Florida Department of Education

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Brooker Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough County
Principal: Julie Kelly	Superintendent: Mary Ellen Elia
SAC Chair: Michelle Ebner and Catherine Cosmas	Date of School Board Approval: Pending 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

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

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	Julie Kelly	Educational Leadership, School Principal, Elementary Education, Early Childhood Education, ESOL	7	11	11/12: A 10/11: A 09/10: B
Assistant Principal	Donna Cassella-Barker	Educational Leadership, Elementary Education, Gifted	3	2	11/12: A 10/11: A 09/10: B

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

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

Subject	Name	Degree(s)/	Number of Years at	Number of Years as an	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains,

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

Area		Certification(s)	Current School	Instructional Coach	Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Linda Griffiths	Primary Education, ESOL	7	8	11/12: A 10/11: A 09/10: B

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	District Staff	June	
2. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	Ongoing	
3. District Peer Program	District Peers	Ongoing	
4. School Based teacher recognition Program	Principal	Ongoing	
5. Opportunities for leadership	Principal	Ongoing	
6. Regular opportunities for collaboration	Principal	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly qualified.

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Qualified
Jane Bodeau	Elementary Education, Prekindergarten/ Primary	Kindergarten	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Gina Melaragno	Prekindergarten/ Primary	Kindergarten	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Lissia Billingsley	Elementary Education	First Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Julie Dermotta	Prekindergarten/ Primary	First Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Amy Labrasciano	Elementary Education	First Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Laura Korte	Prekindergarten/ Primary	First Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Virginia Rivera	Elementary Education	Second Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Lisa Contreras	Prekindergarten/ Primary	Third Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Jennifer Knapp	Elementary Education	Fourth Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Elizabeth Greenwald	Elementary Education	Fifth Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Jaclyn Lewinsohn	Elementary Education	Fifth Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Sheena McDeed	Elementary Education	Third Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Kathleen Wilde	Elementary Education	Second Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Ashley Wiese	Elementary Education	Kindergarten-Fifth Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Terese Larsen	Exceptional Student Education	Kindergarten-Fifth Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Michelle Peters	Exceptional Student Education, Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum	Kindergarten-Fifth Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Abigail Wightman	Exceptional Student Education, Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum	Kindergarten-Fifth Grade	Working toward ESOL endorsement
Raina Webb	Varying Exceptionalities (grades k-12), ESOL	Fourth Grade	Working toward Elementary Education certification
Donna Cassella-Barker	Educational Leadership, Elementary Education, Gifted	Assistant Principal	Working toward ESOL endorsement

Staff Demographics

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

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
82	6 (5%)	29 (24%)	28 (23%)	19 (16%)	25 (23%)	81 (99%)	0	3 (2.5%)	47 (39%)

Teacher Mentoring Program

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities

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

Tshalani Cruz		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.
Alyse Figueredo		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.
Sheena McDeed		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.

Terese Larsen		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.
Kathleen Wilde		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.
Michelle Peters		The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

Additional Requirements

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

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

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Julie Kelly, Principal / Attendance Committee Representative

Donna Cassella-Barker, Assistant Principal / Attendance Committee Representative

Jessica Savage, Psychologist

Casma Henlon, Guidance Counselor / Attendance Committee Representative

Juanita Colleton, Social Worker / Attendance Committee Representative

Michele Rudacille , ESE Teacher

Jennifer Caramato, ESE Specialist

Jana Pettibone, Teacher

Micky Gerding, Teacher

Mary Gurbacs, Teacher

Linda Sheppard, Teacher

Traci Wright, Teacher

Jennifer Thomas, Teacher

Lauren Smith, Teacher

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

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

The Leadership team meets weekly. Specific responsibilities include:

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

- Create, manage and update the school resource map

- Ensure the master schedule incorporates allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels.

- Determine scheduling needs, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers2/3

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

- Support systematic data collection *(e.g., district and state assessments; during-the-grading period school assessments/checks for understanding; in-school surveys)*

- 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 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 PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)

    o Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions.

- 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).

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

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 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.

- 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:

  - 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*)*

  - Identify the problem (based on an analysis of the data disaggregated via data sorts) in multiple areas – curriculum content, behavior, and attendance

  - Develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers).

  - Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.

  - Identify appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at regular intervals matched to the intensity of the level of instructional/intervention support provided.

  - 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).

  - 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

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

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

FCAT released tests	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach/Math Coach/AP
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability *Reading/Math/Science Formative Assessments* *Writing 2.0 Field Test (4th only)*	Scantron Achievement Series	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science *Reading/Math/Science Formative Assessments* *Writing 2.0 Field Test (4th only)*	Scantron Achievement Series PLC Logs	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network	Reading Coach/Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
DRA-2	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher
Reports on Demand/Crystal Reports	District Generated Database	Leadership Team/Specialty PSLT

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
The Leadership Team/will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts.
DRT will be invited to present new information on MTSS to all staff at a faculty meeting. DRT will be invited to meet with grade level teams to review MTSS progress. 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, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans). ● Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS. ● Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="1" align="center">School-Based Literacy Leadership Team</td></tr>
<tr><td>

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

Julie Kelly, Principal

Donna Cassella-Barker Assistant Principal

Linda Griffiths, Reading Coach

Instructional members of the team are: Janet O'Grady, Michelle Ebner, Julie Dermotta, Amy Labrasciano, Annie Stockdale, Ashley Pippin, Virginia Santesteban, and Dennis Klein
</td></tr>
<tr><td>

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

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, assistant principal and principal meet every two weeks on Friday afternoon to collaborate and share information.   The reading coach and administration collaborate with the Reading Vertical Curriculum Team to ensure that data driven instruction support is provided to all teachers and that reading strategies for the implementation of the SIP.
</td></tr>
<tr><td>

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

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

- Implementation of CCSS for Kindergarten and first grade.

- Professional development

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

- Data-analysis (on-going)

- Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan
</td></tr>
</table>

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1. **FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).**	1.1. Need additional training to implement effective RtI. Teachers are at varying levels of differentiated instruction. Lack of common planning time. Lack of planning time to analyze data.	1.1. Students' comprehension of course content/standards increases through teachers' use of data to guide instruction. Teachers will provide Differentiated Instruction as a result of common assessments to ensure mastery of essential skills. Teachers will use reciprocal teaching to teach informational text in reading, science, and social studies. Student's comprehension of course content/standards will increase through teachers' use of active engagement strategies.	1.1. Teachers, administration, Reading Coach, Vertical Curriculum Committees	1.1. Analyze data of common assessments and FAIR. PLC and VCC minutes will be turned in to administration. Administration observations.	1.1. FAIR DRA Student Work Teacher created common assessments		
Reading Goal #1: In grades 3-5 the percentage of students scoring a level 3 higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 71% to 74%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	71%	**74%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	

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

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.	2.1. Need additional training to implement effective RtI. Teachers are at varying levels of differentiated instruction. Lack of common planning time. Lack of planning time to analyze data.	2.1. Identifying bottom quartile group for grade level and each classroom. Monitor progress of bottom quartile students. Using more Differentiated Instruction strategies. Sharing lessons, strategies, and data in PLCs. Using reciprocal teaching to teach informational text in reading, science, and social studies. Reading Nights.	2.1. Teachers, administration, Reading Coach, Vertical Curriculum Committees.	2.1. Teacher Level- The teacher will analyze assessments and reflect on student progress. PLC/Department Level- The teacher will analyze assessments and reflect on student progress. Departments will discuss strategies. Leadership Team Level- Administration and Reading Coach will review data and minutes from PLC/ VCC meetings.	2.1. FAIR DRA Ongoing Progress monitoring During Grading Period Student Work Teacher created assessments		
Reading Goal #2: In grades 3-5 the percentage of students scoring a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 45% to 48%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	45%	**48%**					
		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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.	3.1. Need additional training to implement effective RtI. Teachers are at varying levels of differentiated instruction. Lack of common planning time. Lack of planning time to analyze data.	3.1. Identifying bottom quartile group for grade level and each classroom. Monitor progress of bottom quartile students. Using more Differentiated Instruction strategies. Sharing lessons, strategies, and data in PLCs. Using reciprocal teaching to teach informational text in reading, science, and social studies.	3.1. Teachers, administration, Reading Coach, Vertical Curriculum Committees	3.1. Teacher Level- The teacher will analyze assessments and reflect on student progress. PLC/Department Level- The teacher will analyze assessments and reflect on student progress. Departments will discuss strategies. Leadership Team Level- Administration and Reading Coach will review data and minutes from PLC/ VCC meetings.	3.1. 2-3 times per year FAIR DRA Ongoing Progress monitoring During Grading Period Student Work Teacher created assessments		

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

Reading Goal #3: In grades 4-5 the percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 68 points to 71 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	68 pts	**71pts**				
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

4. **FCAT 2.0:** Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4.1. Need additional training to implement effective RtI. Teachers are at varying levels of differentiated instruction. Lack of common planning time. Lack of planning time to analyze data.	4.1. Identifying bottom quartile group for grade level and each classroom. Monitor progress of bottom quartile students. Using more Differentiated Instruction strategies. Sharing lessons, strategies, and data in PLCs. Using reciprocal teaching to teach informational text in reading, science, and social studies.	4.1. Teachers, administration, Reading Coach, Vertical Curriculum Committees	4.1. Teacher Level- The teacher will analyze assessments and reflect on student progress. PLC/Department Level- The teacher will analyze assessments and reflect on student progress. Departments will discuss strategies. Leadership Team Level- Administration and Reading Coach will review data and minutes from PLC/ VCC meetings.	4.1. 2-3 times per year FAIR DRA Ongoing Progress monitoring During Grading Period Student Work Teacher created assessments		
Reading Goal #4: In grades 3-5 the percentage of students in the bottom 25% making gains will increase from 66% to 69% on the 2013 Reading FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	66%	**69%**					

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

		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	
		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
Reading Goal #5:							

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

White:

Black:

Hispanic:

Asian:

American Indian: | 5A.1.

See Goals 1, 3, and 4. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | | |

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

Reading Goal #5A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of white students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 Reading FCAT will increase from 79% to 82%. The percentage of black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 Reading FCAT will increase from 54% to 57%. The percentage of hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 Reading FCAT will increase from 56% to 59%.						
	White: 79% Black: 54% Hispanic: 56% Asian: American Indian:	White: 82% Black: 57% Hispanic: 59% Asian: American Indian:				

		5A.2.	5A.	5A.2	5A2.	5A.2	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1.	5B.1. **See Goals 1, 3, and 4.**	5B.1.	5B.1.			

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

Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
.The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring satisfactory/proficient on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 56% to 59%.						
	56%	**59%**				
		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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1.	5C.1. See Goals 1, 3, and 4.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory will increase from 31% to 34% on the 2013 FCAT Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	31%	**34%**					
	–	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1.	5D.1. See Goals 1, 3, and 4.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient / satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 17% to20%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	17%	**20%**					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

Reading Professional Development

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Fair Data Analysis	K-5	Reading Coach	All reading teachers	September	PLC will analyze data throughout the year and provide summary notes of meeting to administration.	PLC facilitator Reading Coach Administration
DRA Recalibration	K-5	Reading Coach	All reading teachers	September and October	Reading Coach to review selected DRAs with teachers.	Reading Coach Administration
Common Core State Standards	K – 1	Reading Coach	All K and 1 reading teachers	June-November	Teachers will discuss implementation in PLC and VCC	Reading Coach Team Leaders VCC team members Administration
Higher Level Questioning and Discussion	All teachers	PLC Facilitator	All teachers	August-June	Teams will discuss Higher Level Questioning and Discussion from lessons.	PLC Facilitator

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

| Student Engagement Strategies | All Teachers | PLC Facilitators | All teachers | August-June | Teachers will share results of implementing engagement strategies from Teach Like A Champion at PLCs. | PLC facilitator |

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).	1.1. District Calendar Lack of common planning time Limited funding for ELP tutoring Teachers possess different levels of skill using Differentiated Instruction. Students lack of mathematics skills.	1. Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increase through teachers' use of data to inform instruction. Teachers will provide Differentiated Instruction as a result of common assessments to ensure mastery of essential skills. Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases though participation in higher order/ Webb's Depth of Knowledge to promote critical thinking and problem solving. Students' comprehension of course content/ standards will increase through teachers' use of active	1.1. Teachers Administration Grade Level PLC's Vertical Curriculum Committee	1. The teacher will analyze assessments and reflect on student progress. The teacher will analyze assessments and chart the increase of students reaching 70% mastery. PLCs will review common assessments to determine students not making at least 70% or greater mastery and will plan remediation strategies. Administration will review data and logs from PLC/ VCC meetings.	1.1. District Formative Assessments Chapter Tests Teacher created assessments Student work Benchmark assessments Fast Math		

		engagement strategies and purposeful talk. Students understanding of mathematics expectations increases as school-wide Math Norms are implemented.				
Mathematics Goal #1:

In grades 3-5 the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Math will increase from 63% to 68%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
	63%	**68%**				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of

Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

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

| 2. **FCAT 2.0:** Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics. | 2.1. District Calendar Lack of common planning time Limited funding for ELP tutoring Teachers possess different levels of skill using Differentiated Instruction. Students lack of mathematics skills. | 2. Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increase through teachers' use of data to inform instruction. Teachers will provide Differentiated Instruction as a result of common assessments to ensure mastery of essential skills. Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases though participation in higher order/ Webb's Depth of Knowledge to promote critical thinking and problem solving. Students' comprehension of course content/ standards will increase through teachers' use of active | 2.1 Teachers Administration Grade Level PLC's Vertical Curriculum Committee | 2.1 The teacher will analyze assessments and reflect on student progress. The teacher will analyze assessments and chart the increase of students reaching 70% mastery. PLCs will review common assessments to determine students not making at least 70% or greater mastery and will plan remediation strategies. Administration will review data and logs from PLC/ VCC meetings. | | | |

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

34

		engagement strategies and purposeful talk. Students understanding of mathematics expectations increases as school-wide Math Norms are implemented.				
Mathematics Goal #2: In grades 3-5 the percentage of students scoring Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 33% to36%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	33%	**36%**				
		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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

| 3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics. | 3.1. District Calendar

Lack of common planning time

Limited funding for ELP tutoring

Teachers possess different levels of skill using

Differentiated Instruction.

Students lack of mathematics skills. | 3.1 Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increase through teachers' use of data to inform instruction.

Teachers will provide Differentiated Instruction as a result of common assessments to ensure mastery of essential skills.

Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases though participation in higher order/ Webb's Depth of Knowledge to promote critical thinking and problem solving.

Students' comprehension of course content/ standards will increase through teachers' use of active engagement strategies and | 3.1 . Teachers

Administration

Grade Level PLC's

Vertical Curriculum Committee | 3.1 The teacher will analyze assessments and reflect on student progress.

The teacher will analyze assessments and chart the increase of students reaching 70% mastery.

PLCs will review common assessments to determine students not making at least 70% or greater mastery and will plan remediation strategies.

Administration will review data and logs from PLC/ VCC meetings. | | | |

		purposeful talk. Students understanding of mathematics expectations increases as school-wide Math Norms are implemented.				
Mathematics Goal #3: In grades 3-5 the percentage of students making Learning Gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 66 points to 69 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	66 pts	**69 pts**				
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4.1. District Calendar Lack of common planning time Limited funding for ELP tutoring Teachers possess different levels of skill using Differentiated Instruction. Students lack of mathematics skills.	1.	Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increase through teachers' use of data to inform instruction. Teachers will provide Differentiated Instruction as a result of common assessments to ensure mastery of essential skills. Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases though participation in higher order/ Webb's Depth of Knowledge to promote critical thinking and problem solving. Students' comprehension of course content/ standards will increase through teachers' use of active	4.1. Teachers Administration Grade Level PLC's Vertical Curriculum Committee	1.	The teacher will analyze assessments and reflect on student progress. The teacher will analyze assessments and chart the increase of students reaching 70% mastery. PLCs will review common assessments to determine students not making at least 70% or greater mastery and will plan remediation strategies. Administration will review data and logs from PLC/ VCC meetings.	4.1. District Formative Assessments Chapter Tests Teacher created assessments Student work Benchmark assessments Fast Math	

		engagement strategies and purposeful talk. Students understanding of mathematics expectations increases as school-wide Math Norms are implemented.				
Mathematics Goal #4: In grades 3-5 the percentage of students making Learning Gains in the Lowest 25% on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 54 points to 57 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	54 pts	**57 pts**				
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.

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

		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
Math Goal #5:							

| 5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics** | 5A.1.

White:

Black:

Hispanic:

Asian:

American Indian: | 5A.1.

See Goals 1, 3, and 4. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | 5A.1. | | |

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

Reading Goal #5A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of white students scoring proficient/satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from .

The percentage of black students scoring proficient/satisfactory progress on the 2012 FCAT Math will increase from

The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from | | | | | | |
| | White: 67%

Black: 42%

Hispanic:54%

Asian:

American Indian: | White: 73%

Black: 47%

Hispanic:59%

Asian:

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1.	5B.1. **See Goals 1, 3, and 4.**	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

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

Mathematics Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from						
	51%	**56%**				
		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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. **See Goals 1, 3, and 4.**	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		

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

Mathematics Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of English Language Learners (ELL) students scoring proficient/satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from	**51%**	**56%**				
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. **See Goals 1, 3, and 4.**	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		

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

Mathematics Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The percentage of Students with Disabilities (SWD) making proficient/satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase						
	27%	**32%**				
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Lesson Planning	3 and 4	Jack Fahle, DRT	All teachers of math in grades 3 and 4 (includes AGP, Speech, ELL)	September 24 and 26 October 15	Participants will participate in a reflective problem solving session on October 16. Grade level PLCs will analyze assessment data todetermine if student progress in effective planning.	Donna Cassella-Barker, APEI
First in Math	k-5	Technology Committee	All math teachers in grades k-5	November	Walk Throughs	Technology Committee Administration

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

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

1. Attendance	1.	1.	1.1. The Attendance Team will consist of principal, assistant principal, guidance counselor, and social worker.	1.1. The Attendance Team and PSLT will examine data quarterly.	1.1. Attendancece Report		
	Parents are planning vacations during the school year.	Guidance Counselor and Social Worker will communicate via Brooker Notes and visit to PLC's to remind teachers about attendance procedures.			Tardy Report		
	Serious family/ personal issues are impacting students' attendance.				EASI Attendance		
	Lack of staff focus on attendance and completing of attendance referrals.	The Attendance Team will meet once each quarter to review school attendance to include targeted students.					
	Teachers lack time to write attendance referral.	The Guidance Counselor and Social Worker will review monthly unexcused absence reports and e-mail teacher with expected procedures.					
	Teachers are uncomfortable discussing attendance issues with parents.						

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

Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
The attendance rate will increase from 95.75 in 2011-2012 to 96.75 in 2012-2013.							
	95.75	**96.75**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	74	**50**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	0	**0**					

		2. Lack of parent buy in to arrive at school on time.	2. When a student reaches 10 tardies to school, parents/ guardians are notified via school mail. When a student has 3 unexcused absences, the teacher will initiate the *Attendance Intervention Form* and conference with parent. Teacher will continue to monitor attendance. If unexcused absences continue (10-15) student is referred to CST, the Social Worker, for further intervention.	1.2. The Attendance Team will examine data quarterly.	1.2.	1.2. Attendance Report Tardy Report EASI Attendance	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject and/or PLC Leader	PD Facilitator	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance Plan	All instructional staff	Social Worker	Faculty Meeting	October	Review data for number of students with excessive absences and those with students with Attendance Plan	Attendance Team

End of Attendance Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.	1. Lack of district focus on science content in previous grades. No state testing in science in previous grades. Lack of resources for labs. The need for after school ELP. Many teachers are new to reciprocal teaching and "Inquiry Monday". Lack of technology "lap tops".	1.1. Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increase through teachers' use of data to inform instruction. Teachers will provide Differentiated Instruction as a result of common assessments to ensure mastery of essential skills. Teachers will use reciprocal teaching to teach informational text in reading, science, and social studies. Students' comprehension of course content/ standards increases through participation in higher order/ Webb's Depth of Knowledge to promote critical thinking and problem-solving. Students' comprehension of course content/ standards will increase through teachers' use of active engagement strategies. Teachers will use Inquiry Monday lessons	1.1.Science teachers Vertical Curriculum Committee Grade level PLCs Administration	1. Teachers will administer common assessments to look for common trends from instruction. Grade level PLCs will analyze data from common assessments to look for common trends and plan for remediation/enrichment strategies. Science PLC will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 70%. Vertical Curriculum Committee will review grade level data to look for common trends.	1. District level baseline and mid-year (grade 5 only). Chapter tests Unit tests FCAT practice	

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

56

		provided by the county.				
Science Goal #1: In grade 5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 62% to 68%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	62%	**68%**				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

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

Science Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance·*	2013Expected Level of Performance·*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.							
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

Science Professional Development

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

Inquiry Monday Training	K-5	Science VCC	All science teachers	October	VCC discusses and reflects grade level information communicating the success of Inquiry Monday	VCC
						Administration

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.	1.1. Lack of common planning tie to discuss deficiencies, common trends, and holistic scoring, Teachers lack sufficient instructional time for writing.	1.1. Students' writing skills will improve through participation of best practices for teaching writing. Best Practices include PLC instructional calendars, Differentiated Instruction, student conferencing, student engagement, higher level questioning, and effective holistic scoring methods.	1.1. Writing teachers Vertical Curriculum Committee Administration	1. Teachers will analyze student writings to determine trends, deficiencies, growth in student writing and collaborate with peers to reflect on trends. PLCs will determine trends and deficiencies and growth in student writing performance through collaboration and share effective teaching strategies. Teachers on the Vertical Writing Curriculum Committee will discuss common trends and deficiencies and create suggestions for professional development and support.	1. Grade level PLCs will examine school writing data on an on-going basis. Monthly writing assessments will be given and scored.		

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

Writing/LA Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In grade 4, the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 90% to 92%.							
	90%	**92%**					
		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.

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Rubric training	2-5	District facilitator	All writing teachers	December	Grade level PLCs will score papers to discuss for recalibration.	Members of the Vertical Writing Curriculum Committee

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

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

1. **Suspension**	1. Inconsistency of consistency and awareness of school-wide rules on and off campus (including transportation).	1. Kids With Character Program will continue to be implemented and expanded to all faculty, staff, and bus drivers to address school-wide expectations and rules Provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide expectations / rules. Implement Love and Logic Program. Implement weekly Breakfast Club for students to discuss / problem solve common challenges.	1. Character Education / Social Studies Vertical Curriculum Committee. Administration	1.1. Character Education / Social Studies Committee and administration will review data on discipline referral, out of school suspension, and bus suspension.	1.1. Discipline Action Ethnic Summary Report and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data for the 2012-2013 school year.

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

Suspension Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions				
	10	**8**				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School				
	4	**3**				
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
	6	**5**				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School				
	4	**3**				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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
Love and Logic Program	All grades and subjects	Mary Rogers, drt	All grades and subjects	Monthly meetings September - January	Weekly coffee talks to discuss strategy effectiveness, successes, and challenges	Julie Kelly, Principal Virginia Rivera, Teacher Ashley Pippin, Teacher

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)
Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

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

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year*.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					

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

		2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.		
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.		

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement	**Problem-**					

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

Goal(s)	solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1:	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #2:	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**					

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Health and Fitness Goal	Outside temperature Lack of covered court areas Constraints of academic schedule Students dressed appropriately for running	1. All students will engage in physical activity with a PE teacher two times a week for a total of 60 minutes. On 3 nonscheduled PE days, classroom teachers will engage students for a total of 90 minutes per week of physical activity. Implement new Mile Club – before and after school _during class recess	1. Physical Education Specialist Classroom teachers Administration	1. Checking of classroom teachers' daily schedule to verify the students receive a total of 150 minutes of physical activity a week. FTE signatures – 150 minutes per week of physical exercise. Mile Club log	1. Pacer test component of Fitness Gram Mile Club log		

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

Health and Fitness Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
During the 2012-2013 school year the percentage of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health post test will increase from 74% in 2011-2012 to 80% in 2012-2013.							
	74%	**80%**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Health and Fitness Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Running Club (ways to increase cardio)	1-5	Kim Errity Molly Black	Area V Elementary P.E. teachers	Monthly meetings on Early Release Days	Review on Mile Club attendance log	Kim Errity Debbie Maronic

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

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

| 1. Continuous Improvement Goal | 1.1.

Lack of technology

Lack of opportunities to share technology with staff.

Lack of opportunities to provide support to staff using technology. | 1.1.

The Technology Curriculum Committee will survey staff members to determine the current use of technology used in the classroom to support instruction.

The Technology Curriculum Committee will provide professional development opportunities at school for staff to learn new technology.

The Technology Curriculum Committee will create and prioritize a list of items to purchase that would enhance the school's technology. | 1.1.

Administration

Technology Contacts

Technology VCC | 1.1.

The Technology Curriculum Committee would create a survey to be used to determine if classroom teacher use of technology has increased during the 2012-2013 school year. | 1.1.

Teacher Survey

Administrator Walk Throughs | | |

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

Continuous Improvement Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*				
The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "The teachers that I work with effectively use technology in the classroom.						
	29.6%	**50.0%**				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Mimeo	All grades	DRT	School-wide	January	Survey and Walk Throughs	
First in Math	All grades	Technology Committee	All K-5 math teachers	November	End of year survey	Technology Committee
						Administration
Mouse Mischief	All grades	Technology Committee	School-wide	November	Walk Throughs	Technology Committee
						Administration

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

NEW Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

		A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	
		A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	
B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.		
Reading Goal B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	
		B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	

NEW Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
C. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1. Lack of appropriate personnel to support ELL students. Teachers are unfamiliar with Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach CALLA.	1.1. ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to teachers on how to embed Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach CALLA into core content lessons.	1.1. ESOL Resource Teacher Administration PLC facilitator	1.1. Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive instruction. ERT meets with PLC on a rotating basis to provide support and to monitor student progress.	1.1. FAIR CELLA	

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

CELLA Goal #C:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:				
The number of students scoring proficient in Listening and Speaking will increase from 55% to 60% on the 2013 Cella.					
	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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
D. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1. Lack of appropriate personnel to support ELL students. Teachers are unfamiliar with Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach CALLA.	2.1. ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to teachers on how to embed Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach CALLA into core content lessons.	2.1 ESOL Resource Teacher Administration. PLC facilitator	2.1 Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive instruction. ERT meets with PLC on a rotating basis to provide support and to monitor student progress.	2.1. FAIR CELLA

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

CELLA Goal #D:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :					
The number of students scoring proficient in Reading will increase from 36% to 41% on the 2013 Cella.						
	36%					
		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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
E. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1. Lack of appropriate personnel to support ELL students. Teachers are unfamiliar with Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach CALLA.	2.1. ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to teachers on how to embed Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach CALLA into core content lessons.	2.1. ESOL Resource Teacher Administration PLC facilitator	2.1. Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive instruction. ERT meets with PLC on a rotating basis to provide support and to monitor student progress.	2.1. FAIR CELLA	

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

CELLA Goal #E:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
The number of students scoring proficient in Writing will increase from 39% to 44% on the 2013 Cella. .						
	39%					
		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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

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: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
		F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.
		F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.

G. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.		
Mathematics Goal G: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		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						

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

	Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
H. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Geometry Goal H: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
I. Students scoring in the upper third on Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Geometry Goal I: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		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

Elementary, Middle ==and High== 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	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	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.		

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

Science Goal J: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	
		J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	

NEW Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Biology EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
K. Students scoring in the middle or upper third (proficient) in Biology.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Biology Goal K: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

L. Students scoring in upper third in Biology.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Biology Goal L: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

Writing Goals	Problem-						

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

	Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
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: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

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

STEM Goal #1:	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Increase the number of and participation in STEM competitions and events, including STEM Fair, Math Bowl, and Science Olympics. Implement / expand problem-based learning in math and science. Expand the opportunities for math and science presentations during the Great American Teach In.	Need for common planning time for math and science teachers.	Explicit communication and direction for STEM PLC. Increase the opportunities for reflection of effective lessons.	Grade level PLCs Science / Math Curriculum Committees	Science and Math Curriculum Committee Reflection Administrative Walk Throughs	Logging the number of participants in STEM Fair, Math Bowl, and Science Olympics
	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

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
STEM Fair Procedures and Qualifications	K-5	Science VCC	K-5	Monthly		

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	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.

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

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		

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

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
Reading/Writing/Math/Science Goals	These funds will be used to purchase technology items (toner, projector bulbs)	$1401.40	
Reading Goal #4	These funds will be used to purchase I-Station and Easy CBM subscriptions for students.	$ 276.00	
Health and Fitness Goal #1	These funds will be used to purchase charms to recognize students who participate in the Running Club.	$200.00	
Math Goal #1	These funds will be used to purchase items for a Family Mathematics Night.	$ 200.00	
STEM Goal #1 / Science Goal #1	These funds will purchase pencils to recognize student participation in Science Fair.	$ 100.00	
Science/Math/ Reading/Writing Goals	These funds will be used to recognize students hard work during Stanford and FCAT testing.	$ 90.00	

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July, 2012

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

Attendance Goal #1	These funds will be used to purchase popsicles to recognize perfect attendance.	$ 60.00	
Final Amount Spent $2,327.40			