

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Mango Elementary	District Name: Hillsborough
Principal: Felicia Davis	Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair: Kelli Coleman	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	Felicia Davis	MA Educational Leadership BS Elem. Ed (1-6)	7	7	11/12: C 48% Reading, 40% Math 10/11: C 74% AYP 09/10: B 82% AYP
Assistant Principal	Jessica Hessler	MA Educational Leadership BA Elem. Ed (1-6)	3	3	11/12: C 48% Reading, 40% Math 10/11: C 74% AYP 09/10: B 82% AYP

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)
Math	Marseena Bobo	Masters/ education (1-8)	3	5	11/12: C 48% Reading, 40% Math 10/11: C 74% AYP
Reading	Angela Heintz	Bachelors of Science, Elem. Ed. (k-6), ESOL endorsed	2	2	11/12: C 48% Reading, 40% Math Grade 1 teacher 10-11 Grade 1 teacher 09-10
Reading	Laura Edwards	Masters/Elem. Ed and Education Leadership	4	4	On-leave previous 3 years

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	General Directors	June	
2. Recruitment Fairs	Dr. Jim Goode	June	
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	
7. Regular time for teacher collaboration	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 effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
5 staff members are not ESOL certified.	Staff are being provided ESOL training opportunities.

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
63	13% (8)	38% (24)	32% (20)	17% (11)	21% (13)	100%(63)	5% (3)	3% (2)	89% (56)

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
Kaylin Likon	Thalia Ordaz	The mentor impacts student learning through furthering new teacher practice.	The mentor develops teacher practice through observations, co-reflecting, co-planning, modeling best practices,

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

			lesson planning, co-teaching, problem solving, sharing resources.
Kaylin Likon	Tyssa Garner	The mentor impacts student learning through furthering new teacher practice.	The mentor develops teacher practice through observations, co-reflecting, co-planning, modeling best practices, lesson planning, co-teaching, problem solving, sharing resources.
Kaylin Likon	Waleska Ramos	The mentor impacts student learning through furthering new teacher practice.	The mentor develops teacher practice through observations, co-reflecting, co-planning, modeling best practices, lesson planning, co-teaching, problem solving, sharing resources.
Kaylin Likon	Stephanie Bass	The mentor impacts student learning through furthering new teacher practice.	The mentor develops teacher practice through observations, co-reflecting, co-planning, modeling best practices, lesson planning, co-teaching, problem solving, sharing resources.
Kaylin Likon	Sara Rerucha	The mentor impacts student learning through furthering new teacher practice.	The mentor develops teacher practice through observations, co-reflecting, co-planning, modeling best practices, lesson planning, co-teaching, problem solving, sharing resources.
Kaylin Likon	Vanessa Alvarez	The mentor impacts student learning through furthering new teacher practice.	The mentor develops teacher practice through observations, co-reflecting, co-planning, modeling best practices, lesson planning, co-teaching, problem solving, sharing resources.
Kaylin Likon	Barry Fossard	The mentor impacts student learning through furthering new teacher practice.	The mentor develops teacher practice through observations, co-reflecting, co-planning, modeling best practices, lesson planning, co-teaching, problem solving, sharing resources.
Kaylin Likon	Tina Cross	The mentor impacts student learning through furthering new teacher practice.	The mentor develops teacher practice through observations, co-reflecting, co-planning, modeling best practices, lesson planning, co-teaching, problem solving, sharing resources.
Kaylin Likon	Alissa Restivo	The mentor impacts student learning through furthering new teacher practice.	The mentor develops teacher practice through observations, co-reflecting, co-planning, modeling best practices,

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

			lesson planning, co-teaching, problem solving, sharing resources.
Kaylin Likon	Cindy Candamil	The mentor impacts student learning through furthering new teacher practice.	The mentor develops teacher practice through observations, co-reflecting, co-planning, modeling best practices, lesson planning, co-teaching, problem solving, sharing resources.

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A: Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school and summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors.
Title I, Part C- Migrant: Migrant funds allow for the purchases of supplies, materials and resources to ensure that the migrant students' needs are being met.
Title I, Part D: The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice.
Title II: The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training. In addition, the funds are utilized in the Salary Differential Program at Renaissance schools.
Title III: Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners
Title X- Homeless: The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI): SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs.
Violence Prevention Programs: N/A
Nutrition Programs: N/A

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

Housing Programs: N/A
Head Start: We utilize information from students in Head Start to transition into Kindergarten.
Adult Education: N/A
Career and Technical Education: The career and technical support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations
Job Training: Job training support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations
Other: N/A

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. The RtI Leadership team (Problem Solving Leadership Team – PSLT) includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Principal - Felicia Davis• Assistant Principal for Elementary Instruction – Jessica Hessler• Guidance Counselor - Sarah Fagan• School Psychologist - Michele Realmuto• Social Worker – Cindy Sampson• Academic Coaches (Reading – Angela Heintz , Math- Marseena Bobo)• Reading Resource- Laura Edwards• VE Teacher/ESE Contact – Teresa Joslyn• SAC Chair – Kelli Coleman• ELP Coordinator – Jessica Hessler• ELL Resource Teacher – Sylvia Herrera• Technology Resource Teacher – Jermaine Hankerson• Media Specialist – Cecil Baker• Gifted Instructor – Deborah Husarek <p>(Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals for the meeting)</p>
<p>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?</p>

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

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

The PSLT is considered the main leadership team in our school. The PSLT meets weekly and uses the problem solving process to:

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

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

- The Chair of SAC is a member of the PSLT.

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

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

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

- The PSLT will communicate with and support the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by assigning PSLT members as consultants to the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, PLCs will periodically report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger PSLT team through the grade level PSLT representatives.
- The PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process: Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
 - review and analyze screening and collateral data
 - develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers)
 - develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses

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

- establish methods to track students’ progress with appropriate progress monitoring assessments at intervals matched to the intensity of the interventions and/or enrichment
- develop progress monitoring goals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify interventions and/or enrichments)
- review goal statements to ensure they are ambitious, time-bound and meaningful (e.g., SMART goals)
- assess the fidelity of instruction/intervention implementation and other PS/RtI processes

MTSS Implementation

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

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released test	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach, Math resource, Reading Resource, A.Principal
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	PSLT, PLCs, individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach/ Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Common Assessments* (<i>see below</i>) of chapter/segments tests using adopted curriculum resources	Subject Area Generated Database	Resource Teachers, individual teachers, PSLT
Mini-Assessments on specific tested Benchmarks	Subject Area Generated Excel Database	Resource Teachers, individual teachers
DRA 2	School generated Excel database	Individual teachers, reading coach

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

- Determine if the lesson plans and teaching strategies used to teach the core curriculum were effective or need to be modified.
- Determine which skills need to be taught with alternative strategies.
- Determine which skills need to be re-taught within the core curriculum and which skills need to be moved to the Reinforcement Instructional Calendar.
- Determine which students need Differentiated Instruction within the classroom and which students might need Supplemental Services.

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program	School Generated Database in	PSLT/ ELP Facilitator

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

(ELP)* (<i>see below</i>) Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials)	Excel	
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	PSLT/ Reading Coach
I-Station	I-station online database	Individual teacher, PSLT, reading coach

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

The FAIR Toolkit Ongoing Progress Monitoring measures are one example of this type of assessment that can be used frequently to track student progress in Tiers 2 and 3. The PSLT will work to develop an Excel database to be used by interventionists to enter data from FAIR OPMs and other data for ongoing analysis of outcome data for supplementary and intensive supports. The PLCs (with support from PSLT consultants) will determine how often students will be assessed during the course of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, but in general progress monitoring will occur at least 2-4 times per month for instruction at Tier 2 and weekly for Tier 3. These assessments will provide more immediate feedback to determine if the alternative teaching strategies are working so that decisions can be made concerning continuing, fading or modifying intervention strategies.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
 Staff received overview training over the course of several faculty meetings during the 2011-2012 school year. PSLT members who attended the district level RtI trainings served as consultants to the PLCs to guide the process of data review and interpretation. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District’s Problem Solving Team develops resources and staff development trainings on PS/RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions will occur during Tuesday faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. Our school will invite our school psychologist and guidance counselor to review our progress in implementation of PS/RtI and provide on-site coaching and support to our PSLT/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI as they become available.

Describe plan to support MTSS.
 Grade levels will be supported through on-site trainings and grade level consultants.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). -Principal – Felicia Davis -Assistant Principal – Jessica Hessler -Reading Coach – Angela Heintz -Media Specialist – Cecil Baker -Academic Intervention Specialist-Kelli Coleman -Reading Resource-Laura Edwards -ELL specialist- Sylvia Herrera -ELL paraprofessional-Grettel Simpson -Teacher- Thalia Ordaz -Teacher-Stephanie King -Teacher-Sheri Fritz -Teacher-Barry Fossard -Teacher-Susan Drake
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading strategies on the SIP. The principal is the LLT chairperson. The reading coach is a member of the team and provides extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions. The reading coach and principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instruction support is provided to all teachers. The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the Problem Solving Leadership team's support plan. Additionally the principal ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading strategies across the content areas• Professional Development• Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas• Data analysis (on-going)• Implement K-12 Reading Plan

NCLB Public School Choice

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

Hillsborough 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised July, 2012

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

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

In Hillsborough County Public schools, all kindergarten children are assessed for Kindergarten Readiness using the FLKRS (Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener.) This state-selected assessment contains a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System and the first five measures of the Florida Assessments in Reading (FAIR). The instruments used in the screening are based upon the Florida Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Education Standards. Parents are provided with a letter from the Florida Commissioner of Education, explaining the assessments. Teachers will meet with parents after the assessments have been completed to review student performance. Data from the FAIR will be used to assist teachers in creating homogeneous groupings for small group reading instruction. Children entering Kindergarten may have benefited from the Hillsborough County Public Schools' Voluntary Prekindergarten Program. This program is offered at elementary schools in the summer and during the school year in selected Head Start classrooms and as blended program in several Early Exceptional Learning Program (EELP) classrooms. Starting in the 2012-13 school year, students in the VPK program will be given the state-created VPK assessment that looks at Print Knowledge, Phonological Awareness, Mathematics and Oral Language/Vocabulary. Students in the VPK program are given a district-created screening that looks at letter names, letter sounds phonemic awareness and number sense. This assessment will be administered at the start and end of the VPK program. A copy of these assessments is mailed to the school in which the child will be registered for kindergarten, enabling the child's teacher to have a better understanding of the child's abilities from the first day of school. Parent Involvement events for Transitioning Children into Kindergarten include Kindergarten RoundUp. This event provides parents with an opportunity to meet the teachers and hear about the academic program. Parents are encouraged to complete the school registration procedure at this time to ensure that the child is able to start school on time.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in reading (Level 3-5).			1.1. - Too many resources to use for instruction - District calendars move too quickly - Core curriculum is very broad - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum. - Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. - Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. - Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Teachers at varying levels of	1.1. Strategy: Students comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, teachers use core curriculum and provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to insure the mastery of essential skills. Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction in the following ways: -Content (All students must learn the content but they learn it in different ways. Some students learn it in depth while others learn the basics.) -Processes (This includes the various levels [Webb's Depth of Knowledge] that students think about the content and interact with the content.) -Products/Performances (This represents the multitude of ways that students can demonstrate what they understand, know and can do as a result of their learning.)	1.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Subject area leaders -Resource teachers <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk throughs. -EET formal evaluations EET pop-ins (Admin. and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations(Admin. and Peer/Mentor) -School based informal walk-through form which includes the schools SIP strategies.	1.1. <u>Teacher level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART Goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart their students individual progress towards the SMART goal(s). <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLC's calculate the SMART goal data across all classes. -For each class, PLC's chart their overall progress towards the SMART goal. -After each assessment, PLC's will ask the following questions: 1. How are we using data to inform our instruction? 2. What barriers to implementation are we facing	1.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> -FAIR Data -DRA -KRT <u>During the grading period:</u> -Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) -Running Records
<u>Reading Goal #1:</u> In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 48% to 53 % In Kindergarten, the percentage of Standard curriculum students reading at a DRA reading level of 6 or higher will increase from 41% in 2011-12 to 46% in 2012-13 In first grade, the percentage of Standard curriculum students reading at a DRA reading level of 20 or higher will increase from 51% in 2011-12 to 56% in 2012-13 In second, the percentage of Standard curriculum students reading at a DRA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 48%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 53%					

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

<p>reading level of 30 or higher will increase from 1% in 2011-12 to 6% in 2012-13.</p>			<p>implementation of Differentiated Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students)</p>	<p>-Learning Environment (This includes physical space, resources and flexible groupings of students.)</p> <p><i>In the classroom</i> During the lessons, students are involved in flexible grouping techniques such as: -Homogeneous/Cluster/Ability Grouping -Heterogeneous/Mixed Ability Grouping -Individualized Work/Independent Study -Whole Class Instruction -Pairs or Partners</p> <p>For English Language Learners: -Use gestures, visuals and graphic organizers when explaining concepts. -Specifically pinpoint and teach the academic language these students need to learn in order to complete a task. -Recognize cultural/experiential differences, and when feasible includes these in units and examples.</p>		<p>and how will we address them? 3.To what degree are we making progress towards our SMART goal? 4.Are there skills that need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the entire class? 5.Are there skills that need to be re-taught as mini-lessons to the entire class? 6.Are there skills that need to be re-taught to targeted students? 7.How do report and share our results with the leadership team? 8. How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? 9. How will we use what we learned from the problem solving process to design future DI lessons for new content?</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator with share data with their grade level RTI chairperson. The chairperson will consult with grade level teachers to assist with Tier 2 differentiated instructional strategies and assessment pieces for targeted students. Once data is collected for targeted student(s), the teacher will meet with the Problem Solving Leadership Team to discuss progress or further needs. This data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.</p> <p><u>Kindergarten through Second</u> -Team leader for grades 1 & 2 will collect from each teacher</p>	
---	--	--	---	---	--	---	--

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

						a Running Record list of where each 1 & 2 student is reading on an instructional level monthly. Kindergarten will begin collecting the same data in December. Data will be turned in to the Reading coach and reviewed by the leadership team.	
		1.2 -PLC's struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion. To address this barrier, this year PLC's are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	1.2 Strategy -Student achievement improves through PLC's-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 4 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 respond if they already know it? Actions/Details- Within PLCs -Through collaboration, grade level/like-course PLCs generate their own actions steps for each SIP strategy/task. PLCs generate their own specific plan of action (using the school-level SIP strategy as a base) for	1.2. Who -Principal -Asst. Principal -Instructional Coaches -Subject area leaders - PLC facilitators How PLC's turn their logs into administration and/or instructional coaches after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLC's receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings. -Progress of PLC's discussed at Leadership team.	1.2 -PLCs work with the administration/coach/subject area leader to come to consensus on a Plan-Do-Check-Act log template. -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check-Act log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on the Plan-Do-Check-Act log and shared with administration, Instructional coaches and/or Leadership team.	1.2. During the grading Period -Common Assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)	

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

			implementing the school’s designated tasks/strategies. Action plans are adjusted during the school year based on both teacher walk-through data and student data (checks for understanding and end-of-unit assessments). Grade level PLC’s use a Plan-Do-Check-Act “Unit of instruction” log. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional actions steps are outlined on grade level PLC action plans.				
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	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<u>Reading Goal #2:</u> In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 22% to 24%	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 22%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 24%	See Reading goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1
	2.2. See 1.2		2.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	2.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	2.2 See Reading Goal 1.2	2.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	2.2. See Reading Goal 1.2
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.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
<u>Reading Goal #3:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1

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

In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 75 points 80 Points.	75pts	80pts					
	3.2.		3.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	3.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	3.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	3.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	3.2. See Reading Goal 1.2
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Reading Goal #4: In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 81Points 86 Points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1
	81pts	86 pts					
4.2.		4.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	4.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	4.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	4.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	4.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	4.2. See Reading Goal 1.2

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.								
<u>Reading Goal #5:</u>								
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5A.1. See Reading Goal 1.1	5A.1. See Reading Goal 1.1	5A.1. See Reading Goal 1.1	5A.1. See Reading Goal 1.1	5A.1. See Reading Goal 1.1	
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> The percentage of white students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 55% to 60%. The percentage of Black students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 38% to 44%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 48% to 53%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	White:55 Black:38 Hispanic:48 Asian:NA American Indian:NA	White:60 Black:44 Hispanic:53 Asian:NA American Indian:NA						
			5A.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	5A.2 See Reading Goal 1.2	5A.2 See Reading Goal 1.2	5A.2 See Reading Goal 1.2	5A.2 See Reading Goal 1.2	
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.	
<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> The percentage of ED students	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	

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

scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 46% to 51%.	46%	51%					
	5B.2.		5B.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	5B.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	5B.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	5B.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	5B.2. See Reading Goal 1.2
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 31% to 38%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1
	31%	38%					
5C.2.		5C.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	5C.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	5C.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	5C.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	5C.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	5C.2. See Reading Goal 1.2
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Reading Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1

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

	Y						
			5D.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	5D.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	5D.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	5D.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	5D.2. Reading Goal 1.2

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
Phonics	K-5 Reading	L. Edwards, A. Heintz, K. Coleman	Grades Kg-5th	September 18,2012	FAIR data SAT data	A. Heintz L. Edwards
Vocabulary	K-5 Reading	L. Edwards, A. Heintz, K. Coleman	Grades Kg-5th	October 30, 2012	FAIR data SAT data	A. Heintz L. Edwards J. Hessler
Progress Monitoring and Miscue analysis	K-5 Reading	L. Edwards, A. Heintz, K. Coleman	Grades Kg-5th	December 4, 2012	FAIR data SAT data	A. Heintz L. Edwards J. Hessler
Fluency	K-5 Reading	L. Edwards, A. Heintz, K. Coleman	Grades Kg-5th	January 8,2013	FAIR data SAT data	A. Heintz L. Edwards J. Hessler
Daily 5 including Student Accountability	K-5 Reading	L. Edwards, A. Heintz, K. Coleman	Grades Kg-5th	February 5, 2013	FAIR data SAT data	A. Heintz L. Edwards J. Hessler
DRA refresher	K-5 Reading	L. Edwards, A. Heintz, K. Coleman	Grades Kg-5th	April 2, 2013	FAIR data SAT data	A. Heintz L. Edwards J. Hessler
Text Complexity	K-5	L. Edwards C.Wilson	Grades Kg-5 th	August 2012	Fair Data SAT Data	A. Heintz L. Edwards J. Hessler
ELL Strategy	K-5	S.Herrera	Grades Kg-5 th	Oct. 16 th , 2012	Lesson plans	S. Herrera

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

Checklist						
-----------	--	--	--	--	--	--

End of Reading Goals

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check	Strategy Data Check	Student Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient in mathematics (Level 3-5).			2.1. -Teachers not familiar with new Math series and Standards - Lack of understanding of how to implement the Core Continuous Improvement Model (C-CIM with the core curriculum), as the emphasis has been placed on F-CIM for targeted mini lessons and NOT on the core curriculum. -Lack of common planning time to discuss best practices before the unit of instruction. -Lack of common planning time to identify and analyze core curriculum assessments. -Lack of planning time to analyze data to identify best practices. - Need additional training to implement effective PLCs. - Teachers at varying levels of implementation of Differentiated	2.1. Strategy: Students comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specially, teachers use core curriculum and provide Differentiated Instruction (DI) as a result of the common assessments to insure the mastery of essential skills. Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction in the following ways: -Content (All students must learn the content but they learn it in different ways. Some students learn it in depth while others learn the basics.) -Processes (This includes the various levels [Webb's Depth of Knowledge] that students think about the content and interact with the content.) -Products/Performances (This represents the multitude of ways that students can demonstrate	2.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Reading Coach -Subject area leaders -Resource teachers <u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk throughs. -EET formal evaluations EET pop-ins (Admin. and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations(Admin. and Peer/Mentor) -School based informal walk-through form which includes the schools SIP strategies.	2.1. <u>Teacher level</u> -Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the SMART Goal developed in their PLC. -Teachers chart their students individual progress towards the SMART goal(s). <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLC's calculate the SMART goal data across all classes. -For each class, PLC's chart their overall progress towards the SMART goal. -After each assessment, PLC's will ask the following questions: 1. How are we using data to inform our instruction? 2. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them? 3.To what degree are we making progress towards our SMART goal? 4.Are there skills that need to be re-	2.1. <u>2-3x Per Year</u> District Baseline <u>During the grading period:</u> -Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
<u>Mathematics Goal #1:</u> In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 40% to 45%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 40%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 45%					

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

			<p>Instruction (both with the low performing and high performing students).</p> <p>what they understand, know and can do as a result of their learning.)</p> <p>-Learning Environment (This includes physical space, resources and flexible groupings of students.)</p> <p><i>In the classroom</i> During the lessons, students are involved in flexible grouping techniques such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Homogeneous/Cluster/Ability Grouping -Heterogeneous/Mixed Ability Grouping -Individualized Work/Independent Study -Whole Class Instruction -Pairs or Partners <p>For English Language Learners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Use gestures, visuals and graphic organizers when explaining concepts. -Specifically pinpoint and teach the academic language these students need to learn in order to complete a task. -Recognize cultural/experiential differences, and when feasible includes these in units and examples. 		<p>taught in a whole lesson to the entire class?</p> <p>5.Are there skills that need to be re-taught as mini-lessons to the entire class?</p> <p>6.Are there skills that need to be re-taught to targeted students?</p> <p>7.How do report and share our results with the leadership team?</p> <p>8. How are we going to re-teach the skill differently?</p> <p>9. How will we use what we learned from the problem solving process to design future DI lessons for new content?</p> <p><u>Leadership Team Level</u></p> <p>-PLC facilitator with share data with their grade level RTI chairperson. The chairperson will consult with grade level teachers to assist with Tier 2 differentiated instructional strategies and assessment pieces for targeted students. Once data is collected for targeted student(s), the teacher will meet with the Problem Solving Leadership Team to discuss progress or further needs. This data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction.</p>	
			2.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	2.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	2.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	2.2. See Reading Goal 1.2

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: In grades 3-5, the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 14% to 16%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	See Math Goal 2.1	See Math Goal 2.1	See Math Goal 2.1	See Math Goal 2.1	See Math Goal 2.1
	14%	16%					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1.	3.1	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: In grades 3-5, the percentage of <u>All Curriculum</u> students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 53 points to 58 Points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1
	53pts	58pts					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2
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

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.	4.1	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: In grades 3-5, the percentage of All Curriculum students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 59 Points to 64 Points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 59pts	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 64pts	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016 2016-2017
5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.							
Math Goal #5:							
5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics			5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.
Math Goal #5A: The percentage of White students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 37% to 43%. The percentage of Black students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 32% to 39%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:37% Black:32% Hispanic:46% Asian:NA American Indian:NA	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:43% Black:39% Hispanic:51% Asian:NA American Indian:NA	See reading goal 1.1	See reading goal 1.1	See reading goal 1.1	See reading goal 1.1	See reading goal 1.1
			5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.
			See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2

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

The percentage of Hispanic students scoring satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA will increase from 46% to 51%.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Mathematics Goal #5B: The percentage of E.D. students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 37% to 43%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 37%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 43%	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			See Reading Goal 1.2	See Reading Goal 1.2	See Reading Goal 1.2	See Reading Goal 1.2	See Reading Goal 1.2
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL. students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 28% to 35%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 28%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 35%	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1	See Reading Goal 1.1
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2	See reading goal 1.2

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. See Reading Goal 1.1	5D.1. See Reading Goal 1.1	5D.1. See Reading Goal 1.1	5D.1. See Reading Goal 1.1	5D.1. See Reading Goal 1.1
Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD. students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from 17% to 25%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	17%	25%					
			5D.2. See reading goal 1.2	5D.2. See reading goal 1.2	5D.2. See reading goal 1.2	5D.2. See reading goal 1.2	5D.2. See reading goal 1.2

End of Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math Norms and Calendar Math	K-5 Math	M. Bobo	Kg-5 th Math teachers	September, 2012	Math assessments	M.Bobo J. Hessler
Trajectory Tasks	K-5 Math	M. Bobo	Kg-5 th Math teachers	October, 2012	Math assessments	M.Bobo J. Hessler
Using the "24" Game Computer	K-5 Math	M. Bobo	Kg-5 th Math teachers	November, 2012	Math assessments	M.Bobo J. Hessler
Using Virtual Manipulatives	K-5 Math	M. Bobo	Kg-5 th Math teachers	January, 2012	Math assessments	M.Bobo J. Hessler
Book Study	K-5 Math	M. Bobo	Kg-5 th Math teachers	February-April, 2012	Math assessments	M.Bobo J. Hessler

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient (Level 3-5) in science.			1.1. -Not all teachers know how to identify misconceptions and depth of student knowledge of science concepts. -Not all teachers are knowledgeable of the strategies of inquiry based instruction such as engaging the students, explore time, accountable talk, higher order questioning, etc. -Not all PLC meetings include regular discussion of student data and/or the implementation of the inquiry model. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with the use of achievement series to accurately analyze student data. -Not familiar with new series. -Lack of time to plan together as a team.	1.1. Strategy -Student achievement improves through PLC's- teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the <u>Plan-Do-Check-Act model</u> and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following 4 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 respond if they already know it? Actions/Details- Within PLCs -Through collaboration, grade level/like-course PLCs generate their own actions steps for each SIP strategy/task. PLCs generate their own specific plan of action	1.1. Who -Principal -Asst. Principal -Instructional Coaches -Subject area leaders - PLC facilitators How PLC's turn their logs into administration and/or instructional coaches after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLC's receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings. -Progress of PLC's discussed at Leadership team.	1.1. -PLCs work with the administration/coach/subject area leader to come to consensus on a Plan-Do-Check-Act log template. -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check-Act log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on the Plan-Do-Check-Act log and shared with administration, Instructional coaches and/or Leadership team	1.1. During the grading Period -Common Assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
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 29% to 34%.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * 29%	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 34%					

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

				(using the school-level SIP strategy as a base) for implementing the school's designated tasks/strategies. Action plans are adjusted during the school year based on both teacher walk-through data and student data (checks for understanding and end-of-unit assessments). Grade level PLC's use a Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of instruction" log. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional actions steps are outlined on grade level PLC action plans.			
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.			2.2. See Reading goal 1.2	2.2. See reading goal 1.2	2.2. See reading goal 1.2	2.2. See reading goal 1.2	2.2. See reading goal 1.2
Science Goal #2: In grade 5 the percentage of Standard Curriculum students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 5% to 8%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 5%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 8%					

Science 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
STEM fair	Kg-5	B. Long	Kg-5 th	9/11/12	On-going	Grade level PLC's
Science Olympics/Inquiry Monday	Kg-5	B. Long	Kg-5 th	9/25/12	On-going	Grade level PLC's
Design Challenges	Kg-5	B. Long	Kg-5 th	10/2/12	On-going	Grade level PLC's

End of Science Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals

Writing/Language Arts Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.			1.1 - Teachers lack skill and understanding regarding the FCAT Writing Assessment and Scoring Rubric. - Teachers new to Language Arts may not have FCAT Writing training - Teachers do not have confidence using holistic scoring methods - Teachers lack sufficient time to score student papers - Teachers lack common planning time to meet in PLCs to discuss common deficiencies in writing - students who are struggling in Reading are most likely struggling in Writing	1.1 Strategy -Student comprehension of course content/standards increases through teacher's use of data to inform instruction. Specifically, teachers use on-going progress monitoring data (FCAT, district formative assessments, baseline, mid-year, nine week assessments, curriculum assessments and daily classwork) to plan and deliver mini-lessons and mini-assessments (F-CIM). Actions/Details- Within PLCs -Through collaboration, grade level/like-course PLCs generate their own actions steps for each SIP strategy/task. PLCs generate their own specific plan of action (using the school-level SIP strategy as a base) for implementing the school's designated tasks/strategies. Action plans are adjusted during the school year based on both teacher walk-through data and student data	1.1 Who -Principal -AP -Resource Teachers How -PLC logs turned into administration. Administration provides feedback. -Evidence of strategy in teachers' lesson plans seen during administration walk throughs. -EET formal evaluations EET pop-ins (Admin. and Peer/Mentor) -EET formal observations(Admin. and Peer/Mentor) -School based informal walk-through form which includes the schools SIP strategies.	1.1 <u>Teacher level</u> Teachers reflect on lessons during the unit citing/using specific evidence of learning and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers chart their student's individual progress. <u>PLC level</u> -PLCs will review mini-assessment data. Mini-assessment data recorded in PLC data base (excel spread sheet). -For the mini-assessments, PLCs will chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 80% mastery on each mini-assessment. -For each class, PLC's chart their overall progress towards the SMART goal. -After each assessment, PLC's will ask the following questions: 1.Are there skills that need to be re-taught in a whole lesson to the whole class? 2.Are there skills that need to be re-taught as a mini-lesson to the entire class using a different teaching technique? 3.Are there skills that need to be re-taught to targeted students? 4.How do we report and share our results with the Leadership team? <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator with share data with their grade level RTI chairperson. The	1.1 Student monthly demand writes, student daily drafts, conferencing notes
Writing/LA Goal #1: In grade 4, the percentage of AYP All Curriculum (AC) students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing will increase from 73% to 78%.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * 73%	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 78%					

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

				(checks for understanding and end-of-unit assessments). Grade level PLC's use a Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of instruction" log. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional actions steps are outlined on grade level PLC action plans.		chairperson will consult with grade level teachers to assist with Tier 2 differentiated instructional strategies and assessment pieces for targeted students. Once data is collected for targeted student(s), the teacher will meet with the Problem Solving Leadership Team to discuss progress or further needs. This data will be used to plan for future supplemental instruction. -The Problem Solving Leadership Team 1) reviews FAIR OPM data to determine the percentage of students scoring medium to high and 2) reviews course-generated nine week assessment that includes all skills covered during the nine week period. -The PSLT will review assessment data for positive trends at a minimum of once per nine weeks.	
			1.2. See reading goal 1.2	1.2. See Reading goal 1.2	1.2. See Reading goal 1.2	1.2. See Reading goal 1.2	1.2. See Reading goal 1.2

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
District Writing Moodle	Grade 4	District trainer	Grade 4	District online course dates.	District required follow up activity	District trainer, and J. Hessler

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. -Most students with significant unexcused absences (10 or more) have serious personal or family issues that are impacting attendance.	1.1. The Administration Team along with other appropriate staff will meet every 20 days to review the school’s Attendance Plan to 1) ensure that all steps are being implemented with fidelity and 2) discuss targeted students. A data base will be maintained for students with excessive unexcused absences and tardies. This data base will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of attendance interventions and to identify students in need of support. Guidance counselor will put an attendance reward program in place to reward attendance. School Social Worker will meet weekly with attendance group of targeted children	1.1. School Social Worker will run Attendance/Tardy meetings every 20 days with appropriate reports AP will maintain data base with: Social Worker Guidance Counselors	1.1. Administration Team and subset of PSLT will examine data monthly and look for repeat patterns and trends	1.1. Attendance Report Tardy Report Attendance Plan
Attendance Goal #1: -The attendance rate will increase from 94.43% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013. -The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences throughout the school year will decrease from 156 in 2011-2012 to 125 in 2012-2013. -The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies to school throughout the school year will remain at 0 for the 2012-2013 school year.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*	-Lack of time to focus on attendance -Lack of staff to focus on attendance -No attendance incentives permitted at school sites -Lack of parent involvement and communication				
	94.43%	96%					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	156	125					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	0	0					

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
Attendance procedures	K-5	Sampson	K-5 faculty and Staff	September 25 th , 2012	Weekly district data checks	C. Sampson (School Social Worker)

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 -Lack of parental involvement -Not enough mentors to review rules and expectations for struggling students -Monitoring teacher effectiveness of school-wide behavior plan -No Detention or ISS policy/procedure	1.1 Tier 1: Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey and discussion, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations.	1.1 PSLT “behavior” subgroup	1.1 PSLT “behavior” subgroup with review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions monthly.	1.1 Crystal Report ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data
Suspension Goal #1:	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.	2	1					
2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
-The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease from 44 in 2011-2012 to 40 in 2012-2013.	2	1					
	<u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	44	40					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
-The total number of students receiving suspension Out-of-School will decrease from 28 in 2011-	28	24					

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

2012 to 24 in 2012-2013.						

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
PBS overview	K-5	S. Fagan	K-5 faculty and Staff	Aug. 2012, on- going Monthly	Crystal Reports	S. Fagan

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.

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	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. Parent Involvement			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Parent Involvement Goal #1:							
Enter narrative for the goal in this box. See PIP	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	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. Parent Involvement		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Parent Involvement Goal #2:						
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.

Parent Involvement 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
See PIP						

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Health and Fitness Goal			1.1. -Students not eating healthy at home -Not enough time in the day for TDP	1. Students will engage in the equivalent of one class period per day of physical education	1. Principal Guidance Counselors	-Classroom walkthrough -Monitoring teachers schedules	- Student schedules -Master schedule
Health and Fitness Goal #1: During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the “Healthy Fitness Zone” (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 44% on the Pretest to 54% on the Posttest.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	44%	54%	1.2.	2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the school’s H.E.A.R.T. team. Physical Education coach will attend local PLC’s, HCPEA meetings and physical education workshops to learn additional activities to improve our student’s cardiovascular fitness levels.	2. H.E.A.R.T. team.	2. H.E.A.R.T. team notes/agendas	2. Healthy Fitness Zone post-test

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
District aligned workshops	P.E. Coach	District trainer	P.E. coach	District training dates	District assigned follow-up activities	District trainer

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

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
1. Continuous Improvement Goal			1.1. - Note enough time for PLC's to meet and go over data in all curriculum areas effectively. -Not sure which pieces to use as a grade level.	1.1. -Weekly PLC's and quarterly Vertical PLC's to desegregate data and align the curriculum and grade level expectations.	1.1. -Principal -AP -Team Leaders -PSLT Team	1.1. PLST will examine the feedback from all PLCs and determine next steps in the PLC process.	1.1. PLC Facilitators will provide feedback to PLST team on progress of their PLC.
<u>Continuous Improvement Goal #1:</u> The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "The teachers that I work with are trained to understand and use data in the classroom.(under Documenting and Using Results)" will increase from 40.7% in 2012 to 50% in 2013.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	40.7%	50%					

Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Electronic Data	K-5	Hankerson	K-5 classroom teachers	Mon. Oct. 1 st , 2012	Monthly Data Checks	Asst. Principal, Reading Coach, Math Resource teacher

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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	0	*					
			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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	0	*					
			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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #C: The percent of students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking will increase from 44% in 2012 to 46% in 2013	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 44%	See reading goal 1.1	See reading goal 1.1	See reading goal 1.1	See reading goal 1.1	See reading goal 1.1
		1.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	1.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	1.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	1.2. See Reading Goal 1.2	1.2. See Reading Goal 1.2
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.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #D: The percent of students scoring proficient in Reading will increase from 27% in 2012 to 29% in 2013.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading : 27%	See reading goal 1.1	See reading goal 1.1	See reading goal 1.1	See reading goal 1.1	See reading goal 1.1
		2.2. See reading goal 1.2	2.2. See reading goal 1.2	2.2. See reading goal 1.2	2.2. See reading goal 1.2	2.2. See reading goal 1.2
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 goal 1.1	2.1. See reading goal 1.1	2.1. See reading goal 1.1	2.1. See reading goal 1.1

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

CELLA Goal #E: The percent of students scoring proficient in Writing will increase from 19% in 2012 to 29% in 2013.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :	See reading goal 1.1				
	19%					
		2.2. See reading goal 1.2	2.2. See reading goal 1.2	2.2. See reading goal 1.2	2.2. See reading goal 1.2	2.2. See reading goal 1.2

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: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance: * 0	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * *					
			F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.
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: _____	2012 Current Level of Performance: *	2013 Expected Level of Performance: *					

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

N/A	0	*					
			G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.

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	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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	0	*					
			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 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
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: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0	*					
			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	Fidelity Check Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	Strategy Data Check How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	Student Evaluation Tool

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

STEM Goal #1: We will increase the number of Math bowl participants by 10% from 29 to 32 students	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	Transportation for students to get ride to/from school for additional practice. Lack of teachers with additional time before/after school to work with Math Bowl students.	On-going grade level planning, modeling and facilitation with the Reading Resource teacher and PLC's to increase math outcomes so that more students at each grade level will qualify to practice and participate.	The math bowl team attendance/membership will be monitored by the Math resource teacher.	Effectiveness will be determined by attendance/team membership data.	Area Math Bowl competition.

STEM Professional Development

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

CTE 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
CTE Goal #1: Mango had 14 different professions represented during our 2011-12 Great American Teach In. We would like to increase the number of professions by 15% to include 16 different professions represented during our 2012-13 Great American Teach In.	1.1. Finding parents in professionally diverse jobs in our school clientele, Parents able and willing to take time off work to talk with various grade levels	1.1. Begin recruiting parents and our business partners earlier in the year so that they can arrange for time off.	1.1. The Serve Coordinator will keep track of the number of volunteers whom have agreed to present as well as their topic.	1.1. We will calculate the percentage of different topics from 2012 and compare it to the 2013 percentage.	1.1. Student feedback via classroom teachers.

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
Volunteer Handbook Training	K-5	J. Teston	K-5 faculty and support staff	Aug. 2012	Great American Teach In volunteer count	J. Teston

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		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

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

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

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
2.1. Math— Differentiated Instruction (DI)	Resources are needed to support our Math Curriculum night. This event will encourage family involvement and show math in everyday use through fun and engaging activities.	\$100	\$43.52
1.1. Science- PLC's-teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Plan-Do-Check-Act model	Resources are needed to support our Science Curriculum night. This event will encourage family involvement and showcase science in everyday use through fun and engaging Science Fair activities.	\$100	\$16.22
1.1. Reading- Differentiated Instruction (DI)	Reading Resources are needed to support our Reading Curriculum night. This event will encourage family involvement in reading through fun and engaging activities.	\$400	\$589.15
1.1 Writing— mini-lessons and mini-assessments (F-CIM).	Resources are needed to encourage and reward student work and engagement during writing assessments.	\$200	\$191.50
1.1- Suspension— Positive Behavior Support (PBS) will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules	Resources are needed to provide tickets, and other rewards used to encourage our M.A.N.G.O. Expectations through PBS. PBS indirectly supports all of our goals.	\$300	\$244.32
1.1 Attendance--The Administration Team along with other appropriate staff will meet every 20 days to review the school's Attendance Plan	Resources are needed to fund our monthly attendance incentives .	\$300	\$290.10
1.1 Reading PLC's-teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Plan-Do-Check-Act model	Resources are needed to fund monthly Professional Development opportunities for teachers working towards increasing student achievement.	\$500	\$745.76
Final Amount Spent			