a department. | | | |
| | | | | *Leadership Team and Coach* | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | -The academic coach meets with the principal/APC to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year.<br>-Every two weeks, the academic coach meets with the principal/APC to:<br>--Review log and work accomplished and<br>--Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks. | | | |
| | | | 4.2<br>-The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis.<br>-Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP.<br>-Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers. | 4.2<br><u>Strategy</u><br>Students' reading comprehension improves through receiving **ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills** that are not at the mastery level.<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>-Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered.<br>-ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level.<br>-Students attend ELP sessions.<br>-Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a | 4.2<br><u>Who</u><br>Administrators<br><br><u>How Monitored</u><br>Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation. | 4.2<br>Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students. | 4.2<br>Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM)<br>*(From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)* |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher. -When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program. | | | |
| | | 4.3 | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target | | **2011-2012** | **2012-2013** | **2013-2014** | **2014-2015** | **2015-2016** / **2016-2017** |
| **5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** Reading Goal #5: **Data for this goal can be found on The Office of Assessment's SIP Evaluation and Development Report** | | | **Information on how to fill out this section/row is forthcoming from the state.** | | | |
| **5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | 5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | 5A.1. See Goals 1, 3, & 4 | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. |

Reading Goal #5A:

The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from ___% to ____%.

The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will

| 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* |
|---|---|
| White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5A.2. | 5A.2 | 5A.2 | 5A.2 | 5A.2 |

| increase from ___% to ____%. | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. |
| Reading Goal #5B: . | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. |
| | | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | 5C.1 -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority. -The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy.  To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development | 5C.1 ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/standard improves through participation in the **Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)** strategy across Reading, Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science. | 5C.1 Who -School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -Reading Coach How -Administrative walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from: The CALLA Handbook, p. 101, | 5C.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs | 5C.1 -FAIR -CELLA During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of  core common unit/ segment tests  with data aggregated for ELL performance |
| Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from % to  %. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | | | | delivered by the school's bilingual aide, Guidance Counselor or APC. -Teachers implementation of CALLA is not consistent across core courses. -ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of CALLA/ in order to effectively conduct a CALLA fidelity check walk-through. | **Action Steps** -Bilingual aide or district personnel provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons. -Lead teacher or reading coach models lessons using CALLA. -Bilingual aide observes content area teachers using CALLA and provides feedback, coaching and support. -District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of CALLA. -Core content teachers set SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming core curriculum assessments. -Core content teachers administer and analyze ELLs performance on assessments. -Teachers aggregate data to determine the performance of ELLs compared to the whole group. -Based on data core content teachers will differentiate instruction to remediate/enhance instruction. | Table 5.4 "Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction. | calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -Bilingual aide meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -Bilingual aide meets with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) | |

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

| | | | | | instruction.<br>-Reading Coach and Bilingual Aide meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 5C.3<br>-Lack of understanding teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing.<br>-Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing support.<br>-Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on number of ELLs.<br>-Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL guidelines and job responsibilities of Bilingual paraprofessional. | 5C.3<br>ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves through participation in the following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across Reading, LA, Math, Science, and Social Studies:<br>1. Extended time (lesson and assessments)<br>2. Small group testing<br>3. Para support (lesson and assessments)<br>4. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments) | 5C.3<br>Who<br>-School based Administrators<br>-Guidance Counselor<br>-Bilingual Aide<br><br>How<br>-Administrative and Reading Coach walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms | 5C.3<br>Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students. | 5C.3<br><u>During the Grading Period</u><br>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests |
| | | 5C.4<br>-Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority.<br>-Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the | 5C.4<br>ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through teachers working | 5C.4<br>Who<br>-School based Administrators<br>-Reading Coach<br>-Bilingual Aide<br>-PLC Facilitators<br><br>How<br>PLC logs (with | 5C.4<br><u>Teacher Level</u><br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their | 5C.4<br>-FAIR<br>-CELLA<br><br><u>During the Grading Period</u><br>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for |

| | | ELL level. | collaboratively to focus on ELL student learning. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act model** to structure their way of work for ELL students.<br><br>Action Steps<br>-Teachers analyze CELLA data to identify ELL students who need assistance in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing.<br>-Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL effective teaching strategies (CALLA and A+ Rise) in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing.<br>-Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL Differentiated Instruction lessons using the district provided ELL Differentiated Instruction binders (provided by the ELL Department) in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies.<br>-PLCs generate SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming units of instruction.<br>-PLCs/teachers plan for upcoming lessons/units | specific ELL information) for like courses/grades. | PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.<br><ins>PLC Level</ins><br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-Bilingual aide meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data.<br>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal.<br><ins>Leadership Team Level</ins><br>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.<br>-Bilingual aide, reading coach meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) | ELL performance |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | using targeted CALLA and A+ Rise strategies and Differentiated Instruction strategies based on ELLs needs in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing.<br>-PLCs/teachers plan for accommodations for core curriculum content and assessment.<br>-When conducting data analysis on core curriculum assessments, PLCs aggregate the ELL data.<br>-Based on the data, PLCs/teachers plan interventions for targeted ELL students using the resources from CALLA, A+ Rise, and Differentiated instruction binders. | | | |
| 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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |

| Based on the analysis... | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check | Strategy Data Check | Student Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | 5D.1.<br>-Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher.  To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for | 5D.1.<br>**Strategy**<br>SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations.<br>-Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to | 5D.1.<br>Who<br>Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal ESE Specialist<br><br>How<br>IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC | 5D.1.<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level | 5D.1.<br>-FAIR<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>-Core curriculum end of  core common unit/ segment tests  with data aggregated for SWD performance |

| Reading Goal #5D: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* |
|---|---|---|
| The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from  % to  %. | | |

| | | | this school year. | ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity.<br>-Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons. | | -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.<br><u>Leadership Team Level</u><br>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 5D.2.<br>-Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority.<br>-Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level.<br>-General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time. | 5D.2.<br>**Strategy/Task**<br>SWD student achievement improves through **teachers' implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model** in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications.<br><br>**Actions**<br>*Plan*<br>For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: | 5D.2<br><u>Who</u><br>-School based Administrators<br>-PLC Facilitators<br><br><u>How</u><br>PLC logs (with specific SWD information) for like courses/grades. | 5D.2<br><u>Teacher Level</u><br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal.<br><u>PLC Level</u><br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. | 5D.2<br>-FAIR<br><br><u>During the Grading Period</u><br>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance |

| | | | | -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit?<br>-What are standards that our SWD need to learn?<br>-How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD?<br>-What does mastery look like?<br>-What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD?<br><br>***Plan for the "Do"***<br>What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal?<br>-What resources do we need?<br>-How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD?<br>-What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our SWD?<br>-What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help SWD learn?<br>-Specifically how will we implement the specific strategy during the lesson?<br>-What are teachers going to do during the lesson for SWD?<br>-What are SWD going to do during the lesson to maximize learning? | | -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal.<br><u>Leadership Team Level</u><br>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SWD SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | ***Reflect on the "Do"/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work <u>during</u> the unit.*** For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers **reflect** and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD: <br>-What worked within the lesson?  How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? <br>-What didn't work within the lesson? Why?  What are we going to do next? <br>-For the implementation of the predetermined strategy, what worked? How do we know it was successful?  Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons? <br>-For the implementation of the predetermined strategy, what didn't work?  Why?  What are we going to do next? <br>-What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding? And/or analysis of student performance? <br>-How do we take what | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | we have learned and apply it to future lessons?<br><br>***Reflect/Check – Analyze Data***<br>Discuss one or more of the following:<br>-What is the SWD data?<br>-What is the data telling us as individual teachers?<br>-What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department?<br>-What are SWD not learning?  Why is this occurring?<br>-Which SWD are learning?<br><br>**Act on the Data**<br>After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data.<br>-What are we going to do about SWD not learning?<br>-What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions (either to individual SWD or small groups)?<br>-How are we going to re-teach the skill differently?<br>-How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working? | | | |
| | | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 |

**Reading Professional Development**

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Differentiated Instruction | 6-8 | -Subject Area Leaders -Course specific PLC Facilitators -Reading Coach | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | -On-going -Demonstration classrooms | Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations | Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders |
| The 3 S's of Complex Text: Selecting /Identifying Complex Text, Shifting to Increased Use of Informational Text, and Sharing of Complex Text with All Students (K-12) | Grades 6-8 | Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders |
| Identifying and Creating Text-Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension (K-12) | Grades 6-8 | Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders |

| Designing and Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning (K-12) | Grades 6-8 | Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders |
| IEP Training | 6-8 | ESE Teachers | ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs | On-going | Case Manager | ESE Specialist |
| SWD Co-Teaching | 6-8 | DRT | ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team DRT |
| ELL Strategies | 6-8 | English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT) | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team |

*End of Reading Goals*

## 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. Lack of infrastructure to support technology -Lack of | 1.1. **Strategy** Students' math achievements improves through the use of | 1.1. Who - Principal -Math DH/SAL -Technology | 1.1. PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students | 1.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing |
| Mathematics Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*    2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 41% to 44%. | **41%** | **44%** | technology hardware<br>-Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS | **technology and hands-on activities** to implement the Common Core State Standards. In addition, student practice taking on-line assessments to prepare students for on-line state testing.<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>-PLCs use their core curriculum information to learn more about hands-on and technology activities.<br>-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans. | Specialist<br>-Math Coach<br>-Math Resource Teacher<br><br>How Monitored<br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.<br>-PLCs receive feedback on their logs.<br>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.<br>-Administrator and coach aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation | reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends. | Semester Exams<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>-Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.) |
| | | | 1.2.<br>Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques.<br>-PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.<br>-Finding time to conduct Webb's Depth of Knowledge walk-throughs is sometimes | 1.2.<br>**Strategy/Task**<br>Students math achievement improves through frequent participation in higher order questions/discussion activities to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality questions/prompts and discussion techniques promotes thinking by students, assisting them to arrive at new understandings of | 1.2.<br>**Who**<br>-Principal<br>-Math DH/SAL<br>-Technology Specialist<br>-Math Coach<br>-Math Resource Teacher<br><br>How Monitored<br>-PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.<br>-PLCs receive feedback on their | 1.2.<br>PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends. | 1.2.<br>2x per year<br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br><br>Semester Exams<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>-Core Curriculum Assessments<br>(pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.) |

| | | challenging. | complex material.<br><br>**Actions/Details**<br>*Within PLCs*<br>-Teachers work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively use higher order questions/activities.<br>-Teachers plan higher order questions/activities for upcoming lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement.<br>-Teachers plan for scaffolding questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students.<br>-After the lessons, teachers examine student work samples and classroom questions using Webb's Depth of Knowledge to evaluate the sophistication/complexity of students' thinking.<br>-Use student data to identify successful higher order questioning techniques for future implementation.<br><br>*In the classroom*<br><u>During the lessons, **teachers**</u>:<br>-Ask questions and/or provides activities that | Logs.<br>-Classroom walk-throughs using Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel as a higher order walk-through form.   They look for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency<br>-Administrator and coach aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | require students to engage in frequent higher order thinking as defined by Webb's Depth of Knowledge.<br>-Wait for full attention from the class before asking questions.<br>-Provide students with wait time.<br>-Use probing questions to encourage students to elaborate and support assertions and claims drawn from the text/content.<br>-Allow students to "unpack their thinking" by describing how they arrive at an answer.<br>-Encourage discussion by using open-ended questions.<br>-Ask questions with multiple correct answers or multiple approaches.<br>-Scaffold questions to help students with incorrect answers.<br>-Engage all students in the discussion and ensure that all voices are heard.<br><br>During the lessons, students:<br>-Have opportunities to formulate many of the high-level questions based on the text/content.<br>-Have time to reflect on | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | classroom discussion to increase their understanding (and without teacher mediation).<br><br>School Leadership<br>-The coach/resource teacher/PLC member/administrator collects higher order questioning walk-through data using Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel.<br>-Monthly, school leaders conduct one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools.   This teacher data/chats guides the leadership's team professional development plan (both individually and whole faculty) | | | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.** | | 2.1. | 2.1.<br><br># See Goals 1, 3 & 4 | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #2:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from   14% to   17%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**14%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**17%** | | | | | |

|  |  | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
|  |  | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.** Mathematics Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 59 points to 61 points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* **59** / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **61** | 3.1. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log. | 3.1. **Strategy** Students' math achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? Actions/Details -This year, the like-course PLCs will administer common end-of-chapter assessments. The assessments will be | 3.1 Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis. . | 3.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team. | 3.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) |

| | | | identified/generated prior to the teaching of the unit. <br> -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log. <br> -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 3.2. <br> Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. <br> -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. <br> -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc. | 3.2. <br> **Strategy/Task** <br> Students' math achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction. <br><br> **Actions/Details** <br> Within PLCs <u>Before</u> Instruction and <u>During</u> Instruction of New Content <br> -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. <br> **In the classroom** <br> -During the lessons, students are involved in flexible grouping | 3.2. <u>Who</u> <br> -Principal <br> -AP <br> -Instruction Coaches <br> -Subject Area Leaders <br> -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses <br><br> <u>How</u> | 3.2. <br> <u>Teacher Level</u> <br> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <br> -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. <br> -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. <br> <u>PLC Level</u> <br> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. <br> -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. <br> - For each class/course, | 3.2. <br> <u>2x per year</u> <br> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing <br><br> Semester Exams <br><br> <u>During the Grading Period</u> <br> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) |

| | | | techniques<br>**PLCs After Instruction**<br>-Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons.<br>-Use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation.<br>-Using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided.<br>-Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLCs. | | PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.<br>Leadership Team Level<br>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3..3. | 3.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>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.<br><br>-Scheduling time for the principal/APC to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis.<br>-Teachers willingness to accept support from the coach. | 4.1.<br>**Strategy Across all Content Areas**<br><br>**Strategy/Task**<br>Students' math achievement improves through **teachers' collaboration with the academic coach** in all content areas.<br><br>**Actions/Details**<br>*Academic Coach* | 4.1.<br>Who<br>Administration<br><br>How<br>-Review of coach's log<br>-Review of coach's log of support to targeted teachers.<br>-Administrative walk-throughs of coaches working with teachers (either in | 4.1.<br>Tracking of coach's participation in PLCs.<br>-Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, de-debriefing, professional development, and walk throughs.<br>-Administrator-Instructional Coach meetings to review log and discuss action plan | 4.1.<br>2x per year<br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br><br>Semester Exams<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>- Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) |
| Mathematics Goal #4:<br><br>Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 54 points to  56   points. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**54** | **56** | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | -The academic coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the teacher's student past and/or present data.<br>-The academic coach rotates through all subjects' PLCs to:<br>--Facilitate lesson planning that embeds rigorous tasks<br>--Facilitate development, writing, selection of higher-order , text-dependent questions/activities, with an emphasis on Webb's Depth of Knowledge question hierarchy<br>--Facilitate the identification, selection, development of rigorous core curriculum common assessments,<br>--Facilitate core curriculum assessment data analysis<br>--Facilitate the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students<br>-Using walk-through data, the academic coach and administration identify teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing | classrooms, PLCs or planning sessions) | for coach for the upcoming two weeks. | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | and debriefing.<br>-The academic coach trains each subject area PLC on how to facilitate their own PLC using structured protocols.<br>-Throughout the school year, the academic coach/administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This data is used for future professional development, both individually and as a department.<br><br>***Leadership Team and Coach***<br>-The academic coach meets with the principal/APC to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year.<br>-Every two weeks, the academic coach meets with the principal/APC to:<br>--Review log and work accomplished<br>--Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks. | | | |
| | | | 4.2<br>The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the | 4.2.<br>Strategy<br>Students' math achievement improves | 4.2.<br>Who<br>Administrators | 4.2.<br>Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers | 4.2.<br>Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) |

| | | specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis.<br>-Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP.<br>-Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers. | through receiving ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills that are not at the mastery level.<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>-Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered.<br>-ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level.<br>- Students attend ELP sessions.<br>- Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher.<br>-When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program. | How Monitored<br>Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation. | who have students. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 4.3 | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>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**

| 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%.** | | | | **Information on how to fill out this row is forthcoming from the state.** | | | | |
| Math Goal #5:<br>**Data for this goal can be found on The Office of Assessment's SIP Evaluation and Development Report** | | | | | | | | |
| **5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics** | | | 5A.1.<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | 5A.1.<br><br>**See goals 1, 3 & 4** | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | |
| Math Goal #5A:<br><br>The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from ___% to ___%.<br><br>The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from ___% to ___%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | | | | | | |
| | | | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | 5A.2. | |
| | | | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | 5A.3. | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>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. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | |
| Mathematics Goal #5B:<br><br>Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. |
| | | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | | 5C.1. -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority. -The majority of the math teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's Math Coach -Math teachers implementation of CALLA is not consistent across math courses. -ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and | 5C.1. ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/standard improves through participation in the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) strategy in math. **Action Steps** -Math Coach and bilingual aide provide professional development to all math area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons. -Math Coach models lessons using CALLA. -Bilingual aide observes content area teachers using CALLA and provides feedback, | 5C.1. Who -School based Administrators -Math Coach -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and Math Coach walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from: The CALLA Handbook, p. 101, Table 5.4 "Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction | 5C.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -Bilingual aide meets with Math PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. | 5C.1. 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) |
| Mathematics Goal #5C: . The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from % to %. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | acculturation is not consistent across core courses. <br>-Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of CALLA/ in order to effectively conduct a CALLA fidelity check walk-through. | coaching and support. <br>-District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of CALLA. <br>-Math teachers set SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming core curriculum assessments. <br>-Math teachers administer and analyze ELLs.  In particular, teachers aggregate data to determine the performance of ELLs compared to the whole group. <br>-Based on data math teachers differentiate instruction to remediate/enhance instruction. | | -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. <br><u>Leadership Team Level</u> <br>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. <br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. <br>-Math Coach meets with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) | |
| | | | 5C.2. <br>-Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority. <br>-The majority of the math teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy.  To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's Math | 5C.2. <br>ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards increases in math through the use of the district's on-line program **A+Rise** located on IDEAS under Programs for ELL. <br><br>**Action Steps** <br>-Math Coach provides professional development to all math area teachers on | 5C.2. <br><u>Who</u> <br>-School based Administrators <br>-District Resource Teachers <br>-Math Coach <br><br><u>How</u> <br>-Administrative and Math Coach walk-throughs looking for implementation of A+ Rise strategies. | 5C.2 <br><u>Teacher Level</u> <br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. <br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. <br><u>PLC Level</u> <br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all | 5C.2 <br><u>2x per year</u> <br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing <br><br><u>Semester Exams</u> <br><br><u>During the Grading Period</u> <br>-Core curriculum end of  core common unit/ segment tests  with data aggregated for ELL performance |

| | | Coach.<br>-Math teachers implementation of A+ Rise is not consistent across core courses.<br>-Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of A+ Rise in order to effectively conduct an A+ Rise fidelity check walk-through. | how to access and use A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs at http://arises2s.com/s2s/ into math lessons.<br>- Math Coach models lessons using A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs.<br>- Blingual aide observes content area teachers using A+Rise and provides feedback, coaching and support.<br>- District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs. | | classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-ERTs meet with Math PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data.<br>-For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal.<br><u>Leadership Team Level</u><br>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.<br>-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.<br>-Math Coach meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) | |
| | | 5C.3<br>-Lack of understanding that math teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing.<br>-Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing heritage language support. | 5C.3<br>ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves through participation in the following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments in math:<br>-Extended time (lesson and assessments) | 5C.3<br><u>Who</u><br>-School based Administrators<br>-ESOL Resource Teachers<br><br><u>How</u><br>-Administrative and Math Coach walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting | 5C.3<br>Analyze math core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students. | 5C.3<br><u>2x per year</u><br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br><br>Semester Exams<br><br><u>During the Grading Period</u><br>-Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | -Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on membership of ELLs.<br>-Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL Program guidelines and job responsibilities of Bilingual paraprofessional. | -Small group testing<br>-Para support (lesson and assessments)<br>-Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments) | Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist  can be used as walk-through forms | | |
| | | 5C.4<br>-Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority.<br>-Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the ELL level. | 5C.4<br>ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves in math through teachers working collaboratively to focus on ELL student learning.  Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act model to structure their way of work for ELL students.**<br><br>Action Steps<br>-Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL effective teaching strategies (CALLA and A+ Rise) in order to integrate them into the math lessons.<br>-Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL Differentiated | 5C.4<br>Who<br>-School based Administrators<br>-Math Coach<br>-PLC Facilitators<br><br>How<br>PLC logs (with specific ELL information) for like courses/grades. | 5C.4<br>Teacher Level<br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal.<br>PLC Level<br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>-Bilingual aide meet with Math PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data.<br>- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall | 5C.4<br>2x per year<br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br><br>Semester Exams<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>-Core curriculum end of  core common unit/ segment tests  with data aggregated for ELL performance |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Instruction lessons using the district provided ELL Differentiated Instruction binders (provided by the ELL Department) in math. -PLCs generate SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs/teachers plan for upcoming lessons/units using targeted CALLA, A+ Rise strategies and Differentiated Instruction strategies based on ELLs needs. -PLCs math teachers plan for accommodations for core curriculum content and assessment. -When conducting data analysis on core curriculum assessments, PLCs aggregate the ELL data. -Based on the data, PLCs/teachers plan interventions for targeted ELL students using the resources from CALLA, A+ Rise, and Differentiated Instruction binders. | progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | **Anticipated Barrier** | | | | |
| **5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | 5D.1. | 5D.1. **Strategy** | 5D.1. <u>Who</u> | 5D.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> | 5D.1 <u>2x per year</u> |

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

| Mathematics Goal #5D: . The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from % to %. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year. | SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons. | Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal  How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC | -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  Semester Exams  During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 5D.2. -Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling | 5D.2. **Strategy/Task** SWD student achievement improves through teachers' implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act | 5D.2. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders | 5D.2. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SWD SMART goal outcomes to administration, | 5D.2. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period of SWD SMART goal outcomes to administration, |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | down their core assessments to the SWD level.<br>-General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time. | model in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications.<br><br>**Actions**<br>*Plan*<br>For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following:<br>-What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit?<br>-What are standards that our SWD need to learn?<br>-How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD?<br>-What does mastery look like?<br>-What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD?<br><br>***Plan for the "Do"***<br>What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal?<br>-What resources do we need?<br>-How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD?<br>-What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our SWD?<br>-What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to | -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses<br><br>How<br>-PLC logs turned into administration/coaches.<br>Administration/coaches provides feedback<br>-Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings<br>-Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team | coach, SAL, and/or leadership team. | coach, SAL, and/or leadership team. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | help SWD learn?<br>-Specifically how will we implement the _____strategy during the lesson?<br>-What are teachers going to do during the lesson for SWD?<br>-What are SWD student going to do during the lesson to maximize learning?<br><br>***Reflect on the "Do"/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work <u>during</u> the unit.***<br>For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers **<u>reflect</u>** and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD:<br>-What worked within the lesson?  How do we know it was successful?  Why was it successful?<br>-What didn't work within the lesson?  Why?  What are we going to do next?<br>-For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what worked?  How do we know it was successful?  Why was it successful?  What checks for understanding were used during the lessons?<br>-For the | | | |

|  |  |  | implementation of the ____ strategy, what didn't work? Why? What are we going to do next? <br>-What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding? And/or analysis of student performance? <br>-How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons? <br><br>***Reflect/Check – Analyze Data*** <br>Discuss one or more of the following: <br>-What is the SWD data? <br>-What is the data telling us as individual teachers? <br>-What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department? <br>-What are SWD not learning? Why is this occurring? <br>-Which SWD are learning? <br><br>**Act on the Data** <br>After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data. <br>-What are we going to do about SWD not learning? <br>-What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions |  |  |  |

| | | | (either to individual SWD or small groups)? -How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? -How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working? | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 | 5D.3 |

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

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

| Algebra EOC 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** |
| **Alg1. Students scoring proficient in Algebra (Levels 3-5).** <br><br> Algebra Goal #1: <br><br> The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 Algebra EOC will increase from 68% to 71%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <br><br> **68%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <br><br> **71%** | 1.1. | 1.1. **See Goals 1, 2, 4 & 5** | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| 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** |
| **Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. **See** | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |

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

| Algebra Goal #2: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | **Goals 1, 2, 4 & 5** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 Algebra EOC will increase from 20 % to 23 %. | **20%** | **23%** | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

*End of Algebra EOC Goals*

## Mathematics Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Differentiated Instruction | 6-8 | -Math SAL/Coach | Math Departmental and course-specific PLCs | PLC Meetings every two weeks | Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation | Administration Team |
| Analyzing first semester exams | 6-8 | -Math SAL/Coach | Math Departmental and course-specific PLCs | After the administration of the test | PLC logs | APC |
| IEP Training | 6-8 | ESE Teachers | ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs | On-going | Case Manager | ESE Specialist |
| SWD Co-Teaching | 6-8 | DRT | ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team DRT |
| ELL Strategies | 6-8 | English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT) | All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs | On-going | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration Team |

*End of Mathematics Goals*

## **Middle School Science Goals**

| Science Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.** | | | 1.1.  -Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model. -Lack of common planning time to facilitate and hold PLCs for like courses | 1.1. Students' science skills will improve through participation in the **5E instructional model.**  **Action Steps** Teachers will create or use 5 E Instructional Models created by master teachers in Hillsborough County and other sources. This information will be shared with their PLCs. -PLCs write SMART goals based for units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively with peers or science coach building a 5E Instructional Model for upcoming lessons. -PLC teachers instruct students using the 5E Instructional Model. -At the end of the unit, | 1.1. <u>Who</u> Principal APC Science Coach (where available) Science SAL  <u>How Monitored</u> -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. | 1.1. Teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plan to drive future instruction.  <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall | 1.1.  <u>2x per year</u> District-level baseline and mid-year tests  Semester Exams  <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc.) |
| Science Goal #1:  The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 30 % to 33 %. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*  **30%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*  **33%** | | | | | |

| | | | | | | progress towards the SMART Goal.<br><u>Leadership Team Level</u><br>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1.2.<br>-PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log. | 1.2.<br><u>Strategy</u><br>Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning using the 5E Instructional Model. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:<br>1. What is it we expect them to learn?<br>2. How will we know if they have learned it?<br>3. How will we respond if they don't learn?<br>4. How will we respond if they already know it?<br><br><u>Actions/Details</u><br>*Within PLCs:*<br>-PLCs will use a PLC log to monitor the following:<br>--Guide their Plan-Do- | 1.2. <u>Who</u><br>-Principal<br>-AP<br>-Science Coaches<br>-Subject Area Leaders<br>-PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses<br><br><u>How</u><br>-PLC logs turned into administration/coaches provides feedback<br>-Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings<br>-Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team<br>-Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis. | 1.2.<br>School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team. | 1.2.<br><u>2x per year</u><br>District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing<br><br>Semester Exams<br><br><u>During the Grading Period</u><br>Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) |

| | | | Check-Act conversations and way of work. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | --Monitor the frequency of meetings. All grade level/subject area PLCs collaborate at least two times per month for curriculum planning, reflection, and data analysis.) | | | |
| | | | -Working with the core curriculum, within grade level PLCs teachers will: | | | |
| | | | --Unpack the benchmark and identify what students need to understand, know, and do. | | | |
| | | | --Plan for checks for understanding during the unit. | | | |
| | | | --Plan for the End-of-Unit Assessment | | | |
| | | | --Plan upcoming lessons/units using the 5E Instructional Model. | | | |
| | | | --Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught | | | |
| | | | --Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments. | | | |
| | | | --Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group. | | | |
| | | | -PLCs will generate SMART goals for upcoming units of instruction. | | | |
| | | | -PLCs will report SMART goal data through their | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | logs.<br>As a Science Department<br>-PLC, share action plan successes and challenges of the grade levels courses.<br>-PLCs will adjust action plans based on teacher/coach walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data. | | | |
| | | 1.3<br>-Teachers are at varying skill levels in using appropriate instructional, scientific and laboratory technology (computer lab simulations (GIZMOS), digital probeware/ graphing technology (SPARKS), probeware, electronic devices, and iPad science apps Administrators are at varying skill levels in using appropriate instructional, scientific and laboratory technology (computer lab simulations (GIZMOS), digital probeware/ graphing technology (SPARKS), probeware, electronic devices, and iPad science apps) | 1.3<br>**Strategy**<br>Student understanding of the nature of science and scientific inquiry improves when students are intellectually active in learning important and challenging science content through the use of appropriate instructional methods, scientific processes, laboratory experiences, and uses of technology (computer lab simulations (GIZMOS), digital probeware/ graphing technology (SPARKS), probeware, electronic devices, and iPad science apps<br><br>**Action Steps**<br>-As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling | 1.3<br><u>Who</u><br>Principal<br>APC<br>Science Coach<br>Science SAL<br><br><u>How Monitored</u><br>-Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. | 1.3<br><u>Teacher Level</u><br>-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.<br>-Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.<br><u>PLC Level</u><br>-Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.<br>-PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.<br>- For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.<br><u>Leadership Team Level</u><br>-PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. | 1.3.<u>2x per year</u><br>District-level baseline and mid-year tests<br><br>Semester Exams<br><br><u>During the Grading Period</u><br>-Unit assessments |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | technology and hands-on strategies.<br>-Within PLCs, teachers plan for engaging exploration of science content using hands-on learning experiences, inquiry, labs, technology (computer lab simulations (GIZMOS), digital probeware/ graphing technology (SPARKS), probeware, electronic devices, and iPad science apps<br><br>Model.<br>-Teachers implement the 5E Instructional Model to promote learning experiences that cause students to think, make connections, formulate and test hypotheses and draw conclusions.<br>-Teachers facilitate student-centered learning through the use of the 5E Instructional Model.<br>-Common Core Literacy Standards for both Reading and Writing are appropriately embedded throughout the 5E Instruction Model.<br>-Each teacher maintains a record of the number of occurrences of engagement tasks (hands-on-learning experiences, labs, and technology) per week. | | -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. | |

| | | This data is then reported on the Science PLC log.<br>-Monthly, school leaders conduct one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools and engagement task records.  These teacher data/chats guide the leadership's team professional development plan (both individually and whole faculty). | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.**<br><br>Science Goal #2:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 5 % to  8 %. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**5%** | 2013Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**8%** | 2.1<br>-Not all teachers have received the CCLS for Science overview.<br>-Not all teachers understand how to integrate close reading with the 5E instructional model.<br>-Not all PLCs routinely look at curriculum materials beyond those posted on the curriculum guide | 2.1<br>**Strategy**<br>Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text (textbooks and other supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the **close reading model** (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least 1 times per content | 2.1<br>Who<br>Principal<br>AP<br>Science Coach<br>Reading Coach<br>Reading Leadership Team<br>CCLS Science Team<br>Science SAL/DH<br><br>How Monitored<br>Administration, Coach, SAL walk-throughs<br>-PLC logs turned into administration.<br>-Administration provides feedback. | Science PLC Resource meetings<br>Reading Leadership Team<br><br>PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing baseline achievement level to 80% mastery using the proximal evaluation tool. | 3x-per year<br>District level baseline, mid-year, and pre-EOC administration<br><br>Semester Exams<br><br>During the Grading Period<br>-mini-assessments<br>-unit assessments |

| | | | | unit.  high-Lexile will be defined as at least 1 grade level above for Regular classes and two grade levels above advanced classes. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Action Steps** *Professional Development* -The Reading Coach along with the Departmental Leaders/Coach/SAL conduct small group departmental trainings to develop teachers' ability to use the close reading model. -The Reading Coach attends  I science departmental PLCs every other month to co-plan with teachers, developing lessons using the close reading model. Teacher will invite Reading coach into the classroom to model Close Reading Strategies if needed. -Teachers within departments attend professional development provided by the district/school on text complexity and close reading models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model. | | | |
| | | | | *In PLCs/Department* | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | -Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks.<br>-PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile.<br>-PLCs assign appropriate NGSSS benchmark to Close Reading passage<br>-To increase stamina, teachers select high-Lexile, complex and rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous<br>- Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons.<br><br>***During the lessons, teachers:***<br>-Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text using the following:<br>--Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text. | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | --Stating an essential question prior to reading --Using questions to check for understanding. --Using question to engage students in discussion. --Requiring oral and written responses to text. -Ask text-based questions that require close reading of the text and multiple reads of the text. *During the lessons, students:* -Grapple with complex text. -Re-read for a second purpose and to increase comprehension. -Engage in discussion to answer essential question using textual evidence. -Write in response to essential question using textual evidence. | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

## Science Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Technology and Hands-On Activities | Grades 6-8 | Science Coach/SAL | Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs | On-going in science PLCs 2 times per month | Administrators/science coach conduct targeted walk-throughs | Administration Team |

| (animations/Gizmos, scientific probeware, laboratory technology) | | and Technology Resource | | | to monitor Hands-On Activity implementation. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Inquiry and the 5E Instructional Model | Grades 6-8 | Science Coach/SAL and Technology Resource | Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs | On-going in science PLCs 2 times per month | Administrators /Science coach conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor 5 E Instructional Model lessons. | Administration Team |
| Close Reading | Grades 6-8 | Reading Coach Science SAL Reading Leadership Team | Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs | One PLC meeting per month | Reading Coach walk-throughs | Administration Team & Reading Coach |

*End of Science Goals*

## Writing/Language Arts Goals

| Writing/Language Arts Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.**<br><br>Writing/LA Goal #1:<br><br>The percentage of students scoring **Level 3.0** or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 85 % to 88%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**85%** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**88%** | 1.1. | 1.1.<br>**Tier 1** – The purpose of this strategy is to strengthen the core curriculum. Students' writing skills will improve through participation of best practices for teaching writing. Best practices include PLC instructional calendars, Differentiated Instruction and effective holistic scoring methods.<br><br>Action Steps<br>1. As a Professional Development activity, teachers new to the profession and/or content area are required to attend district level trainings.<br>2. As a Professional Development activity, Language Arts SAL and grade level (PLC) chairs will facilitate advanced scoring sessions.<br>3. PLCs will participate in rubric Norming sessions to identify teacher barriers impeding effective holistic scoring.<br>4. Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART | 1.1.<br><u>Who</u><br>Principal<br>APC<br>LA SAL<br>LA PLCs<br><br><br><u>How</u><br>- PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback.<br>- Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy using district developed tool(based on the Springboard walkthrough form)<br>-HCPS Informal Observation Pop-In Form (EET tool). | 1.1.<br>PLCs will identify trends (deficiencies and growth) in student writing performance and collaborate to modify the instructional calendar to provide differentiated instruction as appropriate.<br><br>PLCs - Review of monthly formative writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric. For each monthly writing prompt, 8th Grade student data will reported on an excel document and given to the SAL. For 6-7 grade students, teachers will report a class average of students scoring a level 4.0 or above on a data collection form. PLCs will analyze the increase in the number of students reaching 4.0 or above on the monthly writing prompt.<br><br>PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. | 1.1. Review of monthly formative writing assessments to determine number and percent of students scoring above proficiency as determined by the assignment rubric<br>- Embedded writing assessments from the core curriculum<br>- Student portfolios |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | goals for each nine weeks. (For example, during the first nine weeks, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the monthly formative writing prompt.)<br>5. 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.<br>6. 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.<br>7. Teachers and students will maintain writing portfolios to demonstrate student engagement in all stages of the writing process.<br>8. Students will complete scaffold activities prior to required Embedded Assessments and teachers will share reflections of student growth or need in order | | The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends. | |

| | | | | to inform instruction.<br>9. Teachers and students will engage in metacognitive reflection of embedded assessments to celebrate attainment of writing skills and goals and to identify continuing needs and adjust instruction.<br>10. Teachers implement the ideas based on specific student needs.<br>11. As a Professional Development activity PLCs examine student conference notes, daily drafts, and monthly demand writes and adjusts the monthly writing menu of teaching points and share ideas to grow students.<br>12. PLCs review nine week data, set a new goal for the following nine weeks.<br>13. PLCs record their work in the PLC logs. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Writing/Language Arts Professional Development

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Writing Holistic Scoring Training | 6-8 | LA SAL PLC facilitators Academic Coach | Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams | On-going | PLC logs turned into administration | Principal APC SAL PLC Facilitators |
| Mode-based Writing Training | 6-8 | LA SAL PLC facilitators Academic Coach | Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams | On-going | -Administration or Coach walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration | Principal APC SAL PLC Facilitators |
| Springboard Pacing | 6-8 | LA SAL PLC facilitators Academic Coach | Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams | On-going | -Administration or Coach walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration | Principal APC SAL PLC Facilitators |

*End of Writing Goals*

## Attendance Goal(s)

| Attendance Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **1. Attendance**<br><br>Attendance Goal #1:<br><br>1. The attendance rate will increase from 94.19 % in 2011-2012 to    % in 2012-2013.<br><br>2. The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10%<br><br>3.The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:*<br><br>**94.19**<br><br>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)<br><br>**49**<br><br>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)<br><br>**69** | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*<br><br>**95**<br><br>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)<br><br>**45**<br><br>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)<br><br>**62** | 1.1.<br>Attendance committee needs to meet on a regular basis throughout the school year.<br>-Need support in building and maintain the student database. | 1.1.<br>**Tier 1**<br>The school will establish an attendance committee comprised of Administrators, guidance counselors, teachers and other relevant personnel to review the school's attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data.  The attendance committee will also maintain a database of students with significant attendance problems and implement and monitor interventions to be documented on the attendance intervention form (SB 90710) The attendance committee meets every two weeks. | 1.1.<br>Attendance committee will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the Principal on a monthly basis and shared with faculty. | 1.1.<br>Attendance committee will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students. | 1.1. |
| | | | 1.2.<br>Need an Edline Attendance Waiver to increase the number of teachers posting on a weekly basis. | 1.2. **Tier 1**<br>All teachers will post their attendance to EdLine at a minimum of once per week allowing parents to monitor attendance. | 1.2.<br>Assistant Principal/Team leaders/ Department Heads will monitor Edline | 1.2.<br> Principal will use Edline reports to evaluate teachers adherence to policy | 1.2.<br>Edline Reports |

| | | There is no system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1.3. | 1.3.<br>**Tier 2**<br>Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, the Attendance Committee (which is a subgroup of the Leadership Team) collaborate to ensure that a letter is sent home to parents outlining the state statute that requires parents send students to school. If a student's attendance improves (no absences in a 20 day period) a positive letter is sent home to the parent regarding the increase in their child's attendance. | 1.3.<br>Social Worker<br>Guidance Counselor<br>PSLT | 1.3.<br>The attendance committee (which is a subset of the leadership Team) will disaggregate attendance data for the "Tier 2" group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children. | 1.3.<br>Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data |

| 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 |
| EdLine | 6-8 | AP | School-wide | September and then an as needed basis | Random check of EdLine postings | AP |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*End of Attendance Goals*

## Suspension Goal(s)

| Suspension Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **1. Suspension** | | | 1.1. There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior. | 1.1. Tier 1 CHAMPS will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey, discipline data, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations. -Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and rules. -Leadership team conducts walkthroughs using a CHAMPS walk-through form (generated by the district RtI facilitators). -The data is shared with faculty at a monthly meeting, tracking the overall improvement of the faculty. -Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk- | 1.1. Who -PSLT Behavior Committee -Leadership Team -Administration | 1.1. PSLT /Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions, ATOSS data monthly. | 1.1. UNTIE, EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data |
| Suspension Goal #1: 1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. 2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. 3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%. 4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. | 2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions **189** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School **95** 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions **98** 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School **61** | 2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions **170** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School **85** 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions **88** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School **54** | | | | | |

| | | | | through data chats. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Suspension Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| CHAMPS | 6-8 | District Trainer | School-wide | Pre Planning with follow ups in House and Department PLCs | Administration, district Rtl facilitator and guidance walk-throughs | Administration, district Rtl facilitator and guidance walk-throughs |

*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.**

# Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

| Additional Goal(s) | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Health and Fitness Goal**<br><br>Health and Fitness Goal #1:<br><br>During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of 8th grade students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) on the | 2012 Current Level :*<br><br>**56%** / 2013 Expected Level :*<br><br>**59%** | 1.1. | 1. 1Middle School students will engage in the equivalent of one class period per day of physical education for one semester of each year in grades 6 through 8 | 1.APC Guidance | 1.Checking student schedules | 1. |

| Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 56% for the on the Pretest to 59% on the Posttest. | | | **1.2** Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the Principal's designee. | **2.** Principal's designee. | **2** Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ) | 1.2.**.** PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health. |
| | | | **1.3** Five physical education classes per week for a minimum of one semester per year with a certified physical education teacher. | **3.** . Physical Education Teacher | **3** Classroom walk-throughs Class schedules | 1.3.**.** PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health. |

## Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

## Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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

| Additional Goal(s) | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Continuous Improvement Goal** | | | 1.1 -There is still confusion on how to conduct PLCs that are focused on deepening the knowledge | 1.1 The leadership team will become trained on the use of the PLC "Unit of Instruction" log that follows the Plan-Do- | 1.1 Who Principal Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders | 1.1 "Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will | 1.1 PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach (Anne Jolly) |
| Continuous Improvement Goal #1: | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |

| | | | base of teachers and improving student performance by the implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model.<br>-Still confusion on how the Plan-Do-Check-Act model works.<br>-Still some resistance to staff members attending PLCs and/or arriving on time to meetings.<br>-Teachers asking for more PLC collaboration time. Possibility of waiver will be explored. | Check-Act model. Subject Area Leader and/or PLC facilitators will guide their PLCs through the Plan-Do-Check-Act model for units of instruction. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Leadership Team. | PLC facilitators | aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students' learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning)" will increase from 65 % in 2012 to 68 % in 2013. | **65 %** | **68 %** | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2<br>-Not enough time to meet in PLCs. | 1.2<br>Leadership team will use teacher survey information every nine weeks to determine next steps for PLC professional development. | 1.2<br>Who<br>Leadership team<br><br>How<br>Leadership team aggregates the data | 1.2<br>"Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training. | 1.2<br>PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach (Anne Jolly) |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity<br>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| PLCs | | | | | | |
| Plan-Do-Check-Act Model | Leadership Team<br>All teachers | Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC Facilitators | School-wide | PLCs meet every three weeks for Plan-Do-Check-Act PLCs. | Administrator and leadership team walk-throughs Administrator and leadership attendance at PLC meetings PLC Survey data | Leadership Team |

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

# <span style="color:red">NEW Goal(s) For the 2012-2013 School Year</span>

## <u>NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals</u>

| **A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient in reading (Levels 4-9).** | | | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. | A.1. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal A:<br><br>**NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>**NA** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>**NA** | | | | | |
| | | | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. | A.2. |
| | | | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. | A.3. |
| **B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.** | | | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. | B.1. |
| Reading Goal B:<br><br>**NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>**NA** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>**NA** | | | | | |
| | | | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. | B.2. |
| | | | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. | B.3. |

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

| CELLA Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4** | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 55% to 58 %. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: **55%** | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **D.  Students scoring proficient in Reading.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4** | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| CELLA Goal #D: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from 25% to 28 %. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : **25%** | | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.** | | 2.1. | 2.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4** | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 33% to 36 %. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : **33%** | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

## NEW Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).** | | | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. | F.1. |
| Mathematics Goal F: **NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* **NA** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **NA** | | | | | |
| | | | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. | F.2. |
| | | | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. | F.3. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. | G.1. |
| **G. Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.**<br><br>Mathematics  Goal G:<br><br>**NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**NA** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**NA** | | | | | |
| | | | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. | G.2. |
| | | | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. | G.3. |

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

| Geometry EOC 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<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | Strategy Data Check<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | Student Evaluation Tool |
| **H.   Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry.**<br><br>Geometry Goal H:<br><br>**NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**NA** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**NA** | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| 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** |
| **I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Geometry Goal I: **NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* **NA** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **NA** | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

## NEW Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

| **Middle 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** |
| **J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).** | | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. | J.1. |

| Science Goal J:<br><br>**NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**NA** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**NA** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. | J.2. |
| | | | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. | J.3. |

## NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

| Writing 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**<br>Who and how will the fidelity be monitored? | **Strategy Data Check**<br>How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy? | **Student Evaluation Tool** |
| **M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).** | | | M.1. | M.1. | M.1. | M.1. | M.1. |
| Writing Goal M:<br><br>**NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>**NA** | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>**NA** | | | | | |
| | | | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. | M.2. |
| | | | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. | M.3. |

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

| STEM Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|---|

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

| 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:<br><br>Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM electives. | 1.1.<br>Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers | 1.1.<br>-Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established.<br>-Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs.<br>-Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc. | 1.1.<br>PLC or grade level lead -Subject Area Leaders | 1.1.<br>Administrative/SAL walk-throughs | 1.1.<br>Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM elective per nine week. Share data with teachers. |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## STEM Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity<br>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Project-based learning | 6-8 | SALs | Science, math, ELA and technology teachers PLCs | On-going | Administrator walk-throughs | Administration |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

# 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: <br><br>Increase the student membership in FBLA from 8 in 2011-2012 to 16 in 2012-2013. | 1.1. Students not aware of FBLA and how it can benefit them | 1.1. Increase student participation in FBLA competitions/events. | 1.1. Business Technology (CTE) teacher | 1.1. Aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop next steps | 1.1. Log of number of CTSO events Log of number of students who attend CTSO events |
| | 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 |
| Establishing or growing FBLA | 7-8 | District | CTE Teachers | October, 2012 | Log of events and attendance | CTE Contact Teacher |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

*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.

x☐ Yes          ☐ No

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

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