Florida Department of Education

2012-2013

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name:	District Name:
Greco Middle School	Hillsborough
Principal:	**Superintendent:**
Olayinka Alege	MaryEllen Elia
SAC Chair:	**Date of School Board Approval:**
Mikel Lewis	Pending 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

Hillsborough 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised July 18, 2012

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

List your school's highly effective 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	Olayinka Alege	Ed.M - Leadership BS English Ed.	0	7	11/12: Pending (former school – King High School) 10/11: B 77% AYP 09/10: A 79% AYP 08/09: D 69% AYP
Assistant Principal	Manuschka Michaud	Ed.M - Leadership BS Biology	0	7	11/12: F (former school – Sligh Middle School) 10/11: D 72% AYP 09/10: D 77% AYP 08/09: C 79% AYP
Assistant Principal	David Lawrence	Ed. S - Leadership MS Adult Ed BS Comprehensive Social Studies	0	0	11/12: Pending (Teacher: former school – King High School) 10/11: B 77% AYP 09/10: A 79% AYP 08/09: D 69% AYP
Assistant Principal	Angel Hernandez	Ed.M – Leadership Business 6-12	0	0	11/12: B (Teacher: former school – Adams Middle School) 10/11: A 64% AYP 09/10: A 79% AYP 08/09: A 77% 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)
Reading	Stevonia Dixon	BA – Communications K-6 Reading Endorsement	2	First year	NA
Science	Mary Worden	BS Elementary Education - USF K-6 w/ESOL Middle Grades Science 5-9	First year	First year	NA
Writing	Sabrina Richards	Middle Grades English 5-9 English 6-12 Educational Leadership	First year	First Year	NA

Math	Jennifer Merritt	BA - Communication Sciences and Disorders MA - Teaching	1	1	11/12: School Grade – D FCAT Math: ● 58% of all students made learning gains ● 59% of students in lowest quartile made learning gains

	6th Grade	7th Grade	8th Grade
Level 1	34	35	42
Level 2	32	32	29
Level 3	21	22	17
Level 4	10	9	7
Level 5	3	2	5

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable

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

Teachers ● 6 out of field	Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented. **Administrators** Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on: ● Preparing and taking the certification exam ● Completing classes need for certification ● Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers ● Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s) **Academic Coach** ● The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis **Subject Area Leader/PLC** ● The teachers will attend PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all.

Staff Demographics

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
73	12% (9)	25% (18)	41% (30)	22% (16)	40% (29)	97% (71)	15% (11)	3% (2)	22% (16)

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

Trenika Thornton ***(District EET Mentor)***	Andrea Mallard Sandra D Viers Benjamin Crollick Lisa Bird Christopher Pettit Jacob Bess Jarryd Reid Joseph Copello Salina Salway Andrew Walker	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assess ments, conferen cing and problem solving.

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A A. SES Services; B. School Psychologist C. School Social Worker D. AVID Coordinator E. ESE Specialist F. Student Intervention Specialist G. Ophelia Project H. Resource Teacher
Title I, Part C- Migrant NA
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 reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs.
Nutrition Programs NA
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 Business Technology; Family Consumer Science; STEM; Industrial Science; Student Assistant Program
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 NA

Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-Based RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team (referred to as the Problem-Solving Leadership Team or PSLT).

The MTSS (Multi-Tiered Systems of Support) Leadership team (or PSLT) includes:

A. Principal

B. Assistance Principal for Curriculum

C. Assistant Principal for Administration

D. Administrative Resource Teacher

E. Student Intervention Specialist

F. School Psychologist

G. ESE Specialist

H. Guidance Counselors

I. School Social Worker

J. Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, Writing, Science)

K. Subject Area Leaders

L. Grade Level Team Leaders

M. SAC Chair

N. ELP Coordinator

O. ELL Representative

P. Speech/Language Therapist (adhoc member)

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

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

The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to:

1. Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs at all grade levels.

2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.

3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.

4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

5. Engage in problem solving with PLC leaders regarding progress towards goals and objectives identified in the SIP.

The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly). Specific responsibilities include:

- Oversee the multi-layered model of instructional delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Ensure the master schedule incorporates allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels.
- Determine scheduling needs, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers 2/3.
- Facilitate the implementation of specific programs (e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school; Saturday Academies) that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/chats conducted by the PLCs.
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Organize and support systematic data collection (e.g., district and state assessments; during-the-grading period school assessments/checks for understanding)
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
    - Implementation and support of PLCs

- Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
- Use of Common Core Assessments by teachers teaching the same grade/subject area/course (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
- Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions. (as outlined in our SIP)
- Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences.

- On a monthly basis, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the month (i.e., Academic Coaches & Administrators)
- Support the planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs and Specialty PSLT.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) on core curriculum material.
- Coordinate/collaborate/integrate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).

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

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

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

MTSS Implementation

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

Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released tests	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach/Math Coach/AP
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Electronic Data Walls	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability (Chapter Exams, 8th grade Formatives)		Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science (BIG Ideas, Common benchmark assessments)	Data Wall PLC Logs	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network	Reading Coach/Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative

Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. (Intensive Reading, Intensive Math)	Ed-Line PLC Database PLC logs	Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/Leadership Team Member
Reports on Demand/Crystal Reports	District Generated Database	Leadership Team/Specialty PSLT

Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
Extended Learning Program (ELP)* *(see below)* Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials) (teacher-made tests based on curriculum)	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/ ELP Facilitator
Differentiated mini assessments based on core curriculum assessments.	Individual teacher data base PLC/Department data base	Individual Teachers/PLCs
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/Reading Coach
Ongoing assessments within Intensive Courses	Database provided by course materials (for courses that have one), School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/PLC/Individual Teachers
Other Curriculum Based Measurement	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/PLCs/Individual Teachers
Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs	Assessments included in computer-based programs	PLCs/Individual Teachers

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

- Administrators & PSLT members will receive a booster training on the problem solving/response to intervention process.
- Resources for staff professional development on RtI will be accessed through the District RtI database and distributed to staff.
- Professional Development sessions will occur during faculty meeting times or team meetings (e.g, grade-level teams) as needed.

The Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school committees with the problem-solving process and training needs for successful implementation of a multi-tiered system of support. Selected members of the Leadership team will assist in conducting a booster training to school staff on the problem-solving process and multi-tiered systems of support. Resources for training will be obtained from the District's RtI Committee/RtI Facilitators for staff development trainings on PS/MTSS. Professional Development sessions, as identified by teacher needs assessment and/or EET evaluation data, will occur during faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. The Leadership Team will send school team representatives to ongoing PS/RtI trainings/support sessions that are offered district-wide. Our school will invite our area RtI Facilitator to visit quarterly (or as needed) to review our progress in implementation of PS/RtI and provide on-site coaching and support to our Leadership Teams/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI offered at the district level or school site.

Describe plan to support MTSS**.**

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

- Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).
- Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.

- Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

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

- Principal
- Assistant Principal for Curriculum
- Reading Coach
- Reading Teachers
- Media Specialist
- Teachers across content areas (Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies and Electives) who have demonstrated effective reading instruction as reflected through positive student reading gains
- Language Arts Subject Area Leaders

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

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

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

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

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

- Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading goals/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)
- Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan

NCLB Public School Choice

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

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

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

Project CRISS, Level 1 training, which is a 12 hour initial training, is offered annually through district-provided training. Mandatory follow-up is provided at the school site by the reading coach. Complementing the Project CRISS initiative is the inclusion of close reading lessons in the ELA, reading, and content area classrooms.

The reading coach is required as a part of his/her job description to provide on-site support of the implementation of the Project CRISS Strategic Lesson Plan model and the design and delivery of close reading lessons through professional development opportunities, as well as, coaching opportunities. A yearly action plan is created by the reading coach that outlines what Project CRISS and close reading model lesson professional development will be offered. A monthly written update allows the reading supervisor to monitor the progress of each coach's action plan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Greco Middle School annually will hold elective fairs with present and incoming students. Based on interest, they will establish Course Selection Sheets and courses offerings to best meet their needs. The Guidance Department, ESE Specialist, AVID Coordinator, Department Heads, teachers and APCs will then articulate with feeder schools and assist students in signing up for courses and programs based on their Automatic Course Requests and their individual interests. Guidance Counselors will visit classes to review the curriculum guide and course descriptions. They will distribute Course Selection Sheets and provide information about selecting courses for the following school year. These Course Selection Sheets are then sent home for parent review and signature. On an annual basis, Greco Middle School will review new course offerings at the state and district level to continue to offer rigorous and relevant coursework and to meet the State Standards.

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/ satisfactory in reading (Level 3-5).	1.1. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	1.1. **1. Strategy/Task/ Action** Reading teachers will implement Plan-Do-Check-Act to strengthen the district selected core curriculum. Teachers will meet a minimum of 3 times per month in PLCs with the Reading Coach to plan collaboratively. PLCs will specifically: -Increase content knowledge in pedagogy in order to implement the core curriculum with fidelity. -Monitor pacing of curriculum -Plan for engagement activities being with Think-Pair-Share strategy -Write text-dependent high order questions for	1.1. Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/ or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of	1.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.	1.1. 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)		

		future lessons -Plan for checks for understanding during and at the close of the lessons -Analyze data from common curriculum based assessments to drive differentiated and future instruction **Actions/Details** -Grade level/ like-course PLCs use a **Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log** to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log.	PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.				

Reading Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 36% to 39%.							
	36%	**39%**					

		1.2. Reading teachers are not implementing core curriculum with fidelity	**1.2** **Strategy/Task/ Action** Students' reading, writing, language, and listening / speaking skills will improve through implementation of district selected core curriculum with fidelity. The Reading Coach supports reading teachers through co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, debriefing, or teacher/student data chats. Every two weeks the Coach meets with the principal to review log and develop short term action plans. **Action Steps** -Information will be gathered from surveys, during PLCs, walkthroughs, and school data to inform teachers' instructional needs.	1.2 Who -Reading Coach -OTG Coach Principal/APC How -Coach conferences - PLC logs - Walkthrough's	1.2 Reading coach will differentiate coaching cycles and share information with Administration	1.2. 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit) Student work samples	

			-Coaching cycle will be revisited as appropriate based on the needs of the individual teacher.				

		1.3 -Teachers knowledge base of this engagement strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers .	**1.3** **Strategy/Task/ Action** Student achievement improves when students are intellectually engaged in learning important and challenging content. Specifically Reading teachers will use the Think-Pair-Share strategy. **Action Steps** -Information will be gathered from teacher survey s, during PLCs, walkthroughs, and site-based literacy coaches' meetings regarding teachers' skill levels in utilizing think-pair-share as an engagement technique through the district-selected core curriculum. -In district trainings, school	1.3 Who -Reading Coach -Writing Coach -Social Studies SAL -OTG Coach Principal/APC How -Coach conferences - PLC logs - Walkthroughs	. 1.3 Reading Coach will share walkthrough data information with Administration	1.3. Reading Coach will conduct walkthroughs looking specifically for engagement strategy, Think-Pair-Share.	

			professional development, and PLCSs, teachers will attend ongoing trainings/ professional development to build teachers' skill levels in utilizing think-pair-share through the district-selected core curriculum. -Teachers in classrooms will implement new knowledge of utilizing think-pair-share through the district-selected core curriculum as evident by walkthroughs and artifacts				

		1.4 Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	**1.4** Reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in grappling with complex text. Teachers need to understand how to select/identify complex text, shift the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and share complex texts with all students. **Action Steps** Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.4 Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -Reading PLC Logs -Language Arts PLC Logs -Social Studies PLC Logs -Elective PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	1.4 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/ courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.4 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)	

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?				
2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.	2.1.	2.1. See Goal 1	2.1.				

Reading Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 14% to 17%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	14%	**17%**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.		See Goal 1					

Reading Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 53 points to 56 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance: *	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	53 points	**56 points**					
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.		See Goal 1					

Reading Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 58 points to 61 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance: *	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	58 points	**61 points**					
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:							
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	

5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		**Information on how to fill out this section/ row is forthcoming from the state.**					
Reading Goal #5: **Data for this goal can be found on The Office of Assessment's SIP Evaluation and Development Report**							

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

Reading Goal #5A:	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of White students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 52% to 57%.							
The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 29% to 36%.							
The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 42% to 48%.							
The percentage of Asian students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/							

FAA Reading will increase from 30% to 37%.							
	White: 52% Black: 29% Hispanic: 42% Asian: 30% American Indian: NA	White: 57% Black: 36% Hispanic: 48% Asian: 37% American Indian: NA					
		5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** 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. **NA**	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of Econ. Dis students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 33% to 40%.	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance					
	Econ. Dis: 33%	Econ. Dis: 40%					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	

		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
	Anticipated Barrier	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1 -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority. -The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional developme nt delivered by the school's ERT. -Teachers impleme ntation of CALLA is not consistent across core courses. -ELLs at varying levels of English language	5C.1 ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/standard improves through participation in the **Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)** strategy across Reading, Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science. **Action Steps** -ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons. -ERT models lessons using CALLA. -ERT observes content area teachers using CALLA and provides feedback,	5C.1 Who -School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from: The CALLA Handbook, p. 101, Table 5.4 "Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction.	5C.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)	5C.1 -FAIR -CELLA During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance		

	acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of CALLA/ in order to effectively conduct a CALLA fidelity check walk-through.	coaching and support. -District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of CALLA. -Core content teachers set SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming core curriculum assessments. -Core content teachers administer and analyze ELLs performance on assessments. -Teachers aggregate data to determine the performance of ELLs compared to the whole group. -Based on data core content teachers will differentiate instruction to remediate/enhance instruction.					

Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 27% to 33%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	ELL: 27%	ELL: 33%					

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

			A+Rise and provides feedback, coaching and support. -District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of A+ Rise strategies for ELLs.		support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)		

		5C.3 -Lack of understanding teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing. -Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing support. -Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on number of ELLs. -Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT and Bilingual paraprofessional.	5C.3 ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/ standards improves through participation in the following **day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across** Reading, LA, Math, Science, and Social Studies: 1. Extended time (lesson and assessments) 2. Small group testing 3. Para support (lesson and assessments) 4. Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)	5C.3 Who -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms	5C.3 Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students.	5C.3 During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests	

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

			areas of listening/ speaking, reading and writing. -Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL Differentiated Instruction lessons using the district provided ELL Differentiated Instruction binders (provided by the ELL Department) in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies. -PLCs generate SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs/teachers plan for upcoming lessons/units using targeted CALLA and A+ Rise strategies and Differentiated Instruction strategies based on ELLs needs in the areas of listening/ speaking, reading and writing. -PLCs/teachers plan for accommodations		support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)		

			for core curriculum content and assessment. -When conducting data analysis on core curriculum assessments, PLCs aggregate the ELL data. -Based on the data, PLCs/teachers plan interventions for targeted ELL students using the resources from CALLA, A+ Rise, and Differentiated instruction binders.				
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. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	5D.1. **Strategy** SWD student achievement improves through the effective and **consistent implementation of students' IEP** goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/ SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	5D.1. Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal ESE Specialist How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC	5D.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	5D.1. -FAIR During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance		

Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from 21% to 29%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	SWD: 21%	SWD: 29%					

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

			-What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD? ***Plan for the "Do"*** What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal? -What resources do we need? -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD? -What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our SWD? -What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help SWD learn? -Specifically how will we implement the _____strategy during the lesson? -What are teachers going to do during				

			the lesson for SWD? -What are SWD going to do during the lesson to maximize learning? ***Reflect on the "Do"/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work during the unit.*** For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers **reflect** and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD: -What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? -What didn't work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next? -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what				

			worked? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons? -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what didn't work? Why? What are we going to do next? -What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding? And/or analysis of student performance? -How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons? ***Reflect/Check – Analyze Data*** Discuss one or more of the following: -What is the SWD data? -What is the data telling us as individual				

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

		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

Reading Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	6-8	-Subject Area Leaders -Course specific PLC Facilitators -Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	-On-going -Demonstration classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders

The 3 S's of Complex Text: Selecting /Identifying Complex Text, Shifting to Increased Use of Informational Text, and Sharing of Complex Text with All Students (K-12)	Grades 6-8	Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders
Identifying and Creating Text-Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension (K-12)	Grades 6-8	Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders
Designing and Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning (K-12)	Grades 6-8	Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders
IEP Training	6-8	ESE Teachers	ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs	On-going	Case Manager	ESE Specialist
SWD Co-Teaching	6-8	DRT	ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team DRT
ELL Strategies	6-8	English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT)	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Elementary or Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient/ satisfactory performance in mathematics (Level 3-5).	1.1 -PLCs struggle with developing engaging lessons. -Teachers' incorporation of student directed learning varies across campus.	1.1 **Strategy/ Task** Student achievement improves when teachers work collaboratively to focus on student learning. Teachers will meet a minimum of 3 times per month in PLCs with site-based coach to create student centered lessons while maintaining the pace of the curriculum. **Action Steps** Grade level PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check Act form to guide the way of work.	1.1 **Who** -Math Coach -Principal/APC -District Math Resource Teacher **How Monitored** -PLCS turn their logs into math coach weekly. - Logs shared with district staff on a monthly basis. -Administration/district attends targeted PLCs - Bi-weekly informal classroom visits will be made to monitor pacing.	1.1 Data will be analyzed during PLCs to determine what students are learning and method of instructional delivery	1.1 2x per year - District Formatives -Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments		

Mathematics Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance					
The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 35% to 38%.							

	35%	38%					

		1.2. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.	1.2 **Strategy/Task** Students' math comprehension improves through frequent participation in higher order thinking and discussion activities to deepen and extend student knowledge. **Action Steps** ***Within PLCs*** -Teachers plan higher order thinking questions and appropriate discussion topics when creating lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement. -Teachers plan for scaffolding questions to meet the differentiated needs of students. -Use student data to monitor the correlation of using higher order questioning techniques and student achievement. ***In the classroom*** During the lessons, **teachers**:	1.2 **Who** -Math Resource Teacher -District Math Resource Teacher **How Monitored** -Math Resource Teacher will meet with PLC's to review questions. -Classroom walk-throughs using MS mathematics walk-through form focusing on levels of questioning and student discussion. -	1.2 School and district resource teacher aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with teachers the progress of strategy implementation	1.2 2x per year - District Formatives -Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments	

			-Ask questions and use discussion topics created in PLCs that require students to engage in frequent higher order thinking. -Wait for full attention from the class before asking questions and give wait time once questions are posed. -Encourage students to elaborate and support responses with mathematical evidence. -Scaffold questions to help students with incorrect answers. -Engage all students in the discussion and ensure that all voices are heard.				
		1.3. -Teachers vary in their implementation of checks for understanding during their lessons. -Instructional time used to check for understanding.	1.3. **Strategy/Task** Student achievement will improve when students are engaged in frequent checks for understanding during daily lessons. Feedback will be provided to students to ensure learning prior to unit assessment.	1.3 **Who** -Math Resource Teacher -District Math Resource Teacher **How Monitored** -Classroom walk-throughs using MS mathematics walk-through form -Data chats with teachers about summative results	1.3 School and district resource teacher aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with teachers the progress of strategy implementation	1.3 2x per year - District Formatives -Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments	

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 -PLCs struggle with developing engaging lessons. -Teachers' incorporation of student directed learning varies across campus.	2.1 **Strategy/ Task** Student achievement improves when teachers work collaboratively to focus on student learning. Teachers will meet a minimum of 3 times per month in PLCs with site-based coach to create student centered lessons while maintaining the pace of the curriculum. **Action Steps** Grade level PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check Act form to guide the way of work.	2.1 **Who** -Math Coach -Principal/APC -District Math Resource Teacher **How Monitored** -PLCs turn their logs into math coach weekly. - Logs shared with district staff on a monthly basis. -Administration/district attends targeted PLCs - Bi-weekly informal classroom visits will be made to monitor pacing.	2.1 Data will be analyzed during PLCs to determine what students are learning and method of instructional delivery	2.1 **2x per year** - District Formatives -Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** -Core Curriculum Assessments		

Mathematics Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 13% to 16%.	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	13%	**16%**					

		2.2 -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.	**2.2** **Strategy/Task** Students' math comprehension improves through frequent participation in higher order thinking and discussion activities to deepen and extend student knowledge. **Action Steps** ***Within PLCs*** -Teachers plan higher order thinking questions and appropriate discussion topics when creating lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement. -Teachers plan for scaffolding questions to meet the differentiated needs of students. -Use student data to monitor the correlation of using higher order questioning techniques and student achievement. ***In the classroom*** **During the lessons, teachers**:	2.2 **Who** -Math Resource Teacher -District Math Resource Teacher **How Monitored** -Math Resource Teacher will meet with PLC's to review questions. -Classroom walk-throughs using MS mathematics walk-through form focusing on levels of questioning and student discussion.	2.2 School and district resource teacher aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with teachers the progress of strategy implementation	2.2 **2x per year** - District Formatives -Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** -Core Curriculum Assessments	

			-Ask questions and use discussion topics created in PLCs that require students to engage in frequent higher order thinking. -Wait for full attention from the class before asking questions and give wait time once questions are posed. -Encourage students to elaborate and support responses with mathematical evidence. -Scaffold questions to help students with incorrect answers. -Engage all students in the discussion and ensure that all voices are heard.				
		2.3. -Teachers vary in their impleme ntation of checks for understandin g during their lessons. -Instructional time used to check for understandin g.	2.3. **Strategy/Task** Student achievement will improve when students are engaged in frequent checks for understanding during daily lessons. Feedback will be provided to students to ensure learning prior to unit assessment.	2.3 **Who** -Math Resource Teacher -District Math Resource Teacher **How Monitored** -Classroom walk-throughs using MS mathematics walk-through form -Data chats with teachers about summative results	2.3 School and district resource teacher aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with teachers the progress of strategy implementation	2.3 **2x per year** - District Formatives -Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** -Core Curriculum Assessments	

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**						

3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.	3.1 -PLCs struggle with developing engaging lessons. -Teachers' incorporation of student directed learning varies across campus.	3.1 **Strategy/ Task** Student achievement improves when teachers work collaboratively to focus on student learning. Teachers will meet a minimum of 3 times per month in PLCs with site-based coach to create student centered lessons while maintaining the pace of the curriculum. **Action Steps** Grade level PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check Act form to guide the way of work.	3.1 **Who** -Math Coach -Principal/APC -District Math Resource Teacher **How Monitored** -PLCS turn their logs into math coach weekly. - Logs shared with district staff on a monthly basis. -Administration/district attends targeted PLCs - Bi-weekly informal classroom visits will be made to monitor pacing.	3.1 Data will be analyzed during PLCs to determine what students are learning and method of instructional delivery	3.1 **2x per year** - District Formatives -Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** -Core Curriculum Assessments		

Mathematics Goal #3: Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 58 points to 62 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	58 points	**62 points**					

		3.2 -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.	**3.2** **Strategy/Task** Students' math comprehension improves through frequent participation in higher order thinking and discussion activities to deepen and extend student knowledge. **Action Steps** ***Within PLCs*** -Teachers plan higher order thinking questions and appropriate discussion topics when creating lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement. -Teachers plan for scaffolding questions to meet the differentiated needs of students. -Use student data to monitor the correlation of using higher order questioning techniques and student achievement. ***In the classroom*** During the lessons, **teachers**:	3.2 **Who** -Math Resource Teacher -District Math Resource Teacher **How Monitored** -Math Resource Teacher will meet with PLC's to review questions. -Classroom walk-throughs using MS mathematics walk-through form focusing on levels of questioning and student discussion.	3.2 School and district resource teacher aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with teachers the progress of strategy implementation	3.2 **2x per year** - District Formatives -Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** -Core Curriculum Assessments	

			-Ask questions and use discussion topics created in PLCs that require students to engage in frequent higher order thinking. -Wait for full attention from the class before asking questions and give wait time once questions are posed. -Encourage students to elaborate and support responses with mathematical evidence. -Scaffold questions to help students with incorrect answers. -Engage all students in the discussion and ensure that all voices are heard.				
		3.3. -Teachers vary in their implementation of checks for understanding during their lessons. -Instructional time used to check for understanding.	3.3. **Strategy/Task** Student achievement will improve when students are engaged in frequent checks for understanding during daily lessons. Feedback will be provided to students to ensure learning prior to unit assessment.	3.3 **Who** -Math Resource Teacher -District Math Resource Teacher **How Monitored** -Classroom walk-throughs using MS mathematics walk-through form -Data chats with teachers about summative results	3.3 School and district resource teacher aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with teachers the progress of strategy implementation	3.3 **2x per year** - District Formatives -Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** -Core Curriculum Assessments	

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4.1 -PLCs struggle with developing engaging lessons. -Teachers' incorporation of student directed learning varies across campus.	4.1 **Strategy/ Task** Student achievement improves when teachers work collaboratively to focus on student learning. Teachers will meet a minimum of 3 times per month in PLCs with site-based coach to create student centered lessons while maintaining the pace of the curriculum. **Action Steps** Grade level PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check Act form to guide the way of work.	4.1 **Who** -Math Coach -Principal/APC -District Math Resource Teacher **How Monitored** -PLCS turn their logs into math coach weekly. - Logs shared with district staff on a monthly basis. -Administration/district attends targeted PLCs - Bi-weekly informal classroom visits will be made to monitor pacing.	4.1 Data will be analyzed during PLCs to determine what students are learning and method of instructional delivery	4.1 **2x per year** - District Formatives -Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** -Core Curriculum Assessments		

Mathematics Goal #4: Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 59 points to 63 points.	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	59 points	**63 points**					

		4.2 -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. -	**4.2** **Strategy/Task** Students' math comprehension improves through frequent participation in higher order thinking and discussion activities to deepen and extend student knowledge. **Action Steps** ***Within PLCs*** -Teachers plan higher order thinking questions and appropriate discussion topics when creating lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement. -Teachers plan for scaffolding questions to meet the differentiated needs of students. -Use student data to monitor the correlation of using higher order questioning techniques and student achievement. ***In the classroom*** **During the lessons, teachers**:	4.2 **Who** -Math Resource Teacher -District Math Resource Teacher **How Monitored** -Math Resource Teacher will meet with PLC's to review questions. -Classroom walk-throughs using MS mathematics walk-through form focusing on levels of questioning and student discussion. -	4.2 School and district resource teacher aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with teachers the progress of strategy implementation	4.2 **2x per year** - District Formatives -Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** -Core Curriculum Assessments	

			-Ask questions and use discussion topics created in PLCs that require students to engage in frequent higher order thinking. -Wait for full attention from the class before asking questions and give wait time once questions are posed. -Encourage students to elaborate and support responses with mathematical evidence. -Scaffold questions to help students with incorrect answers. -Engage all students in the discussion and ensure that all voices are heard.				
		4.3 -Teachers vary in their impleme ntation of checks for understanding during their lessons. -Instructional time used to check for understanding	4.3 **Strategy/Task** Student achievement will improve when students are engaged in frequent checks for understanding during daily lessons. Feedback will be provided to students to ensure learning prior to unit assessment.	4.3 **Who** -Math Resource Teacher -District Math Resource Teacher **How Monitored** -Classroom walk-throughs using MS mathematics walk-through form -Data chats with teachers about summative results	4.3 School and district resource teacher aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with teachers the progress of strategy implementation	4.3 **2x per year** - District Formatives -Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** -Core Curriculum Assessments	

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.		

Reading Goal #5A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
The percentage of White students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 50% to 55%.							
The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 27% to 34%.							
The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 42% to 48%.							
The percentage of Asian students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/							

FAA Math will increase from 40% to 46%.							
	White: 50% Black: 27% Hispanic: 42% Asian: 40% American Indian: NA	White: 55% Black: 34% Hispanic: 48% Asian: 46% American Indian: NA					
		5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** 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 Econ. Dis students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 32% to 39%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	Econ. Dis: 32%	Econ. Dis: 39%					
		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	

		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
	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.							

Mathematics Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 32% to 33%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	ELL: 32%	ELL: 33%					
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.							
Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/ satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Math will increase from 14% to 23%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	SWD: 14%	SWD: 23%					

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

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

Alg1. Students scoring proficient/ satisfactory performance in Algebra (Levels 3-5).	1.1. -Time to plan and structure lessons and structure in addition to planning and preparing for FCAT 2.0	1.1. **Strategy/ Task:** -Student achievement improves when students are presented with real world applications which they approach by explaining the meaning of the problem and then applying a variety of strategies and justifying their solutions. **Action Steps:** -Utilize sample Algebra EOC items in instruction and on assessments. -Data chats during 8th	1.1. **Who** -Math Coach -8th Grade PLC -District Math Resource Teacher **How Monitored** -PLC logs -Monitor student progress on Algebra EOC assessments.	1.1 - Data will be analyzed during PLCs to determine what students are learning and method of instructional delivery	1.1 **2x per year** -Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** Algebra EOC assessments		

		grade PLCs.					
Algebra Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013Algebra EOC will increase from 49% to 52%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	49%	**52%**					

		1.2. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons.	**1.2** **Strategy/Task** Students' math comprehension improves through frequent participation in higher order thinking and discussion activities to deepen and extend student knowledge. **Action Steps** ***Within PLCs*** -Teachers plan higher order thinking questions and appropriate discussion topics when creating lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement. -Teachers plan for scaffolding questions to meet the differentiated needs of students. -Use student data to monitor the correlation of using higher order questioning techniques and student achievement. ***In the classroom*** **During the lessons, teachers:**	1.2 **Who** -Math Resource Teacher -District Math Resource Teacher **How Monitored** -Math Resource Teacher will meet with PLC's to review questions. -Classroom walk-throughs using MS mathematics walk-through form focusing on levels of questioning and student discussion. -	1.2 School and district resource teacher aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with teachers the progress of strategy implementation	1.2 **2x per year** - District Formatives -Semester Exams **During the Grading Period** -Core Curriculum Assessments	

			-Ask questions and use discussion topics created in PLCs that require students to engage in frequent higher order thinking. -Wait for full attention from the class before asking questions and give wait time once questions are posed. -Encourage students to elaborate and support responses with mathematical evidence. -Scaffold questions to help students with incorrect answers. -Engage all students in the discussion and ensure that all voices are heard.				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**		

Alg2. Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in Algebra.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Algebra Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2013Algebra EOC will increase from 13% to 16%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					

	13%	16%					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

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
Writing Effective Lesson Plans	6-8	-Math On the Ground Coach -Math Coach	Math Department and course-specific PLCs	-October -PLC Meetings every two weeks	-Walkthroughs -Student Data	Math Coach
Higher Order Thinking	6-8	-District Trainer -Math Coach	Math Department and course-specific PLCs	-November -On-going	-Walkthroughs -Student Data	Math Coach
Kagan	6-8	-District Trainer	Math Department and course-specific PLCs	-January -On-going	-Walkthroughs -Student Data	Math Coach
Metacognitive Thinking in the Classroom	6-8	-All Greco Academic Coaches	Math Department and course-specific PLCs	-November -On-going	-Walkthroughs -Student Data	Math Coach

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

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/ satisfactory performance (Level 3-5) in science.	1.1 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model.	1.1 **Strategy** Students' science skills will improve through participation in the **5E instructional model.** **Action Steps** -Science Coach will meet with individual grade levels/ teachers to plan effective 5E Instructional Models. - During PLCs, Science Coach and Department Head will provide additional training on the individual components of the 5E Instructional Model.	1.1 Who Principal APC Science Coach Science SAL How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	1.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Common Grade Level Benchmark Assessments - Common District Big Idea Summative Assessments		

		-PLCs write SMART goals based for units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collabo ratively building 5E Instructional Model for upcoming lessons. - Grade level PLCs will develop one common 5E Instructional Model per quarter. -PLC teachers instruct students using the 5E Instructional Model. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core					

		curriculum material. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans to drive future instruction.					
Science Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 25% to 27%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance					
	25% **(65)**	**27%** **(81)**					

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

			log to monitor the following: --Guide their Plan-Do-Check-Act conversations and way of work. --Monitor the frequency of meetings. All grade level/subject area PLCs collaborate 3 times per month for curriculum planning, reflection, and data analysis.) -Working with the core curriculum, within grade level PLCs teachers will: --Unpack the benchmark and identify what students need to understand, know, and do. --Plan for checks for understanding during the unit. --Use District made Big Idea Common Assessments. --Plan common benchmark assessments. --Plan upcoming lessons/units using the 5E Instructional Model.				

			--Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught --Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments. --Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group. -PLCs will generate SMART goals for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs will report SMART goal data through their logs. As a Science Department -PLC, share action plan successes and challenges of the grade levels courses. -PLCs will adjust action plans based on teacher/coach walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data.				

		1.3 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in imbedding the Nature of Science Benchmarks into the content being taught using appropriate instructional strategies and technology.	1.3 **Strategy** Student understanding of the nature of science benchmarks and scientific content knowledge improves when students are intellectually active in learning important and challenging science content through the use of appropriate instructional methods, **scientific processes**, **laboratory experiences, and uses of technology** (animations, probeware, digital microscopy). **Action Steps** -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling technology and hands-on strategies. -Within PLCs, teachers plan for engaging exploration of science content using hands-on learning experiences, inquiry, labs, technology (such as probeware, simulations	1.3 Who Principal APC Science Resource Teachers (where available) Science Department Chairperson How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	1.3 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.	1.3 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Common Grade Level Benchmark Assessments - Common District Big Idea Summative Assessments	

			and animations) within the 5E Instructional Model. -Teachers implement the 5E Instructional Model to promote learning experiences that cause students to think, make connections, formulate and test hypotheses and draw conclusions. -Teachers facilitate student-centered learning through the use of the 5E Instructional Model. -Common Core Literacy Standards for both Reading and Writing are appropriately embedded throughout the 5E Instruction Model. -Each teacher maintains a record of the number of occurrences of engagement tasks (hands-on-learning experiences, labs, and technology) per week. This data is then reported on the Science PLC log. -Monthly, school leaders conduct one-on-one data chats with		-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.		

			individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools and engagement task records. These teacher data/chats guide the leadership's team professional development plan (both individually and whole faculty).				

		1.4 Not all teachers understand how to integrate the close reading model into the 5E instructional model.	1.4 **Strategy** Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text (textbooks and other supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the **close reading model** (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least 1 time per nine weeks. **Action Steps** ***Professional Development*** -The Reading Coach along with the Departmental Leaders/Coach/SAL conduct small group departmental trainings to develop teachers' ability to use the close reading model. -In addition to the	1.4 Who Principal AP Science Coach Reading Coach Reading Leadership Team CCLS Science Team Science SAL/DH How Monitored Administration, Coach, SAL walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration. -Administration provides feedback.	1.4 Science PLC Resource meetings Reading Leadership Team PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing baseline achievement level to 80% mastery using the proximal evaluation tool.	1.4 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Common Grade Level Benchmark Assessments - Common District Big Idea Summative Assessments	

			Science Coach and SAL, the Reading Coach will assist science departmental PLCs in, developing lessons using the close reading model. -Teachers within departments attend professional development provided by the district/school on text complexity and close reading models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model. ***In PLCs/Department*** -Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks. -PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile. -PLCs assign appropriate NGSSS benchmark to Close Reading passage -To increase stamina, teachers select high-				

			Lexile, complex and rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous__ - Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons. ***During the lessons, teachers:*** -Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text using the following: --Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text. --Stating an essential question prior to reading --Using questions to check for understanding. --Using question to engage students in				

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

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.	2.1 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model.	2.1 **Strategy** Students' science skills will improve through participation in the **5E instructional model.** **Action Steps** -Science Coach will meet with individual grade levels/ teachers to plan effect 5E Instructional Models. - During PLCs, Science Coach and Department Head will provide additional training on the individual components of the 5E Instructional Model.	2.1 Who Principal APC Science Coach Science SAL How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	2.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	2.1 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Common Grade Level Benchmark Assessments - Common District Big Idea Summative Assessments		

		-PLCs write SMART goals based for units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collabo ratively building 5E Instructional Model for upcoming lessons. - Grade level PLCs will develop one common 5E Instructional Model per quarter. -PLC teachers instruct students using the 5E Instructional Model. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core					

		curriculum material. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans to drive future instruction.					
Science Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 2% to 5%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance					
	2% **(5)**	**5%** **(12)**					

		2.2. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their learning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	2.2. Strategy Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning using the 5E Instructional Model. Specifically, they use the **Plan-Do-Check-Act model** to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? Actions/Details *Within PLCs:* -PLCs will use a PLC	2.2 Who -Principal -AP -Instructional Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -PLC logs turned into administration/coaches provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	2.2. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.	2.2. 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Common Grade Level Benchmark Assessments - Common District Big Idea Summative Assessments	

			log to monitor the following: --Guide their Plan-Do-Check-Act conversations and way of work. --Monitor the frequency of meetings. All grade level/subject area PLCs collaborate 3 times per month for curriculum planning, reflection, and data analysis.) -Working with the core curriculum, within grade level PLCs teachers will: --Unpack the benchmark and identify what students need to understand, know, and do. --Plan for checks for understanding during the unit. --Use District made Big Idea Common Assessments. --Plan common benchmark assessments. --Plan upcoming lessons/units using the 5E Instructional Model.				

			--Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught --Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments. --Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group. -PLCs will generate SMART goals for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs will report SMART goal data through their logs. As a Science Department -PLC, share action plan successes and challenges of the grade levels courses. -PLCs will adjust action plans based on teacher/coach walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data.				

		2.3 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in imbedding the Nature of Science Benchmarks into the content being taught using appropriate instructional strategies and technology.	2.3 **Strategy** Student understanding of the nature of science benchmarks and scientific content knowledge improves when students are intellectually active in learning important and challenging science content through the use of appropriate instructional methods, **scientific processes**, **laboratory experiences, and uses of technology** (animations, probeware, digital microscopy). **Action Steps** -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling technology and hands-on strategies. -Within PLCs, teachers plan for engaging exploration of science content using hands-on learning experiences, inquiry, labs, technology (such as probeware, simulations	2.3 Who Principal APC Science Resource Teachers (where available) Science Department Chairperson How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	2.3 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.	2.3 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Common Grade Level Benchmark Assessments - Common District Big Idea Summative Assessments	

			and animations) within the 5E Instructional Model. -Teachers implement the 5E Instructional Model to promote learning experiences that cause students to think, make connections, formulate and test hypotheses and draw conclusions. -Teachers facilitate student-centered learning through the use of the 5E Instructional Model. -Common Core Literacy Standards for both Reading and Writing are appropriately embedded throughout the 5E Instruction Model. -Each teacher maintains a record of the number of occurrences of engagement tasks (hands-on-learning experiences, labs, and technology) per week. This data is then reported on the Science PLC log. -Monthly, school leaders conduct one-on-one data chats with		-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.		

			individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools and engagement task records. These teacher data/chats guide the leadership's team professional development plan (both individually and whole faculty).				

		2.4 -Not all teachers understand how to integrate the close reading model into the 5E instructional model.	2.4 **Strategy** Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text (textbooks and other supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the **close reading model** (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least 1 time per nine weeks. **Action Steps** ***Professional Development*** -The Reading Coach along with the Departmental Leaders/Coach/SAL conduct small group departmental trainings to develop teachers' ability to use the close reading model. -In addition to the	2.4 Who Principal AP Science Coach Reading Coach Reading Leadership Team CCLS Science Team Science SAL/DH How Monitored Administration, Coach, SAL walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration. -Administration provides feedback.	2.4 Science PLC Resource meetings Reading Leadership Team PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing baseline achievement level to 80% mastery using the proximal evaluation tool.	2.4 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests Semester Exams During the Grading Period -Common Grade Level Benchmark Assessments - Common District Big Idea Summative Assessments	

			Science Coach and SAL, the Reading Coach will assist science departmental PLCs in, developing lessons using the close reading model. -Teachers within departments attend professional development provided by the district/school on text complexity and close reading models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model. ***In PLCs/Department*** -Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks. -PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile. -PLCs assign appropriate NGSSS benchmark to Close Reading passage -To increase stamina, teachers select high-				

			Lexile, complex and rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous__ - Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons. ***During the lessons, teachers:*** -Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text using the following: --Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text. --Stating an essential question prior to reading --Using questions to check for understanding. --Using question to engage students in				

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies

through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Technology and Hands-On Activities (animations/Gizmos, scientific probeware, laboratory technology)	Grades 6-8	Science Coach/ SAL and Technology Resource	Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs	On-going in science PLCs 3 times per month	Administrators/science coach conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor Hands-On Activity implementation.	Administration Team
Inquiry and the 5E Instructional Model incorporating Nature of Science into content	Grades 6-8	Science Coach/ SAL and Technology Resource	Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs	On-going in science PLCs 3 times per month	Administrators /Science coach conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor 5 E Instructional Model lessons.	Administration Team
Close reading into 5E Instructional Model	Grades 6-8	Reading Coach Science Coach SAL Reading Leadership Team	Science Departmental PLCs and course-specific PLCs	One PLC meeting per month	Reading Coach walk-throughs	Administration Team & Reading Coach

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

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. -Students struggle with the generation of responses and ideas related to a writing prompt. -Teachers are at varying levels of levels with teaching writing. -Need to involve the entire department in the implementation of the site-based writing instruction plan. - PLC meetings, walkthroughs, and teacher/ coach conferences revealed a need for teacher support in instructing students how	1.1 Students' ability to plan/ prewrite for an essay will improve due to an emphasis on a site-based writing plan. Action Steps - Information will be gathered during PLCs, walkthroughs, and teacher/ coach conferences regarding teachers' skill levels on teaching the planning/ prewriting process. -Teachers/coach will collaborate to develop a site-based writing plan	1.1 Who -School Writing Resource Teacher -Principal/APC -Academic Writing Coach -District Language Arts Supervisor How -Walkthroughs, -Student work samples, -PLC logs.	1.1 -Grade level PLCS write SMART goals for the upcoming planning/ prewriting for essays. -Data will be analyzed during PLCs to identify the patterns of strengths and weaknesses demonstrated by students in their fully-elaborated body paragraphs using complete sentences. Results will be used to drive further instruction.	1.1 Evidence of planning and prewriting on planning sheet.		

	to plan before writing.	that focuses on planning/ prewriting. -Within PLCs, teachers/ writing resource teacher will attend ongoing trainings/ professional development in order to support the site-based writing plan that focuses on planning/ prewriting. -According to site-based writing plan, teachers will implement instruction on the planning/ prewriting process as evidenced by walkthroughs, student samples and PLC logs.					

		-In PLCs, teachers/coach will analyze the patterns of the strengths and weaknesses demonstrated by students in their planning/ prewriting. Results will be used to drive future instruction. -LA teachers will instruct students on the utilization of the site-based writing plan. The Writing Coach will provide on-going training and modeling for LA teachers. -Non-LA teachers will provide students will practice					

		planning/ prewriting opportunities. The Writing Coach will provide on-going training and modeling for non-LA teachers. -Data from district and site-based writing assessments will be reviewed to target students by writing deficiencies.					

Writing/LA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 69% to 73%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	69%	**73%**					

		1.2. -Students struggle with understanding the structure and development of a an essay. -Teachers are at varying levels of levels with teaching writing. -Need to involve the entire department in the implementation of the site-based writing instruction plan. -PLC meetings, walkthroughs, and teacher/ coach conferences	1.2. Students' ability to write proficiently will improve due to an emphasis on conferencing (checks for understanding) with students about their writing. **Action Steps** -Information will be gathered by teacher survey, walkthroughs, and during PLCs to determine knowledge of and comfort level regarding conferencing with students about their writing. -Within PLCs, teachers/ writing resource teacher will receive on-going training/professional development to support writing conferencing as a tool to improve writing proficiency. -Teachers will conference with students	1.2. Who -School Writing Resource Teacher -Principal/APC -Academic Writing Coach -District Language Arts Supervisor How -Walkthroughs, -Student work samples, -PLC logs.	1.2. -Data will be analyzed during PLCs to identify the patterns of strengths and weaknesses demonstrated by students in fully developed essays. Results will be used to drive future instruction.	1.2. Fully-elaborated body paragraph within an essay.	

		revealed a need for teacher support in instructing students how to write a full developed essay.	during writing activities and record student data using a conference log as evident by walkthroughs, student samples, Writing Resource Logs, and conference logs. -During PLCs, teachers/ writing resource teacher will analyze data gathered from the conference logs to determine the patterns of strengths and weaknesses in student writing and target students who need further support or instruction. Results will be used to drive future instruction.				

		1.3. -Teachers struggle with planning/ teaching assigned curriculum/ framework with fidelity. -Teachers are at varying levels of levels of content knowledge and pedagogy. - Student assessment data revealed a need for teachers' to increase rigor using assigned framework/ curriculum with fidelity.	1.3. Language Arts teachers will implement the Plan-Do-Check-Act to strengthen the district-selected core curriculum. Teachers will meet a minimum of 3 times per month in PLCs with Writing Resource Teacher or SAL to plan for engagement using think-pair-share, plan for text dependent higher order thinking, plan for assessment and analyzing data from common curriculum-based assessments, and plan to increase content knowledge and pedagogy in order to implement district-selected core curriculum with fidelity/ pace. **Action Steps** -Information will be gathered during PLCs, walkthroughs, and site-based literacy coaches' meetings regarding teachers' skill levels. -In district trainings	1.3. Who School Reading Coach School Writing Resource Teacher Principal/APC District Reading Coach District Language Arts Supervisor How - walkthroughs looking for 1) pacing and 2) fidelity of implementation - coach/teacher conversations - student samples - PLC logs emailed to Administration	1.3. -Grade level/course specific PLCs write SMART goals for the framework/ curriculum-based common assessment. -Data will be analyzed during PLCs to identify the patterns of strengths and weaknesses demonstrated by students in their framework/ curriculum-based common assessment. Results will be used to drive future instruction.	1.3. Frame work/ curriculum-based common assessment	

			and within PLC's, teachers and coaches will attend ongoing trainings/professional development to build teachers' skill levels. -Teachers will meet a minimum of 3 times per month on PLCs with site-based coaches to engage in on-going professional development in order to plan effectively. -Teachers in the classroom will implement new knowledge of think-pair-share, text-dependent higher order thinking, assessment and analyzing data from common curriculum assessments, and content and pedagogy, while teaching assigned framework/curriculum as evident by: ● walkthroughs looking for 1) pacing and 2) fidelity of implementation,				

			● coach/teacher conversations, ● student samples, and PLC logs -At the end of a unit of instruction, teachers give a framework/ curriculum-based common assessment and bring results to the PLC meeting. -In PLCs teachers/ coaches analyze the assessment results. - Grade level PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check Act "Unit of Instruction" log to guide their discussion and way of work. -In PLCs teachers/ coaches develop a plan to act on the data. The plan will address the needs of struggling students who are not learning and the needs of students who have mastered the skill/ standards taught.				

		1.4 -Teachers are at varying skill levels with student engagement techniques -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying student engagement techniques.	1.4 Student achievement improves when students are intellectually active in learning important and challenging content. Specifically, Language Arts teachers will utilize think-pair-share as an engagement technique. Strategically, the Writing Resource Teacher, will work with Language Arts teachers. The Writing Resource Teacher will also collaborate with Reading Coach to support Social Studies and Elective Teachers. Action Steps - Information will be gathered from teacher survey s, during PLCs, walkthroughs, and site-based literacy coaches' meetings regarding teachers' skill levels in utilizing think-pair-share as an engagement technique through the district-selected core curriculum.	1.4. Who School Reading Coach School Writing Resource Teacher Principal/APC How -Administrator or coach/resource teacher walkthroughs for utilization of think-pair-share in lessons. -Coach/teacher conversations -Review PLC logs	1.4 School and district resource teachers aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with teachers the progress of strategy implementation	1.4. Think-Pair-Share Walkthrough Form	

			-In district trainings, school professional development, and PLCSs, teachers will attend ongoing trainings/professional development to build teachers' skill levels in utilizing think-pair-share through the district-selected core curriculum. -Teachers in classrooms will implement new knowledge of utilizing think-pair-share through the district-selected core curriculum as evident by walkthroughs and artifacts.				

		1.5 -Teachers struggle with planning/ teaching assigned curriculum/ framework with fidelity. -Teachers are at varying levels of levels of content knowledge and pedagogy. - Student assessment data revealed a need for teachers' to increase rigor using assigned framework/ curriculum with fidelity.	1.5 Students' reading, writing, language and listening/speaking skills will improve through implementation of district-selected core curriculum with fidelity. The Writing Resource Teacher supports Language Arts teachers through co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, debriefing, or teacher/ student data chats. Every two weeks the Writing Resource Teacher meets with the Principal/ APC to review log and develop short term action plans. **<u>Action Steps</u>** -Information will be gathered from surveys, during PLCs, walkthroughs, and school writing data to inform teachers' instructional needs. -Based on individual teacher's instructional needs, the Writing Resource Teacher will	1.5 -Writing Resource Teacher -Principal/APC	1.5 Coaching cycle will be revisited as appropriate based on the needs of the individual teacher	1.5 Anecdotal Records Student Work Samples	

			support teachers through co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, debriefing, or teacher/student data chats. -Coaching cycle will be revisited as appropriate based on the needs of the individual teacher.				

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

	6-8	PLC facilitators Academic Coach	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	PLC logs turned into administration	Academic Coach
Writing Holistic Scoring Training						
	6-8	PLC facilitators Academic Coach	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	-Administration or Coach walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration	Academic Coach
Mode-based Writing Training Springboard Pacing	6-8	PLC facilitators Academic Coach	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	-Administration or Coach walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration	Academic Coach
Rubric Training	6-8	PLC facilitators Academic Coach	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	-Administration or Coach walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration	Academic Coach
Higher-Order Thinking	6-8	PLC facilitators Academic Coach	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	-Administration or Coach walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration	Academic Coach

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

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 -PSLT needs to meet on a regular basis throughout the school year. -Need support in implementing Tier 1 attendance strategies with fidelity.	1.1 **Tier 1** PSLT will review the school's attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data.	1.1 PSLT will keep a log and agenda discussing concerns and problem solving issues which are barriers to implementation with fidelity. These concerns will be discussed and reviewed by PSLT	1.1 PSLT will monitor school wide data from Tier 1 school wide attendance.	1.1 Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/ Tardy data Reports on Demand		

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

Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
1. The attendance rate will increase from 91.6% in 2011-2012 to 94% in 2012-2013. 2. The attendance rate will increase from 91.6% in 2011-2012 to 94% in 2012-2013. The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10% 3. The number of students who have 10 or more **unexcused** tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.							
	91.6%	**94%**					

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	219	**197**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	4	**3**					
		1.2	1.2 **Tier 1** Students will be paid bi-weekly with cub bucks for perfect attendance or attendance improvement. They can use these to purchase items they desire	1.2 Assistant Principal/Team leaders/ Department Heads/ Teachers will monitor	1.2 Students will be randomly asked to show their ledgers of cub bucks to ensure they are being reinforced accordingly.	1.2 None	

		1.3 Need for continued dialogue with students/teachers regarding the importance of attendance.	1.3 **Tier 1** Grade level homeroom attendance winners will be rewarded/recognized monthly. Monthly those homerooms with the highest attendance average, as well as most improved, will receive a reward (hot dogs/burgers/ bingo, etc.).	1.3 PSLT	1.3 The attendance committee (which is a subset of the leadership Team) will extrapolate data to determine who are the monthly homeroom attendance winners as well as monthly to determine highest attendance average and most improved.	1.3 Instructional Planning Tool, Print Systems reports through SDHC	
		1.4 Need to continue to reinforce all students with perfect attendance	1.4 **Tier 1** Monthly, all students with perfect attendance will be provided an incentive.	1.4 PSLT	1.4 The attendance committee will desegregate data to determine those students who had perfect attendance on a monthly basis	1.4 Print Systems through SDHC, Instructional Planning Tool	
		1.1 Students who do not respond to Tier 1 interventions needing more supplemental remediation to address attendance	1.1 **Tier 2** Truancy officer will assist with making home visits to discuss district expectations for attendance and identify barriers in which Attendance Committee can assist with addressing.	1.1 Attendance Committee Admin	1.1 The attendance committee will extrapolate data to determine those students who need more intensive Tier 2 remediation.	1.1 Instructional Planning Tool, Ed Connect	

			1.2 **Tier 2** Phone calls will be made to parents of children who are accruing excessive absences. 5 absences and 10 unexcused absences letters will be sent out notifying parents of attendance concerns.	1.2 Attendance Committee Admin	1.1 Attendance Monitor is provided list of children with excessive absences. 1.2 Parent Liaison sends letters out to parents for students with 5 absences and 10 unexcused days absences.	1.2 SDHC	

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
Training on SB90710 and attendance interventions done within the classroom	6-8	Social Worker	School-wide	October		Attendance Committee

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 intervention and implementation time. -There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	1.1 Tier 1 -Positive Behavior Support (PBS) or CHAMPS will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey, discipline data, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations. -Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and rules. -Leadership team conducts	1.1 Who -PSLT Committee -Leadership Team -Administration	1.1 - PSLT /Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions, ATOSS data monthly.	UNTIE , EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data		

		walkthroughs using a PBS or CHAMPS walk-through form (generated by the district RtI facilitators). -Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats.					

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

Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.							
2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.							
3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.							
4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.							

	1046	**941**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	408	**367**					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	1040	**936**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	119	**107**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community

(PLC) or PD Activity

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Positive Behavior Support (PBS)	6-8	District	School-wide	Every two months on early release days	Administration, district RtI facilitator and guidance walk-throughs	Administration, district RtI facilitator and guidance walk-throughs
CHAMPS	6-8	USF Trainer District	School-wide	Every two months on early release days	Administration, district RtI facilitator and guidance walk-throughs	Administration, district RtI facilitator and guidance walk-throughs

Health and Fitness Goal(s)

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**		

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

1. Additional Goal Additional Goal #1:	1. Students willing to dress out. 2. Students on Physical Education waivers	1. Middle School students will engage in the equivalent of one class period per day of physical education for one semester of each year in grades 6 through 8	1.APC Guidance	1.Checking student schedules	1.		

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 27% on the Pretest to 37% on the Posttest. *Schools will enter the data after the Pretest and Posttest. Make sure there*	2012 Current Level:	2013 Expected Level:					

is at least a 10% between the Pretest and Posttest.							
	27%	37%					
			2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the Principal's designee.	**2.** Principal's designee.	**2.** Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ)	**2.** PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	

			3. Five physical education classes per week for a minimum of one semester per year with a certified physical education teacher.	**3.** Physical Education Teacher	**3.** Class room walk-throughs Class schedules	**3.** PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.	

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

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

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

Continuous Improvement Goal(s)

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. Additional Goal- Additional Goal #1:	1.1 There is still confusion on how to conduct PLCs that are focused on deepening the knowledge base of teachers and improving student performance by the implieme	1.1 The leadership team will become trained on the use of the PLC "Unit of Instruction" log that follows the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. Subject Area Leader and/or PLC	1.1 Who Principal Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC facilitators	1.1 "Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training.	1.1 PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach (Anne Jolly)		

	ntation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. -Still confusion on how the Plan-Do-Check-Act model works. -Still some resistance to staff members attending PLCs and/or arriving	facilitators will guide their PLCs through the Plan-Do-Check-Act model for units of instruction. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Leadership Tea					

	on time to meetings. - Teachers asking for more PLC collaboration time. Possibility of waiver will be explored.	m.					

The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that "teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students' learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/ assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning)" will increase from 60% in 2012 to 75% in 2013.	2012 Current Level:	2013 Expected Level:					

	60%	75%					

		1.2 -Not enough time to meet in PLCs.	1.2 Leadership team will use teacher survey information every nine weeks to determine next steps for PLC professional development.	1.2 Who Leadership team How Leadership team aggregates the data	1.2 "Quick" PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for	1.2 PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach (Anne Jolly)	

					future PLC training.		

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
PLCs						
Plan-Do-Check-Act Model	Leadership Team	Leadership Team	School-wide	PLCs meet every three weeks for Plan-Do-Check-Act PLCs.	Administrator and leadership team walk-throughs	Leadership Team
	All teachers	Subject Area Leaders			Administrator and leadership attendance at PLC meetings	
		PLC Facilitators			PLC Survey data	

Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

A. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring proficient/ satisfactory performance in reading (Levels 4-9).	A.1.	A.1. **See Reading Goal 5d**	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.		

Reading Goal A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will increase by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance					
	76%	**79%**					
		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. **See Reading Goal 5d**	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.		
Reading Goal B: The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

C. Students scoring proficient/ satisfactory performance in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1.	1.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
CELLA Goal #C: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/ Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from **40**% to **43**%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	40%					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**	
D. Students scoring proficient/ satisfactory performance in Reading.	2.1.	2.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

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

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

E. Students scoring proficient/ satisfactory performance in Writing.	2.1.	2.1. **See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

CELLA Goal #E: The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from **38**% to **41**%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	38%					

Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals

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**		
F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).	F.1.	F.1. **See Math Goal 5d**	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.		

Mathematics Goal F: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will increase by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance					
	64%	**67%**					
		F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	
		F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	

G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	G.1.	G.1. **See Math Goal 5d**	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.		

Mathematics Goal G: The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance					
	54%	**55%**					
		G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	
		G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	

Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal

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

J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).	J.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	J.1. **Strategy** SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent impleme ntation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modificat ions, and accommodati ons. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are imple mented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually	J.1. Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC	J.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.			

		and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifica tions into lessons.					
Science Goal J: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will increase by 5%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	63%	**68%**					
		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. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	M.1. **Strategy** SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent impleme ntation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modificat ions, and accommodati ons. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are imple mented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually	M.1. Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC	M.1. Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	On-going writing prompts and assessments		

		and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.					
Writing Goal M: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will increase by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	64%	**67%**					
		M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	M.2.	
		M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	M.3.	

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**	**Fidelity Check** Who and how will the fidelity be monitored?	**Strategy Data Check** How will the evaluation tool data be used to determine the effectiveness of strategy?	**Student Evaluation Tool**
STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM electives.	1.1 Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers	1.1 -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established. -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs. -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.	1.1 PLC or grade level lead -Subject Area Leaders	1.1 Administrative/SAL walk-through	1.1 Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM elective per nine week. Share data with teachers.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies

through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Project-based learning	6-8	SALs	Science, Math, ELA, Social Studies and Technology teachers PLCs	On-going	Administrator walk-through	Administration
Curriculum Integration	6-8	STEM team teachers	Science, Math, ELA, Social Studies and Technology teachers PLCs	Quarterly	Curriculum submitted to STEM district liaison	Team Leader, Administration

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: Sustain/Increase the number of Career Technical Student Organization chapters from 1 in 2011-2012 to 2 in 2012-2013.	1.1. Lack of teacher sponsorship of CTSO	1.1. Increase student participation in CTSO competitions/events.	1.1. CTE Teachers	1.1. Aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop next steps	1.1. Log of number of CTSO events Log of number of students who attend CTSO events
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Establishing or growing a CTSO.	6-8	District	CTE Teachers	October, 2012	Log of events and attendance	CTE Contact Teacher

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability		

Status		
▢Priority	▢Focus	Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

▢ Yes No

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

Describe the use of SAC funds.			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
Anticipated expenditures	Teacher Mini-Grants Approved by SAC: In support of SIP goals.	$2,560.00	
Final Amount Spent			